

# Minutes

## The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 27 June 2019

Present:-

### LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

### COUNCILLORS

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

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

## 1 Minutes

---

### Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 30 May 2019 as a correct record.

## 2 Questions

---

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

## 3 Leader's Report

---

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

- Council schools' estate
- Positive destinations for school leavers
- Delayed discharge
- Waste complaints
- Roads improvements
- Active travel
- Transformation of city centre

The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor Whyte	-	Adult social care services
Councillor Mary Campbell	-	Climate breakdown – extreme weather events
Councillor Aldridge	-	Trams – Hardie Inquiry
Councillor Day	-	Pride 2019 Festival – vote of thanks
Councillor Gordon	-	Thanks to staff in Royal Hospital for Sick Children
Councillor McLellan	-	New affordable homes targets
Councillor Booth	-	Scottish Parliament actions to prevent 20mph zones/short term lets /community rights of appeal in planning
Councillor Osler	-	Summer solstice – Stockbridge street party - closed street events
Councillor Cameron	-	Inclusion and innovation strategies

Councillor Rose	- Homelessness – annual statistics and homeless strategy
Councillor Munro	- Further funding for Edinburgh – meeting with Finance Secretary
Councillor Watt	- Edinburgh Rape Crisis Centre – continuing support
Councillor Gardiner	- Edible Edinburgh Partnership – Sustainable Food City Award
Councillor Doggart	- Smart cities network – integrated planning and management
Councillor Burgess	- Climate Emergency – public engagement – Citizens Assembly

#### **4 Appointments to Committees, Outside Bodies etc**

---

Following the Council's previous agreement of its political management arrangements, the Council had agreed the increased membership of the Policy and Sustainability Committee. A number of Councillors had resigned from their positions on various Committees and organisations and the Council was required to appoint members in their place.

##### **Decision**

- 1) To note that the Green Group had appointed Councillors Main and Staniforth as co-conveners and agree that Councillor Staniforth should receive the Group Leader's Senior Councillor Allowance from 28 June 2019.
- 2) To appoint Councillor Gardiner to the new Policy and Sustainability Committee.
- 3) To appoint Councillor Watt in place of Councillor Kate Campbell on Business Loans Scotland.
- 4) To appoint Councillor Watt in place of Councillor Cameron on The Capital City Partnership.
- 5) To agree that Councillor Cameron remain as an individual Council member on EDI and Housing Management – LLP Corporate Body.

- 6) To appoint Councillor Dickie in place of Councillor Ian Campbell on the Board of Governors of the Dean and Cauvin Young People's Trust.
- 7) To appoint Councillor Fullerton as a Board Member of Community One Stop Shop.
- 8) To appoint Councillors Whyte, Jim Campbell, Webber, McLellan and Hutchison to the Policy and Sustainability Committee.
- 9) To appoint Councillor Webber in place of Councillor Smith on the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 10) To appoint Councillor Bruce in place of Councillor Whyte on the Finance and Resources Committee.
- 11) To appoint Councillors Jim Campbell, McLellan and Whyte to the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee.
- 12) To appoint Councillor Smith in place of Councillor Bruce on the Transport and Environment Committee.
- 13) To appoint Councillor Rose in place of Councillor McLellan on the Planning Committee, Development Management Sub Committee and Local Review Body Panel 2.
- 14) To appoint Councillor Doggart in place of Councillor Webber on the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board.
- 15) To appoint Councillor Main in place of Councillor Mary Campbell on the Policy and Sustainability Committee.
- 16) To appoint Councillor Staniforth in place of Councillor Booth on the Policy and Sustainability Committee.
- 17) To appoint Councillor Staniforth in place of Councillor Rae on the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.
- 18) To appoint Councillor Rae in place of Councillor Main on the Edinburgh Partnership.
- 19) To appoint Councillor Rae in place of Councillor Burgess on the Regulatory Committee and Licensing Sub Committee.
- 20) To appoint Councillor Rae in place of Councillor Staniforth as a Bailie.

- 21) To appoint Councillor Mary Campbell in place of Councillor Staniforth on the Planning Committee, Development Management Sub Committee and Panel 1 of the Planning Local Review Body.
- 22) To appoint Councillor Mary Campbell in place of Councillor Corbett on the Corporate Parenting Member Officer Group.
- 23) To appoint Councillor Miller in place of Councillor Booth on the Transport and Environment Committee and Transport for Edinburgh.
- 24) To appoint Councillor Main in place of Councillor Rae on the Joint Consultative Group.
- 25) To appoint Councillor Booth in place of Councillor Rae on the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee.
- 26) To appoint Councillor Booth in place of Councillor Miller on the Finance and Resources Committee.
- 27) To appoint Councillor Corbett in place of Councillor Burgess on the Transport and Environment Committee, Energy for Edinburgh, and the Solar Co-Op Board.
- 28) To appoint Councillor Burgess in place of Councillor Corbett on the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 29) To appoint Councillor Burgess in place of Councillor Mary Campbell on the Committee on Pupil Student Support.
- 30) To appoint Councillor Burgess in place of Councillor Miller on the Pensions Committee.
- 31) To appoint Councillor Staniforth in place of Councillor Corbett on COMPACT.
- 32) To appoint Councillor Corbett in place of Councillor Burgess on Torness Liaison Committee.
- 33) To appoint Councillor Miller in place of Councillor Booth on SEStran Board.
- 34) To appoint Councillor Staniforth in place of Councillor Miller on the Brexit Working Group.
- 35) To appoint Councillor Mary Campbell in place of Councillor Miller on the Diversity and Inclusion Working Group.
- 36) To appoint Councillor Main in place of Councillor Miller on the Wellbeing Working Group.

- 37) To appoint Councillor Booth in place of Councillor Miller on the Short Term Lets Working Group.
- 38) To appoint Councillor Staniforth in place of Councillor Rae on the Welfare Reform Working Group.
- 39) To appoint Councillor Booth in place of Councillor Rae on Edinburgh Homelessness Forum, Edinburgh Affordable Homes and Homelessness Task Force.
- 40) To appoint Councillor Gloyer as the second Liberal Democrat member on the Policy and Sustainability Committee.
- 41) To appoint Councillor Gloyer in place of Councillor Lang on the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.
- 42) To appoint Councillor Lang in place of Councillor Gloyer on the Transport and Environment Committee.
- 43) To appoint Councillor Aldridge in place of Councillor Osler on the Edinburgh Partnership.

(Reference – report by the Chief Executive, submitted)

## **5 Office of the Lord Provost: Year Two 2018/19**

---

Details were provided on the activity and outcomes of the Lord Provost in the second year of the current administration from June 2018 to May 2019.

### **Motion**

- 1) To welcome the report from the Office of the Lord Provost and note the range and variation of the work undertaken in Year 2 of the current administration.
- 2) To note the increased volume of activity in Year 2 in terms of civic events, speeches made and numbers of people attending engagements.
- 3) To note the wider economic impact of specific conferences and gatherings supported by the Lord Provost and Depute Lord Provost in 2018/19.
- 4) To endorse the direction of travel and key undertakings in 2019/20.

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

## Amendment

- 1) To welcome the report from the Office of the Lord Provost and note the range and variation of the work undertaken in Year 2 of the current administration.
- 2) To note the increased volume of activity in Year 2 in terms of civic events, speeches made and numbers of people attending engagements.
- 3) To note the wider economic impact of specific conferences and gatherings supported by the Lord Provost and Depute Lord Provost in 2018/19.
- 4) To endorse the direction of travel and key undertakings in 2019/20.
- 5) To note that this February the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee had acknowledged flight as the least desirable form of transport the council could undertake and that even if the Council did not fund a flight the environmental impact was the same.
- 6) Therefore adds the following to the report:

“7.6 The Office of Lord Provost will endeavour to avoid journeys which require air travel whenever possible.”

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Rae

## Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	53 votes
For the amendment	-	8 votes

(For the motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Duggart, Doran, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Hutchison, Johnston, Key, Laidlaw, Lang, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rankin, Ritchie, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Watt, Webber, Wilson, Whyte, Work and Young.

For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.)

## Decision

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

(References – Act of Council No 4 of 2 May 2019; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

## 6 Operational Governance Framework 2019

---

Details were provided on proposed changes to the key documents which supported internal controls, accountability and the transparent operation of the Council.

### Motion

- 1) To repeal the existing Procedural Standing Orders for Council and Committee Meetings, Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions, Scheme of Delegation to Officers and Financial Regulations and approve in their place appendices 1-4, such repeal and approval to take effect from 5 August 2019.
- 2) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to take such actions and make such minor adjustments to the documents set out in appendices 1-4 as may be necessary to implement the decision of the Council in relation to this report and to produce a finalised version of the documents, making them available to members for information ahead of publication.
- 3) To note the Liberal Democrat amendment and request a report to Council within one cycle highlighting any potential conflicts of executive committee conveners and vice conveners serving on the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee and any other relevant issues. This report should consider actions to resolve any conflicts including the suggested action of the Liberal Democrat amendment.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

### Amendment

- 1) To repeal the existing Procedural Standing Orders for Council and Committee Meetings, Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions, Scheme of Delegation to Officers and Financial Regulations and approve in their place appendices 1-4, such repeal and approval to take effect from 5 August 2019 with following adjustments:

To insert a new 7.2 within the Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Powers and re-number accordingly:

**“7.2 Membership:** The Conveners and Vice Conveners of the following Committees shall not be eligible to serve as members of the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee:

7.2.1 The Policy and Sustainability Committee.

7.2.2 The Culture and Communities Committee.

7.2.3 The Education, Children and Families Committee.

7.2.4 The Finance and Resources Committee.

7.2.5 The Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee.

7.2.6 The Transport and Environment Committee.

- 2) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to take such actions and make such minor adjustments to the documents set out in appendices 1-4 as may be necessary to implement the decision of the Council in relation to this report and to produce a finalised version of the documents, making them available to members for information ahead of publication.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Main

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	28 votes
For the amendment	-	33 votes

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

For the amendment: Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Jim Campbell, Mary Campbell, Cook, Corbett, Doggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Main, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rae, Ritchie, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Webber, Whyte and Young.)

## **Decision**

To approve the amendment by Councillor Lang.

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

## 7 Annual Performance Report 2018/19

---

Details were provided on the Council's service performance which continued to measure performance with numerical indicators but also provided members and citizens with a more rounded and wider view of service area performance in 2018/19.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the Annual Performance Report 2018/19 as detailed in Appendix A to the report by the Chief Executive, and that this year marked a different approach from previous years, as set out in the report.
- 2) To accept the proposed 2019/20 performance reporting cycle.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note the Annual Performance Report 2018/19 as detailed in Appendix A to the report by the Chief Executive, and that this year marked a different approach from previous years, as set out in the report.
- 2) To regret that the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee did not have the opportunity to consider and agree the reporting of KPIs or the format of the Annual Performance Report for 2018/19:
- 3) To consider that the narrative style of reporting presented gave an unbalanced view of service performance, masked comparisons of performance over time, ignored benchmarking and views from the Edinburgh People Survey and in many instances provided measures of outputs rather than outcomes.
- 4) To agree that in future any alterations to KPIs and performance reporting be considered and approved by the Policy and Sustainability Committee in advance of any future reporting year and that the proposed 2019/20 performance reporting cycle be considered as part of this process.
- 5) To instruct the Chief Executive to ensure all KPIs met established SMART criteria.

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Mowat

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the Annual Performance Report 2018/19 as detailed in Appendix A to the report by the Chief Executive, and that this year marked a different approach from previous years, as set out in the report.

- 2) To accept the proposed 2019/20 performance reporting cycle.
- 3) To note in particular, significant challenges and the need for concerted action on the following areas, amongst others:
  - (a) To tackle greenhouse gas emissions in line with the Council's declared Climate Emergency and the target to reach net zero carbon by 2030;
  - (b) To increase the proportion of people who feel they have a say in local issues and services;
  - (c) To take prompt action on homelessness by reducing the average homeless case length and cutting B&B use;
  - (d) To increase the proportion of waste recycled, cut overall waste arisings through bold action on waste reduction, and reduce the number of missed bin complaints;
- 4) To note and acknowledge the work of council officers to address these issues and agree that further work to improve performance in these areas would be reported to the relevant subject committee at the earliest reasonable opportunity.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Paragraph 3) of Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	27 votes
For the amendment (as adjusted)	-	33 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

For the amendment (as adjusted): Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Jim Campbell, Mary Campbell, Cook, Corbett, Daggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Main, Miller, Mitchell,

Mowat, Osler, Rae, Ritchie, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Webber, Whyte and Young.)

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted amendment by Councillor Doggart.

- 1) To note the Annual Performance Report 2018/19 as detailed in Appendix A to the report by the Chief Executive, and that this year marked a different approach from previous years, as set out in the report.
- 2) To regret that the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee did not have the opportunity to consider and agree the reporting of KPIs or the format of the Annual Performance Report for 2018/19:
- 3) To consider that the narrative style of reporting presented gave an unbalanced view of service performance, masked comparisons of performance over time, ignored benchmarking and views from the Edinburgh People Survey and in many instances provided measures of outputs rather than outcomes.
- 4) To agree that in future any alterations to KPIs and performance reporting be considered and approved by the Policy and Sustainability Committee in advance of any future reporting year and that the proposed 2019/20 performance reporting cycle be considered as part of this process.
- 5) To instruct the Chief Executive to ensure all KPIs met established SMART criteria.
- 6) To note in particular, significant challenges and the need for concerted action on the following areas, amongst others:
  - (a) To tackle greenhouse gas emissions in line with the Council's declared Climate Emergency and the target to reach net zero carbon by 2030;
  - (b) To increase the proportion of people who feel they have a say in local issues and services;
  - (c) To take prompt action on homelessness by reducing the average homeless case length and cutting B&B use;
  - (d) To increase the proportion of waste recycled, cut overall waste arisings through bold action on waste reduction, and reduce the number of missed bin complaints;

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

## 8 Coalition Commitments Progress Update - June 2019

---

The Council had approved its business plan (A Programme for the Capital: The City of Edinburgh Council's Business Plan 2017-22) in August 2017. The plan had been built around 52 commitments the Council Administration had pledged to deliver over five years.

Details were provided on the progress of the plan against the 52 Coalition commitments in the second year of the Administration.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the progress at June 2019 on delivering the 52 coalition commitments that the Council Administration had pledged to deliver by the end of 2022 as detailed in Appendix A to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To note the steps that would be taken in 2019/20 to progress delivery of the commitments as detailed in Appendix A to the report.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note the report "Coalition Commitments Progress Update – June 2019" by the Chief Executive and consider that, once again, this report was potentially misleading and confusing.
- 2) Specifically considers that many of the actions, measures, metrics and targets in the report remained unclear or so general that this rendered them meaningless.
- 3) Was concerned that some commitments had yet to have a target, metric or completion point defined over two years into this Council term and regret the lack of comprehensive measures to determine the status of each commitment.
- 4) To further note the report reflected only part of the Council's performance framework and potentially conflicted with rather than complemented it.
- 5) To agree that a genuine performance framework should measure outcomes and improvements to improve the transparency and accountability of the Council to residents so they could easily assess how the Council was managing the city.
- 6) Therefore to instruct the Chief Executive to provide a further report with the latest metric and trend for all measures, in order to assess progress from the date the Council adopted each commitment; and (b) to replace the words "increasing trend" and "decreasing trend" or similar with specific measures that reflect the specific Council target for each commitment.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Johnston

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the report at Appendix A on Coalition Commitments, and note that many commitments were marked as 'On Track' where there were significant challenges to delivery, or marked as 'Making Progress' where there had been no or very little progress.
- 2) To note in particular that:
  - a) Commitment 2, to increase the number of Living Wage employers year on year was marked as 'Making Progress', despite the fact this figure had fallen over the last year;
  - b) Commitment 7, to improve access to employment and training opportunities for disabled people, was marked as 'On Track' despite the number of disabled people who had accessed Council-funded employability services declining by nearly 10% over a year;
  - c) Commitment 8, to explore the introduction of fair rent zones (Rent Pressure Zones), was marked as 'Making Progress', despite the fact that a rent pressure zone had not been introduced in the Capital and was unlikely to be possible during this administration due to legislative requirements for evidence;
  - d) Commitment 9, to create a homelessness taskforce and explore alternatives to B&Bs, was marked as "On Track" however the number of people in either a shared house or B&B accommodation was the same as last year rather than showing a reducing trend for these types of accommodation, and there were still families in B&B which was unacceptable for their requirements;
  - e) Commitment 10, on prioritising brownfield sites for affordable housing, was marked as 'making progress', despite the only substantive achievement noted being the agreement of a new Housing Land Audit and Completions Programme;
  - f) Commitment 11, on encouraging business and tourism, was marked as "Making Progress" but this council had failed to agree a tourism policy position in order to make constructive input into ETAG's tourism strategy, despite providing funding to ETAG for this project;
  - g) Commitment 12 on reviewing the council's policy on promoting mixed communities was marked as 'Making Progress' despite at least 2 recent planning applications being recommended for grant at

development management sub-committee that were in breach of Council guidance requiring a mix of domestic and student accommodation for applications above a size threshold;

- h) Commitment 13 to improve planning enforcement was marked as 'Making Progress' despite only 51.5% of enforcement cases being resolved within timescales;
- i) Commitment 14, to work with the Scottish Government to give communities the right to appeal in the planning system was marked as 'on track' despite the Scottish Government voting down precisely such an amendment to the Planning (Scotland) Bill just a few days ago;
- j) Commitment 16, on roads, pavements, safer foot and cycle paths was marked as 'On Track', despite resident satisfaction with roads, pavements and footpaths declining over the year;
- k) Commitment 17, on improving cycling in the city was marked as 'On Track', despite over 80% of active travel projects being delayed or having no completion date;
- l) Commitment 18, to improve Edinburgh's air quality and reduce carbon emissions was marked as 'On Track' despite a recent Regulatory Committee decision to allow dirty Euro 5 taxis on our streets until 2023, and despite no data on CO2 emissions for the last 2 years, and despite no revision to this commitment to reflect the recent decision to achieve net zero-carbon by 2030;
- m) Commitment 19, to keep the city moving by reducing congestion, was marked as 'Making Progress' despite Edinburgh recently being named the most congested city in the UK;
- n) Commitment 22 to deliver the tram extension to Newhaven by 2022 was marked as 'On Track' despite the expected completion date slipping to 2023;
- o) Commitment 23 to improve street cleanliness in every ward was marked as 'Making Progress' despite increased incidents of dumping and fly tipping;
- p) Commitment 24 to reduce the incidence of dog fouling was marked as 'On Track' despite a decline in resident satisfaction with this service in the Edinburgh People Survey;
- q) Commitment 26 to expand park and ride provision was marked as 'Making Progress' despite a decision not to proceed with a new Park

and Ride site at Lothianburn, and no expansion of park and ride provision at alternative sites;

- r) Commitment 27 to tackle pavement parking was marked as 'On Track' despite no discernible progress in this area;
  - s) Commitment 31 to expand training opportunities for adults and young people was marked as 'Making Progress' despite the number of senior phase pupils studying vocational qualifications delivered by Edinburgh College declining by nearly 40%, and the number of learners in the Adult Education Programme declining by more than 10%;
  - t) Commitment 38 on increasing the availability of care to help people live in their own homes was marked as 'On Track', despite the proportion of adults receiving care in the community being static for the last three years, and the target for this year not being met;
  - u) Commitment 43 on parks and tree planting was marked as "On Track" despite public outrage at the loss of healthy mature trees in Princes Street Gardens and a failure to provide the budget required to carry out the required survey and maintenance programme for the city's existing tree population;
  - v) Commitment 52 on devolving local decisions to four locality committees was marked as 'On Track' despite the locality committees being dissolved in February 2019.
- 3) To agree that any report on progress to achieving coalition commitments should paint an accurate picture of any progress, or lack of it;
- 4) To therefore agree to receive an updated, and accurate, report at the next meeting of full Council which sets out:
- a) the coalition commitments which had been fully achieved;
  - b) those which had been partially achieved, and the action being taken to achieve them;
  - c) those which had not been partially or fully achieved, and the reasons, including external reasons beyond the Council's control, for that; and
  - d) those which would not be achieved, or had been abandoned or reversed, and the reason for that, including any external reasons beyond the Council's control

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

### **Amendment 3**

To note the progress report which listed a third of coalition commitments as not being “on track” for delivery as planned.

However, Council believed the report failed to provide an accurate assessment of the administration’s performance in delivering on its 2017 commitments.

To specifically note that;

- Commitment 14 on securing a community right of appeal in the planning process was stated as “on track” when the Scottish Parliament explicitly opposed this measure in the Planning Bill.
- Commitment 19 on improving public transport was described as “making progress” when the only measure of success - satisfaction with public transport - had fallen.
- Commitment 22 on delivering the tram extension to Newhaven by 2022 was listed as “on track” despite the report confirming the new line would not be open to passengers until 2023.
- Commitment 26 on expanding park and rides was described as “making progress” when none of the sites had been expanded over the last two years.
- Commitment 28 on building 12 new schools by 2021 was described as “on track” when building work had started on only two.
- Commitment 51 on protecting community policing was stated as “on track” when the coalition cut funding by 20%, resulting in the loss of 10 funded posts.
- Commitment 52 on devolving local decisions to locality committees was listed as “on track” despite these committees being abolished.

To therefore refuse to approve the report by the Chief Executive and agree that Conveners and Vice-Conveners of executive committees should work with officers to present a more accurate evaluation of the coalition’s record for submission to the next meeting of the Council.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

### **Adjournment**

In accordance with Standing Order 20, the meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes to allow each group’s motions and amendments to be considered.

## Resumption

On resuming the meeting the following Composite amendment by the Conservative, Green and Liberal Democrat Groups was submitted:

### Composite Amendment

- 1) To note the report at Appendix A on Coalition Commitments, considered that this report was potentially misleading and confusing; note that many of the actions, measures, metrics and targets remained unclear or so general as to render them meaningless; note that some commitments had yet to have a target, metric or completion point defined over two years into this Council term, further note the report reflected only part of the Council's performance framework and note that many commitments were marked as 'On Track' where there were significant challenges to delivery, or marked as 'Making Progress' where there had been no or very little progress.
- 2) Notes in particular that:
  - a) Commitment 2, to increase the number of Living Wage employers year on year was marked as 'Making Progress', despite the fact this figure had fallen over the last year;
  - b) Commitment 7, to improve access to employment and training opportunities for disabled people, was marked as 'On Track' despite the number of disabled people who had accessed council-funded employability services declining by nearly 10% over a year;
  - c) Commitment 8, to explore the introduction of fair rent zones (Rent Pressure Zones), was marked as 'Making Progress', despite the fact that a rent pressure zone had not been introduced in the Capital and was unlikely to be possible during this administration due to legislative requirements for evidence;
  - d) Commitment 9, to create a homelessness taskforce and explore alternatives to B&Bs, was marked as "On Track" however the number of people in either a shared house or B&B accommodation was the same as last year rather than showing a reducing trend for these types of accommodation, and there were still families in B&B which was unacceptable for their requirements;
  - e) Commitment 10, on prioritising brownfield sites for affordable housing, was marked as 'making progress', despite the only substantive achievement noted being the agreement of a new Housing Land Audit and Completions Programme;

- f) Commitment 11, on encouraging business and tourism, was marked as “Making Progress” but this Council had failed to agree a tourism policy position in order to make constructive input into ETAG’s tourism strategy, despite providing funding to ETAG for this project;
- g) Commitment 12 on reviewing the council’s policy on promoting mixed communities was marked as ‘Making Progress’ despite at least 2 recent planning applications being of Council guidance requiring a mix of domestic and student accommodation for applications above a size threshold;
- h) Commitment 13 to improve planning enforcement was marked as ‘Making Progress’ despite only 51.5% of enforcement cases being resolved within timescales;
- i) Commitment 14, to work with the Scottish Government to give communities the right to appeal in the planning system was marked as ‘on track’ despite the Scottish Government voting down precisely such an amendment to the Planning (Scotland) Bill just a few days ago;
- j) Commitment 16, on roads, pavements, safer foot and cycle paths was marked as ‘On Track’, despite resident satisfaction with roads, pavements and footpaths declining over the year;
- k) Commitment 17, on improving cycling in the city was marked as ‘On Track’, despite over 80% of active travel projects being delayed or having no completion date;
- l) Commitment 18, to improve Edinburgh’s air quality and reduce carbon emissions was marked as ‘On Track’ despite a recent Regulatory Committee decision to allow dirty Euro 5 taxis on our streets until 2023, and despite no data on CO2 emissions for the last 2 years, and despite no revision to this commitment to reflect the recent decision to achieve net zero-carbon by 2030;
- m) Commitment 19, to keep the city moving by reducing congestion, was marked as ‘Making Progress’ despite Edinburgh recently being named the most congested city in the UK;
- n) Commitment 22 to deliver the tram extension to Newhaven by 2022 was marked as ‘On Track’ despite the expected completion date slipping to 2023;
- o) Commitment 23 to improve street cleanliness in every ward was marked as ‘Making Progress’ despite increased incidents of dumping and fly tipping;
- p) Commitment 24 to reduce the incidence of dog fouling was marked as ‘On Track’ despite a decline in resident satisfaction with this service in the Edinburgh People Survey;

- q) Commitment 26 to expand park and ride provision was marked as ‘Making Progress’ despite a decision not to proceed with a new Park and Ride site at Lothianburn, and no expansion of park and ride provision at alternative sites;
  - r) Commitment 27 to tackle pavement parking was marked as ‘On Track’ despite no discernible progress in this area;
  - s) Commitment 31 to expand training opportunities for adults and young people was marked as ‘Making Progress’ despite the number of senior phase pupils studying vocational qualifications delivered by Edinburgh College declining by nearly 40%, and the number of learners in the Adult Education Programme declining by more than 10%;
  - t) Commitment 38 on increasing the availability of care to help people live in their own homes was marked as ‘On Track’, despite the proportion of adults receiving care in the community being static for the last three years, and the target for this year not being met;
  - u) Commitment 43 on parks and tree planting was marked as “On Track” despite public outrage at the loss of healthy mature trees in Princes Street Gardens and a failure to provide the budget required to carry out the required survey and maintenance programme for the city’s existing tree population;
  - v) Commitment 51 on protecting community policing was stated as “on track” when the coalition cut funding by 20%, resulting in the loss of 10 funded posts;
  - w) Commitment 52 on devolving local decisions to four locality committees was marked as ‘On Track’ despite the locality committees being dissolved in February 2019.
- 3) To agree that any report on progress to achieving coalition commitments should paint an accurate picture of any progress, or lack of it; further agrees that a genuine performance framework should measure outcomes and performance improvements to increase the transparency and accountability of the Council to residents so they can easily assess how the Council was managing the city;
  - 4) To therefore not approve the report by the Chief Executive, but instead to agree that the Chief Executive, together with Conveners and Vice-Conveners of executive committees, should present a more accurate evaluation of the coalition’s record for submission in the form of a report at the next meeting of full council with the latest metric and trend for all measures, in order to assess progress from the date the Council adopted each commitment; and to replace the words “increasing trend” and “decreasing trend” or similar with specific

measures that reflected the specific Council target for each commitment, and which also set out:

- a) the coalition commitments which had been fully achieved;
- b) those which had been partially achieved, and the action being taken to achieve them;
- c) those which had not been partially or fully achieved, and the reasons, including external reasons beyond the council's control, for that; and
- d) those which would not be achieved, or had been abandoned or reversed, and the reason for that, including any external reasons beyond the council's control.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Booth

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows;

For the Motion	-	26 votes
For the Composite Amendment	-	33 votes

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

For the Composite Amendment: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Booth, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Jim Campbell, Mary Campbell, Cook, Corbett, Daggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Main, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rae, Ritchie, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Webber and Whyte.)

### **Decision**

To approve the Composite Amendment by Councillor Whyte

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

## **9 Integration Scheme – Carers (Scotland) Act 2016 - Update**

---

Details were provided on progress to date on proposed updates to the Integration Scheme for the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board to reflect changes brought about by the Carers (Scotland) Act 2016 which introduced new statutory obligations on

local authorities and health boards requiring certain local authority and health board functions to be delegated to Integration Joint Boards.

### **Decision**

- 1) To agree to consult on the delegation of Sections 6, 21, 24, 25, 31, 34 and 35 of the Carers (Scotland) Act 2016 as they related to adult social care.
- 2) To note that following the six-week consultation period that a report would be submitted to Council to agree the change to the Integration Scheme.

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

## **10 Unaudited Annual Accounts 2018/19**

---

The unaudited annual accounts for 2018/19 were submitted for the Council's consideration.

### **Decision**

- 1) To note that the unaudited annual accounts for 2018/19 would be submitted to the external auditor by the required date.
- 2) To note that the provisional outturn position showed an overall underspend of £1.582m and that this sum would be set aside within the Council Priorities Fund.
- 3) To note that a more detailed revenue and capital outturn position would be reported to the Finance and Resources Committee in August 2019.
- 4) To further note that the audited annual accounts and the annual auditor's report would be submitted to the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee and thereafter to the Finance and Resources Committee in September 2019, for approval.
- 5) To approve, subject to the outcome of the audit process, an increase of £7.483m in the level of the Council's offer to the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board in respect of 2018/19, in line with the actual service outturn for the year.
- 6) To instruct officers to consider designing a more accessible short form version of the unaudited accounts in plain English to be presented to the August 2020 meeting of the Finance and Resources Committee and publicised thereafter.

(References – report by the Executive Director of Resources, submitted.)

## 11 Operational Governance: Review of Contract Standing Orders

---

Details were provided of proposed changes to the Council's Contract Standing Orders following their annual review.

### Decision

- 1) To approve the proposed revisions to the existing Contract Standing Orders, as summarised in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Resources, and adopt the Contract Standing Orders included in Appendix 2 to the report.
- 2) To note that there would continue to be an annual review of Contract Standing Orders to ensure that they worked effectively and provided effective scrutiny of Council purchasing and contract management.

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

## 12 Rolling Actions Log

---

Details were provided on the outstanding actions arising from decisions taken by the Council from May 2015 to May 2019.

### Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:

**Action 1** - Appointments to Neighbourhood Partnerships and Locality Committee Senior Councillor Allowances

**Action 3** – Statues – Motion by Councillor Mowat

**Action 4** - Webcasting of Public Meetings – Motion by Councillor Miller

**Action 6** - PPP Schools and Non Core Charges - motion by Councillor Staniforth

**Action 7** - World Suicide Prevention Day – Motion by Councillor Bird

**Action 9** - Top-up Funding for Community Councils – Motion by Councillor Staniforth

**Action 10** - Caseworker Software Package – Motion by Councillor Neil Ross

**Action 12** - Review of Locality Committees

**Action 14** - EIJB (Health and Social Care Partnership) – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

**Action 15** - Outcomes of the Statutory Consultation Proposing to Realign the Catchment Areas of Currie PS, Nether Currie PS, Dean Park PS, Currie HS and Balerno HS

**Action 16(a)** - Review of Appointments to Committees, Boards and Joint Boards for 2019-2020

**Action 17** - Senior Councillor Allowances-Appointment of Vice-Conveners

- 2) To note that the closure date for **Action 10** - Caseworker Software Package – Motion by Councillor Neil Ross was November 2018
- 3) To agree to continue **Action 18** - Council Question by Councillor Webber on Taxi Usage for a final answer.
- 4) To otherwise note the rolling actions log.

(Reference – Council Rolling Actions Log, submitted)

### **13 Lothian Pension Fund – Unaudited Annual Report (and Financial Statements) 2019 – referral from the Pension Committee**

---

The Pensions Committee had referred a report on the unaudited Annual Report (and Financial Statements) for the year ended 31 March 2019 for the Lothian Pension Fund and Scottish Homes Pension Fund to the City of Edinburgh Council for information, in its role as administering authority of the Pension Funds.

#### **Decision**

To note the unaudited Annual Report for the year ended 31 March 2019 for the Lothian Pension Fund and the Scottish Homes Pension Fund.

(References - Pensions Committee 26 June 2019 (item 4); referral from the Pensions Committee, submitted)

## 14 Lothian Buses Oversight - Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

---

The following motion by Councillor Jim Campbell was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

- a) Notes that the Vice Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee was clear with Council last month that she saw no place for private number plates in a public bus service company.
- b) Is concerned by recent press reports on this subject.
- c) Instructs the Convener of Transport and Environment, or in her absence, the Vice Convener, to write to the Chair of Lothian Buses asking that the following is provided to Council relating to private number plates owned by Lothian Buses or any subsidiary organisation:
  - the number
  - book cost
  - best estimate of the current market value.”

### Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

### Declaration of Interests

Councillors Booth, Laidlaw and Macinnes declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Directors of Transport for Edinburgh Ltd.

## 15 Independent Night-life Co-ordinator - Motion by Councillor Staniforth

---

The following motion by Councillor Staniforth was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

Council:

- 1) Notes that the position of an independent night-life co-ordinator was raised numerous times at the Music is Audible working group but generally agreed to be beyond the scope of that working group.
- 2) Notes that several cities have chosen to adopt a night-life co-ordinator (often called a ‘night mayor’) including Amsterdam, New York, Paris, Zurich, Toulouse and Mannheim.

- 3) Notes that because every city has unique needs and culture methods of funding and electing or selecting a night-life co-ordinator vary from city to city as does their exact remit.
- 4) Notes that in most cases, though they work with local government, the night-life co-ordinator of a city has a degree of independence from local government.
- 5) Notes that Edinburgh has a vibrant and complex night-time economy which would benefit from the oversight and management of a night-life co-ordinator.
- 6) Notes that, unlike many cities, Edinburgh's city centre is residential in nature which further emphasises the need for its night-life co-ordinator to have a bespoke remit.
- 7) Agrees to establish a 'Night-Life Co-ordinator' working group to assess how the city could best facilitate the introduction of a night-life co-ordinator.
- 8) Agrees that the working group should include one councillor from each of the current political parties active in the council and that representatives of the city night life such as nightclub owners, event organisers, Lothian buses, major city cab companies, theatres, residents' representatives, the NHS, the Edinburgh alcohol and drug partnership and anyone else the working group feels it needs to include once it has met.
- 9) Agrees the working group shall choose its convener at its inaugural meeting.
- 10) Agrees that the working group aims to present a report detailing options for the establishment of an independent night-life co-ordinator for Edinburgh within one year "

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Miller

### **Amendment 1**

To note points 1 – 3 in the motion by Councillor Staniforth and replace points 4 - 10 with:

- 4) Notes that Council currently works in partnership with other agencies, ie Police Scotland, Lothian Buses, Street Assist, Street Pastors to support the night time economy;

- 5) Notes that Council chairs the Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership, a strategic group responsible for coordinating a multi-agency response to promote community safety; and
- 6) Calls for the feasibility of a Night-life Co-ordinator to be discussed at Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership, and requests that an invitation be extended to licensed trade representatives to be part of the discussion.

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

### **Amendment 2**

In paragraph 10 of the motion by Councillor Staniforth, delete all after 'establishment' and replace with 'of a night time co-ordinator for Edinburgh including recommendations about how and to which bodies they will be accountable.'

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Osler

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	15 votes
For Amendment 1	-	44 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Gloyer, Graczyk, Lang, Main, Miller, Osler, Rae, Ritchie, Neil Ross and Staniforth.)

For Amendment 1: The Lord Provost, Councillors Barrie, Bird, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Hutchison, Johnston, Key, Laidlaw, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Rose, Rust, Smith, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson and Work.)

### **Decision**

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor McNeese-Mechan.

## 16 Bike to Work Scheme Revamp - Motion by Councillor Main

---

The following motion by Councillor Main was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“This Council;

- 1) Notes the well documented benefits to personal health and wellbeing benefits active travel affords.
- 2) Notes switching from car use to cycling contributes to Climate Emergency carbon reduction targets and reduces pollution that is harmful to health.
- 3) Notes that last year Council’s Health and Social Care staff alone travelled over 1 million miles in Edinburgh, mainly by car, as part of their working day at a cost of over £500k.
- 4) Notes the Department of Transport’s updated guidance on the Cycle to Work Scheme, published on 12th June, removes the ceiling of £1000 and allows for the purchase of e-bikes and modified bikes for the less abled.
- 5) Notes the success of schemes such as ‘A Better Way to Work’, funded by the Climate Challenge fund, which provide support to cycle to work, including route planning, buddying and cycle loan.
- 6) Therefore Council agrees that a report is brought to Policy and Sustainability Committee within one cycle, detailing how the new scheme can be promoted to all staff and how the Council will actively support those members of staff who wish to cycle to work and/or use cycling as part of their chosen transport in work.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Main.

- moved by Councillor Main, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

### **Amendment**

To insert to the motion by Councillor Main:

- 6) Welcomes this latest UK Government update which will further assist to reach their ambitions to double cycling activity by 2025.

Renumbers paragraph 6 to 7 and adds new paragraph

- 8) The report to include an assessment of procurement options for the renewal of the Scheme in 2020 that allows staff to have a choice of retail providers including independent bike shops in the City with a view to increasing accessibility and uptake.

- moved by Councillor Brown seconded by Councillor Bruce

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), paragraph 8) of the addendum was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Main:

- 1) To note the well documented benefits to personal health and wellbeing benefits active travel affords.
- 2) To note switching from car use to cycling contributed to Climate Emergency carbon reduction targets and reduced pollution that was harmful to health.
- 3) To note that last year Council's Health and Social Care staff alone travelled over 1 million miles in Edinburgh, mainly by car, as part of their working day at a cost of over £500k.
- 4) To note the Department of Transport's updated guidance on the Cycle to Work Scheme, published on 12th June, removed the ceiling of £1000 and allowed for the purchase of e-bikes and modified bikes for the less abled.
- 5) To note the success of schemes such as 'A Better Way to Work', funded by the Climate Challenge fund, which provided support to cycle to work, including route planning, buddying and cycle loan.
- 6) Therefore to agree that a report be brought to Policy and Sustainability Committee within one cycle, detailing how the new scheme could be promoted to all staff and how the Council would actively support those members of staff who wished to cycle to work and/or use cycling as part of their chosen transport in work.
- 7) To agree that the report include an assessment of procurement options for the renewal of the Scheme in 2020 that allowed staff to have a choice of retail providers including independent bike shops in the City with a view to increasing accessibility and uptake.

## **17 Edinburgh South Community Football - 50th Anniversary - Motion by Councillor Cameron**

---

The following motion by Councillor Cameron was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council warmly congratulates Edinburgh South Community Football Club on its 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary.

Originally established in 1969 by the late Mr Eddie Hobbs as Inch Boys Club Football Team, Edinburgh South Community Football Club as of today has over 60 teams and over 750 players of all ages and levels, and is truly an inclusive community football club, with a rapidly expanding girls’ section.

The club has already achieved SFA Community Status and this year, Edinburgh South CFC is on track to receive the (top) Platinum award.

In this, its 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary year, Council asks the Lord Provost to mark the sporting and community achievements of Edinburgh South CFC in an appropriate way.”

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Cameron.

## **18 St Andrew’s Fair Saturday – Motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan**

---

The following motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

- 1) Recognises that Fair Saturday, a global cultural project with a social impact, will be celebrated in 2019 by a growing number of cities worldwide.
- 2) Notes that City of Edinburgh Council celebrated St Andrew’s Fair Saturday, which is Scotland’s contribution to the Fair Saturday movement, in 2018.
- 3) Agrees to work with Fair Saturday to become an official Fair Saturday city.
- 4) Requests a report to Culture and Communities Committee within 1 cycle, setting out how the Council can support and promote Edinburgh St Andrew’s Fair Saturday on 30 November 2019, a day devoted to culture, social causes and celebrating St Andrew’s Day.”

## Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan.

## 19 Dunedin International Folk Dance Festival - Motion by the Lord Provost

---

The following motion by the Lord Provost was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council notes that:

- a) Dunedin Dancers was formed in 1970 by members of the Edinburgh University New Scotland Country Dance Society to provide reciprocal exchanges with other European Folk-Dance Festivals. It was named after the Gaelic name for Edinburgh – ‘Dùn Èideann’. The group have a mix of older and young people who dance at many events and performances.
- b) Dunedin Dancers is a traditional dance group, with over 200 members, and meets weekly for social dancing, complemented by two informal dances and one formal ball per year. The group present a wide range of Scottish traditional dancing styles, including; Scottish Country Dancing, ceilidh, Scottish Step dancing, Highland and occasionally Ladies Step, performing at Church Hill Theatre, the Mound, and the Grassmarket.
- c) Dunedin Dancers also organises a City Biennial International Folk-Dance Festival. Established in 1971, the Festival provides an opportunity for traditional-folk-dancers from other countries, alongside those from the City, to showcase an international range of folk-dancing to new audiences. The 2019 Festival (14th – 20th July 2019) represents the 25th year of this biennial event, which will bring two folk-dance groups from Estonia and France, performing together with local Polish and Irish dancing groups and providing shared workshops in traditional dance culture.

In acknowledging the civic and cultural contribution of the Dunedin Dancers Biennial Festival, alongside the importance of growing the City’s reach as the world’s leading Festival City, in welcoming this international event, Council requests that the Lord Provost, marks the 25th anniversary in an appropriate way.”

## Decision

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

## 20 Edinburgh Interfaith Association – 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary - Motion by the Lord Provost

---

The following motion by the Lord Provost was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council notes that:

- a) Edinburgh Interfaith Association (EIFA) was officially formed in 1989 to “promote and facilitate positive engagement between the faith communities of our religiously and culturally diverse city.”
- b) EIFA is Scotland’s longest running interfaith charity and have a long history of working with and across the City’s faith communities. Through dialogue and education, EIFA strives to make Edinburgh a more respectful and peaceful city.
- c) EIFA aims to promote religious and cultural harmony and diversity in Edinburgh by bringing peoples of all faiths together. The Association’s broad range of initiatives help advance; (i) mutual understanding, trust, respect, co-operation and peace between the communities of Edinburgh, (ii) to advance the general level of awareness on interfaith and multicultural issues among the wider population, and (iii) educate, inform and provide a platform for engagement and understanding on the diversity within religious and spiritual traditions and associated multi-cultural beliefs.
- d) EIFA has also facilitated the visits (and related events) to Scotland by eminent religious and spiritual leaders, including; The Venerable Thich Nhat Hanh, His Holiness The Dalai Lama, Bhai Sahib Mohinder Singh, Chief Rabbi David Rose, Sister Joan Chittister, Archbishop Abuna Elias Chacour, and other distinguished persons such as Arun Gandhi, Prof Tariq Ramadan, Karen Armstrong, Nobel Prize winner Mairead Corrigan Maguire and many others.
- e) For over 20 years, EIFA regularly visit local schools, accompanied by representatives of religious or faith communities in Edinburgh, to offer talks on particular faiths or provide multi-faith panel discussions on moral, or spiritual/religious issues. In addition, the group organise and promote numerous public talks, formal and informal dialogues, panel events, film screenings, exhibitions, conferences on subjects such as Islamophobia and ‘Science and Religion’, and across a number of years, released a number of social commentary documentary films, including the 2014 ‘Faith and I’ which witnessed the lives of three young women of faith, and the positive influence which faith had on their lives within the Sikh, Muslim and Jewish Traditions. This film was produced in response to the rise of anti-Islamic and anti-Semitic

offences in 2012. The film has since been used in schools and universities in Edinburgh as an educational reference on religion and interfaith.

- f) In Celebrating Women, EIFA's 'Women of Faith' Dialogue Series, focusses on women in the diverse religious traditions who have inspired our communities and overcome boundaries, shining a light on women who are greatly admired, but often forgotten, by profiling amazing stories, in order to ensure that these women are no longer 'unsung.'
- g) Building upon EIFA's work in the Capital, and their international connections with other interfaith interests, in February 2019 delegates from across the UK and Europe gathered together at a conference at the City Chambers where the Lord Provost assisted in the official launch of a new Capital Cities Interfaith Network (CCIN).
- h) The CCIN will be vital in helping to promote interfaith understanding and relations which help maintain strong, open, peaceful and cohesive communities. Members of the Network hope that a mutual exchange of learning and best practice, will aid interfaith organisations to speak with a unified voice on issues that matter to them and their cities and communities. The CCIN is supported by Mairead McGuinness, First Vice President of the European Parliament, who recognises the importance of embracing and celebrating the increasing religious diversity of Europe.
- i) The Lord Provost is Patron of Edinburgh Interfaith Association.

In acknowledging the civic, equality, multi-cultural, inclusion, educational and international contributions of the Edinburgh Interfaith Association, Council requests that the Lord Provost marks the 30th anniversary in an appropriate way.”

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

## **21 Leith Victoria Boxing Club - Motion by Councillor Munro**

---

The following motion by Councillor Munro was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council congratulates Leith Victoria Boxing Club, Scotland’s oldest boxing club, who celebrate 100 years of the Noble Art in 2019. In appreciation of their significant contribution to amateur boxing, Council agrees to ask the Lord Provost to mark the occasion in the appropriate manner to thank the club.”

## Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Munro.

## 22 Seafield Recycling Centre - Motion by Councillor Lang

---

The following motion by Councillor Lang was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

- “1) Council recognises its responsibility to make it as easy as possible for residents to reuse and recycle their household waste, and the importance of local recycling centres in helping to meet this duty.
- 2) Council notes the new access arrangements which came into force in Seafield recycling centre on 3 June, which followed significant changes to the internal layout of the centre.
- 3) Council is concerned by the problems which arose following the new access arrangements, resulting in substantial delays at peak periods for those residents seeking to access the site and even the temporary closure of the centre because of road safety concerns on Seafield Road.
- 4) Council appreciates the work of officers in responding to the initial disruption by making adjustments to the internal operation of the site but recognises user complaints about delays in getting into the site have continued.
- 5) Council therefore agrees that the report on recycling centres, due before the September 2019 meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee, should be widened to cover:
  - (a) the reasoning and rationale for the new layout and access point at the Seafield Recycling Centre.
  - (b) feedback from staff and users of the site since the changes were made.
  - (c) what further options exist to make additional changes at the centre to reduce waiting times and increase the throughput of residents using the site.”

## Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

## Amendment

- 1) Council recognises its responsibility to make it as easy as possible for residents to reuse and recycle their household waste, and the importance of local recycling centres in helping to meet this duty.
- 2) Council notes the new access arrangements which came into force in Seafield recycling centre on 3 June, which followed significant changes to the internal layout of the centre.
- 3) Council notes the reasons for these changes included the delivery of a new transfer station to improve reliability of household waste collection service as well as being able to separate heavy vehicles from members of the public for significant safety reasons and that the new design provides an additional 100 yards of queueing space for vehicles.
- 4) Council is concerned by the problems which arose during the first two weeks of operation following the new access arrangements, resulting in delays at peak periods for those residents seeking to access the site and the temporary closure of the centre because of road safety concerns on Seafield Road.
- 5) Council appreciates the work of officers in responding to the initial disruption by adjusting the internal operation of the site and recognises that no further shut downs of the site have been required since then.
- 6) Council notes that if further closures occur in the next four weeks that the forthcoming report to the September 2019 Transport and Environment Committee will be expanded to include:
  - (a) the rationale behind the new layout and access point at the Seafield Recycling Centre
  - (b) feedback from staff and users since the changes were made
  - (c) what further options exist to make additional changes at the centre to reduce waiting times and increase the throughput of residents using the site
- 7) Council requests an Elected Members briefing on all issues surrounding the new access is circulated within two weeks

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Day

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), the amendment was accepted in place of the motion.

## Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor Macinnes.

## 23 Operation Close Pass – Collaboration - Motion by Councillor Booth

---

The following motion by Councillor Booth was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

- 1) notes recent research from British Cycling, based on 15,000 respondents, which found that almost 90% of cyclists experience a “close pass” – an overtake within 1.5m – at least weekly, 66% said they were concerned about their safety while cycling on Britain’s roads, and almost 40% said they experienced a close pass daily;
- 2) notes that in the West Midlands police area, since its launch in September 2015, the Operation Close Pass initiative has been credited with bringing about a 20 per cent reduction in the number of cyclists killed or injured on the roads;
- 3) Notes the original Operation Close Pass was developed by West Midlands Police following analysis of road safety data, and was part of a suite of measures to improve road safety for vulnerable road users, and that WMP are now considering extending the principle of Operation Close Pass to allow them to detect and act on other offences including seat belt, mobile phone and vehicle defect offences;
- 4) Welcomes the recent collaboration between Police Scotland and Cycling Scotland, which has seen Operation Close Pass exercises carried out throughout Scotland, including in Edinburgh, and awareness raising activity to encourage drivers to treat vulnerable road users with respect through the Give Everyone Cycle Space campaign.
- 5) Agrees to explore the option for collaboration between the police and the council on innovative approaches to road safety for vulnerable road users, extending the principle of Operation Close Pass, and to report back to Transport and Environment Committee on options within 3 cycles.”

## Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Booth.

## **24 1.5% Budget Efficiency Savings - Motion by Councillor Whyte**

---

The following motion by Councillor Whyte was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

- 1) Notes that the Administration budget committed to finding a 1.5% efficiency saving, reducing the spend on Council Services compared to last year.
- 2) Regrets the lack of public information on how this will be achieved, and the subsequent lack of scrutiny in Council or by local people on the impact of these efficiency savings.
- 3) Recognises that the Convener of Education, Children and Families Committee gave an undertaking that individual head teachers would know the effect on devolved school budgets, if any, before the schools break for the summer.
- 4) Is concerned that almost a quarter of the financial year in which these savings have to be made has already passed.
- 5) Instructs the Chief Executive to prepare a report listing options so that Council can agree the required 1.5% savings target at its next meeting.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Whyte

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

### **Amendment**

Council:

- 1) Notes point one of the Motion by Councillor Iain Whyte and deletes points two to five replacing with;
- 2) Notes the Coalition Budget Motion approved on 21 February 2019 requested the Chief Executive to report back to Council on the measures included within the 1.55% by the autumn;
- 3) Notes that head teachers received information on the devolved school management budgets on 14 June 2019;
- 4) Notes that a Revenue Budget Framework 2019-2024 Progress Update went to Finance and Resources Committee on 23 May 2019 and Council on 30 May 2019; and

- 5) Notes that a further update will be brought to Finance and Resources Committee on 15 August 2019 which will identify any remaining savings.”

- moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Cameron

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Paragraphs 3 and 5 of the amendment were accepted as amendments to the motion.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	32 votes
For the amendment	-	25 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Jim Campbell, Mary Campbell, Cook, Corbett, Doggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Main, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rae, Ritchie, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Webber and Whyte.

For the amendment: The Lord Provost, Councillors Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Fullerton, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Whyte:

- 1) To note that the Administration budget committed to finding a 1.5% efficiency saving, reducing the spend on Council Services compared to last year.
- 2) To regret the lack of public information on how this would be achieved, and the subsequent lack of scrutiny in Council or by local people on the impact of these efficiency savings.
- 3) To note that head teachers received information on the devolved school management budgets on 14 June 2019.
- 4) To note concern that almost a quarter of the financial year in which these savings had to be made had already passed.
- 5) To note that a further update would be brought to the Finance and Resources Committee on 15 August 2019 which would identify any remaining savings.

## 25 Valedictory – Allan McCartney

---

The Lord Provost, paid tribute to Allan McCartney, Committee Manager, who was retiring after 39 years local government service, with 32 of those years being with Lothian Regional Council and the current City of Edinburgh Council. He commended Allan's support to the democratic process and Councillors and his calm professional approach in fulfilling his role as Committee Manager to the City of Edinburgh Council. He thanked him for his outstanding contribution to the conduct of the Council and its business and on behalf of the Council, he wished him well for a lengthy and enjoyable retirement.

## 26 Chair

---

At this point in the proceedings the Lord Provost left the meeting and the Depute Convener assumed the Chair for the remaining items of business.

## 27 International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) 'Cities Appeal' - Motion by Councillor Burgess

---

The following motion by Councillor Burgess was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"This Council:

- 1) Notes that the City of Edinburgh Council is a member of the Nuclear Free Local Authorities (NFLA) and the Hiroshima-led 'Mayors for Peace' both of which have been working for over 3 decades to promote multilateral nuclear disarmament;
- 2) Notes that NFLA and Mayors for Peace work with the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), which received the Nobel Peace Prize in 2017 for its work in encouraging over two thirds of United Nations members to agree to the International Treaty to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons;
- 3) Notes ICAN's new 'Cities Appeal' which urges Councils to formally support the International Treaty to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons which has already been signed by a number of important global cities likes Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Sydney, Melbourne, Washington DC, Los Angeles, Geneva, Mainz, Trondheim, Zaragoza and in the UK, Manchester and Renfrewshire;
- 4) In supporting the Cities Appeal, is concerned about the grave threat that nuclear weapons pose to communities throughout the world, believes that our residents have the right to live in a world free from this threat, that any use of nuclear weapons, whether deliberate or accidental, would have catastrophic,

far-reaching and long-lasting consequences for people and the environment and therefore welcomes the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons by the United Nations in 2017, and calls on the UK Government to join it;

- 5) Agrees that the Council Leader will write to ICAN to endorse their 'Cities Appeal' in support of the International Treaty to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons."

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Miller

### **Amendment 1**

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor McLellan

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	37 votes
For amendment 1	-	17 votes

For the motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Fullerton, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Ritchie, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work

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

Abstentions: Councillor Neil Ross.)

## **28 European Cities Regarding Short Term Lets – Emergency Motion by Councillor Watt**

---

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 Watt was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

- Notes the letter written by ten European Cities in response to the opinion given by the advocate general of the European Court of Justice regarding digital short-term letting platforms.  
<https://www.amsterdam.nl/bestuur-organisatie/college/wethouder/laurens-ivens/persberichten/press-release-cities-alarmed-about/>
- Notes the Scottish Government’s consultation on the regulation of short-term lets in Scotland closes on 19 July 2019.
- Supports the efforts being made by Amsterdam, Barcelona, Berlin, Bordeaux, Brussels, Krakow, Munich, Paris, Valencia and Vienna to ensure that Cities can set and enforce rules for short-term letting.
- Asks that the Council Leader writes an open letter of support to the Leaders of the ten City Councils and sends a copy to all Scottish MEPs and MP and MSP representatives for the Capital.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Watt

- moved by Councillor Watt, seconded by Councillor Kate Campbell

### **Amendment**

To add to the motion by Councillor Watt:

Notes that after the withdrawal of the UK from the European Union Edinburgh will no longer be subject to this ruling and requests that the Leader also writes to the Brexit Secretary of the UK Government to ask that the rights of cities to determine their own regulations in the above matter are respected in the withdrawal agreements and any subsequent agreements with the EU.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion - 25 votes

For the amendment - 28 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Fullerton, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Ritchie, Watt, Wilson and Work.

For the amendment: Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Jim Campbell, Mary Campbell, Cook, Corbett, Daggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rae, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Webber and Whyte.

Abstentions: Councillor Graczyk.)

## **Decision**

To approve the amendment as follows:

Council:

- Notes the letter written by ten European Cities in response to the opinion given by the advocate general of the European Court of Justice regarding digital short-term letting platforms.  
<https://www.amsterdam.nl/bestuur-organisatie/college/wethouder/laurens-ivens/persberichten/press-release-cities-alarmed-about/>
- Notes the Scottish Government's consultation on the regulation of short-term lets in Scotland closes on 19 July 2019.
- Supports the efforts being made by Amsterdam, Barcelona, Berlin, Bordeaux, Brussels, Krakow, Munich, Paris, Valencia and Vienna to ensure that Cities can set and enforce rules for short-term letting.
- Asks that the Council Leader writes an open letter of support to the Leaders of the ten City Councils and sends a copy to all Scottish MEPs and MP and MSP representatives for the Capital.
- Notes that after the withdrawal of the UK from the European Union Edinburgh will no longer be subject to this ruling and requests that the Leader also writes to the Brexit Secretary of the UK Government to ask that the rights of cities to determine their own regulations in the above matter are respected in the withdrawal agreements and any subsequent agreements with the EU.

## **29 Sir William Y Darling Bequest for Good Citizenship**

---

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 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

Details were given of nominations for the Sir William Y Darling Award for Good Citizenship for the municipal year 2018/2019.

### **Decision**

To make the Sir William Y Darling Award for Good Citizenship for the municipal year 2018/2019 to Brenda Devlin.

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

## Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 2 of 27 June 2019)

### QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019

#### Question

How many properties have been the subject of investigation due to short term holiday lettings in the last 12 months and the previous 12 months, including issues relating to planning, antisocial behaviour, noise, waste, and safety including fire risks and overcrowding

#### Answer

The most recent update on Short Term Lets was considered by [Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee](#) in May 2019.

The Communications team has taken additional steps to raise awareness of the Scottish Government Consultation both through media communications and social media.

The Council is looking at new ways of working in response to the growth of short stay lets, including a proactive approach to enforcement and engagement with residents. This includes the use of impact warning letters to tackle a large concentration of short stay lets. The planning service has also successfully piloted taking enforcement action against key safes on listed buildings.

The data below has been updated to take account of most recent information, alongside a change in how complaints about short term lets are categorised:

<b>Area</b>	<b>Period</b>	<b>Cases</b>
Planning Enforcement	January to December 2018	117
	January to June 2019	109
Private Rented Sector Enforcement and Trading Standards	June 2017 to June 2018	21
	June 2018 to June 2019	20
Family Household and support (ASB)	From April 2019*	22
Environmental Health	From July 2018	5
<b>Total</b>		<b>294</b>

\*Recording of complaints in respect of short term lets was changed in April 2019 from categories of Antisocial Behaviour. Complaint figures prior to that could only be provided by manual checking of all ASB complaints received by the Council.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you, Lord Provost, and thank you to the Convener for the answer to the question. I wonder if the Convener could comment on whether the figures that are provided represent the scale and the extent of the problem that we see in the city and whether the Council should be taking any more proactive approach towards this issue?

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you, Councillor Miller for your question. I think we would all agree that they don't represent the scale of the issue we've got. I think it's very positive that we've seen a doubling of the amount of enforcement cases, so in six months we've done almost as many as we did in the previous year, and I think that demonstrates the commitment to tackling this issue. That has taken significant additional resource and we know that SPICe has for instance said that there's 12 thousand lets across the city, I think the short-term lets working group which has been well attended and had valuable contributions from across the Chamber is in agreement that planning enforcement is not the answer, it will not provide us with the solution. I think we have taken a proactive role as a Local Authority in setting out what we do think the solution will be, which is a regulatory framework, and we have been very clear about how we think that needs to be implemented and the legislative change that is needed. We made representations to the Scottish Government both politically

and through officers attending working groups and that has resulted in a consultation on the regulation of short term lets which the Scottish Government is undertaking at the moment and we hope that that will bring the type of legislative change in regulatory framework that will allow us to get to grips with the problems. So I think we have been proactive and I would just ask that all members of the public, we need as many voices from Edinburgh as possible making the case, that we do need legislative change and we do need a licensing regime because there is serious impacts from short term lets in the city and we need the tools to be able to tackle them.

**QUESTION NO 2**

**By Councillor Johnston for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 27 June 2019**

Tram Extension – Final Design

**Question**

What opportunities will the public have to engage with the final design?

**Answer**

As you will no doubt be aware, extensive consultation was undertaken and evidenced during the development of the final business case. Workshops for local residents and interest groups were held throughout the comprehensive design process. The designs presented to Committee have formed the basis of the engagement with contractors.

As part of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) statutory process, members of the public will have further opportunity to give their views on the finalised road design.

Further information on the project can be found at:

[www.edinburgh.gov.uk/tramstonewhaven](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/tramstonewhaven).

**Supplementary  
Question**

Lord Provost, I am somewhat disappointed with that answer. As we all know there are some groundworks going on for the tram extension and just last month the project director, Alejandro Mendoza said that the ground investigation works we are doing will allow our design team to develop a robust final design. Given we don't know what's been found and that we don't have a final design, will the transport convener think again and perhaps run some public engagement workshops so everyone can engage and have confidence in this project?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary. I think when I look back at the development of the design that we are dealing with at this point, the level of engagement that we had with local resident groups with stakeholder groups that might be impacted, around issues of everything from the design of the specific design of it and the impact right through to act of travel schemes there to the local requirements or for example the residents on Constitution Street, I think the

degree of engagement that we have had has been remarkable and it's been remarkably successful in terms of helping us to shape that. I think your question is somewhat disingenuous. The groundworks going on at the moment is to establish engineering changes that might be required not a change in the final design, so I think that should be recognised. What's happening at the moment is that they're looking at the what the finding in the different areas in order to make sure that we deliver this programme in a well-engineered safe secure manner which can give the city confidence in what we're doing. As mentioned in the response there will be a further opportunity under the TRO schemes in that members of public can then comment on it as well and to raise questions about it as well. So (a) that is a further opportunity and (b) the engagement we've had so far has been unbelievable from local residents and we found it incredibly beneficial and it has shaped the final design already.

**QUESTION NO 3**

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019**

**Question** (1) What new measures have been implemented this year to address the issue of weeds on our streets and pavements?

**Answer** (1) The Council's approach to weed control was reported to Transport and Environment Committee on 9 August 2018 - [http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/58090/item\\_81\\_-\\_progress\\_in\\_implementing\\_the\\_integrated\\_weed\\_control\\_programme](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/58090/item_81_-_progress_in_implementing_the_integrated_weed_control_programme). This successful approach has continued in 2019.

**Question** (2) Can the convener provide details of the number of referrals, number of treatments administered and number of repeat treatments?

**Answer** (2) Under the approach outlined in August 2018, it is intended to administer two treatments per year. This was achieved in 2018. The delivery of this in 2019 is weather dependent, and treatments cannot of course be delivered effectively during periods of inclement weather, as recently experienced.

There have been approximately 65 contacts with the Council about excessive weeds since January 2019. In addition, there have been a further 11 relating to the treatment of weeds.

**Question** (3) What system is in place to gauge effectiveness of the treatments?

**Answer** (3) Following treatment, visual inspections are undertaken on a regular basis to assess the effectiveness of treatment.

**Supplementary  
Question**

It's that time of year again. I thank the Convener for her answer, it gives new meaning to the phrase rose tinted spectacles, clearly she sees something very different to the majority of residents when she's cycling round the city, even the World Heritage Site we see roads so covered in grass you could play long balls, we see practically herbaceous borders going up along the Dean Bridge, we see the city walls becoming living walls. So I'd like to know what metrics she's using her answer to define the successful approach that has been taken?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Have you noticed the rain that we've had in the last little while, have you noticed it? We have this question again and again and again about weeds and again and again and again we talk about the fact that if there is rain

**Comments by  
the Lord  
Provost**

Excuse me Councillor Macinnes - the question's been asked and the Convener is answering it, if members don't want to listen to the answer then they're free to leave, but please don't talk across the Convener when she's giving an answer to a member's question.

**Supplementary  
Answer  
continued**

Thank you Lord Provost. As stated in the written answer the delivery of our weed treatment programme is highly weather dependent, anybody with a garden who is looking at the issue of weeds, knows only too well that if you're trying to de-weed a path you have to have a period where there is no rain, in order to allow that to be effective, Exactly the same thing goes for our city-wide issues. We last year introduced a much faster method of treating weeds courtesy of the introduction of quad bikes, that's being used again this year. They're already out now doing it in this period of much better weather, we will see a difference. I think you should take into account the local conditions before you ask questions of that nature again.

**QUESTION NO 4**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019**

To ask the Convener of Transport and Environment to:

**Question** (1) Provide details of the numbers of choked drains that have been unblocked in the past 12 months by Ward?

**Answer** (1) In the past 12 months 30,172 gullies have been visited, 23,760 gullies were unblocked. These visits are broken down by ward as follows:

Ward	Number of Gullies Unblocked
1	2,341
2	1,897
3	3,071
4	4,023
5	3,632
6	2,705
7	1,961
8	481
9	641
10	666
11	2,219
12	1,031
13	1,207
14	944
15	1,102
16	1,331
17	920

**Question** (2) Provide details of whether these have been treated as a result of individual complaints being raised by members of the public or as part of regular maintenance?

- Answer** (2) Of the 23,760 gullies treated:
- 3,378 reports were raised by members of the public in the past 12 months (around 3,000 enquires are received per annum); and
  - 20,382 were part of regular maintenance.

Broadly, there are usually around 3,000 enquiries/contacts about gullies per annum. The predominant reasons are where the sump is blocked with silt and other debris, or the grating is blocked with leaves. Taken over the size of the Edinburgh road network, this figure can be considered reasonable

- Question** (3) Confirm there is a planned maintenance schedule for the clearing of choked drains and could this be provided, broken down by Ward?

- Answer** (3) The routine gully cleaning rota is based on a 24-month schedule. Sensitive gullies are attended to on a six-monthly basis. The routine gully cleaning programme (overleaf) is based on routes within the old neighbourhood areas therefore, we are unable to provide this information by individual ward.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you, Lord Provost. Will there be a review of the planned maintenance schedule in light of the severe rainfall this week to assess whether the flooding experienced in parts of the city was exacerbated by choked gully's and blocked drains.

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you for your supplementary Councillor Mowat. We have a 24 month rolling programme of gully maintenance and that has been as up-to-date as possible, it's also impacted by the weather, so there have been some slight delays around it. We also have a maintenance programme that looks specifically at sensitive locations, we've already identified that there are issues that can cause localised flooding when we face the kind of extreme weather event that we had on Monday, seems like a very long time ago because of the work that has been involved since, but it was only Monday. We recognise that obviously gully

maintenance is important, also too in this particular instance was the capacity of the sewer system to deal with such an extraordinary dump of rain on the city. We had half a month's worth of rain in three hours. I would challenge almost any city to be able to accommodate that without some degree of localised flooding. What was really important I think however, was our response to it, we had for example one instance where at Bankhead Grove the trams had to stop running because of that precise issue and we had that back up and running very very quickly, that was down to the response of the City of Edinburgh teams in order to get that moving. We've since seen quite a lot of road repairs that have been done to repair road surfaces in particular locations and that of course is going to be continuing until we get to the end of that. I'd like to take this opportunity really to say how well I think the response worked across the emergency services, across Scottish Water group, and across our own particular teams that were out in that. In terms of the gully maintenance, yes we will go back and have a look at it again to see whether or not anything can be learnt from that, of course when we have an extraordinary event as we did on Monday, we have to look at that, but I am confident that the processes in place are strong and that we need to simply look at some tweaks around timing, again it was impacted by weather in the last month.

**Comments by  
the Lord  
provost**

Can I just ask Councillor Macinnes, if you are doing a review as you've just committed to, will that be reported back to the Transport and Environment Committee.

**Councillor  
Macinnes**

Yes I'll do so, under the business bulletin I imagine, as soon as possible.

## Cyclic Routine Gully Cleaning Programme for 2018 - 2020

### Proposed Work Schedule by Old Neighbourhood Area

Neighbourhood	Start Date	Finish Date	weeks to complete
North	01/10/18	29/03/19	26
<i>Sensitive routes</i>	<i>29/10/18</i>	<i>17/11/18</i>	<i>03</i>
City Centre and Leith	01/04/19	19/07/19	16
<i>Sensitive routes</i>	<i>03/06/19</i>	<i>22/06/19</i>	<i>03</i>
East	22/07/19	18/10/19	13
<i>Sensitive routes</i>	<i>11/11/19</i>	<i>29/11/19</i>	<i>03</i>
South	21/10/19	31/01/20	15
South West	03/02/20	29/05/20	17
<i>Sensitive routes</i>	<i>08/06/20</i>	<i>26/06/20</i>	<i>03</i>
West	01/06/20	25/09/20	17
<b>Proposed Programme Timescale – 24 MONTHS</b>			

**Adhoc Event (V) routes to be scheduled prior to large event / within 24-month programme - nightshift can attend where noise is not an issue.**

## NOTES: -

1. 'Sensitive' gullies are cleaned twice a year city wide in June (prior to summer rain storms) and November (after leaves fall of trees).
2. **The dates in this schedule are subject to change** as gully cleaning vehicles cannot operate in the winter months when temperatures are below 0°C. Long periods of heavy rain and vehicle availability can also reduce resources carrying out routine cyclic gully cleaning.
3. When all the gullies in a Neighbourhood Area have been attended on their routes (but not necessarily cleaned), and the area routes have been finished, ad-hoc (one-off) routes are carried out for gullies that could not be accessed during the routine cleaning (due to parked cars, road works, etc). These Ad-hoc routes are scheduled to be carried out within a few weeks of completing a Neighbourhood Area.

**QUESTION NO 5**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019**

In the plans put out for consultation on the Low Emission Zones the proposed boundaries have the effect of diverting traffic through adjacent residential areas. Can the Convener confirm:

**Question** (1) If there was an EIA carried out prior to proposing the boundaries?)

**Answer** (1) EIAs (Environmental Impact Assessments) are assessments undertaken for development proposals which may have significant environmental impacts. For public plans, strategies and programmes such as Low Emission Zones (LEZs), the relevant assessment framework is a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Integrated Impact Assessment work is being undertaken to support LEZs and includes environmental impacts. A pre-screening of whether the SEA framework applies has been undertaken and has been determined as not applicable.

LEZs primary objective is to achieve compliance with the Local Air Quality Management regime, as defined under the Environment Act 1995, including objectives for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) concentrations. Tackling traffic management issues can be achieved through other means.

The development of the LEZs is in line with the [Scottish Government National Low Emissions Framework](#) (NLEF) guidance. The air quality model (developed and run by SEPA) to assess NO<sub>x</sub> levels across the city is in line with the [National Modelling Framework](#) (NMF).

**Question** (2) If an EIA was carried out please append a link to it in the response to these questions?

**Answer** (2) See response to Q(1).

**Question** (3) Have baseline measurements for CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM 2.5 and noise been carried out along all the boundaries and adjacent streets proposed?

**Answer** (3) LEZ development is focussed on NO<sub>x</sub> Air Quality Management Areas. As such assessment against this pollutant is the focus.

A report setting out this assessment has been prepared by SEPA and was considered by Transport and Environment Committee in [February 2019](#).

**Question** (4) If the answer to 2, is yes, where is this information published?

**Answer** (4) The air quality evidence report is available on the Council's website  
[http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/CET/downloads/file/3/air\\_quality\\_evidence\\_report\\_%E2%80%933\\_edinburgh](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/CET/downloads/file/3/air_quality_evidence_report_%E2%80%933_edinburgh).

**Question** (5) What assessment has been made of the impact of displacement of non-compliant EuroVI engine vehicles on streets adjacent to the boundaries?

**Answer** (5) EuroVI diesel vehicles (both car and heavy diesel vehicles) are compliant. It should also be noted that Euro 4 petrol engines are compliant.

The city centre boundary has been defined taking into consideration:

- The location of air quality exceedances – defined partly by the AQMAs and the SEPA model;
- The need to provide clear and legible alternative routes for non-compliant vehicles; and
- The boundary aligns with arterial roads that are suitable to carry higher levels of traffic.

It should be acknowledged that the majority of streets in the wider city centre contain residential properties, not just those areas adjacent to the proposed city centre LEZ boundary.

Supporting measures and actions (including those targeting modal shift, reducing the use of private cars in the city centre, supporting sustainable travel in and around the city

centre) will be delivered through the Edinburgh City Centre Transformation project and the City Mobility Plan, as well as other transport initiatives.

**Question** (6) If such an assessment has been made where can this data be found?

**Answer** (6) These results will be presented to Transport and Environment Committee in October 2019.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost. Convener, in answer 5 you reply that the low emission zone boundaries were drawn up to align with arterial routes that are suitable to carry higher levels of traffic, does this mean that the route through Randolph Crescent, Great Stuart Street and Ainslie Place is now designated as an arterial routes to replace the A1 despite the fact that it is currently signed as not suitable for HGV's?

**Supplementary Answer** I'll come back to you with some specific responses to that Councillor Mowat because it is obviously a very specific question. I would however see that in terms of the way in which the Low Emission Zone proposals are being laid out at the moment it does reflect an enormous degree of work in terms of trying to fit within SEPA recommendations and the national framework for how we organise it. I think it's worth noting in terms of your question, where you talk about the effect of diverting traffic through adjacent residential areas, I'd like to draw attention to the fact that there's barely a street in Edinburgh that is not residential and I think that's something that we ought to be taking into account when commenting on this.

**QUESTION NO 6**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 27 June 2019**

**Question**

Will the arrangement in place for the end of May and early June in response to Councillor Rose's question 5.3 answered at the May 2019 Council meeting relating to Southside, Fountainbridge and Newington, apply to other student areas e.g. City Centre Ward or elsewhere?

**Answer**

Yes, this arrangement applies to all areas with high student populations.

**QUESTION NO 7**

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019**

Can the Convener please reassure families that information previously provided stating the target intake date of spring 2020 is still correct as many families are counting on this timescale by confirming:

- Question** (1) When we can anticipate the building of the new Nether Currie Early Years facility to commence?
- a. If not yet known when can we expect the start date to be confirmed?
- Answer** (1) Construction will begin on Monday 1 July 2019.
- Question** (2) What date can we expect the first intake for pupils?
- a. If not yet known, when can we expect this to be confirmed?
- Answer** (2) August 2020.
- Question** (3) When will the staff recruitment process begin ahead of the building completion date?
- Answer** (3) Recruitment is ongoing on a city-wide basis for the 1140 Early Years programme.
- Question** (4) When can we expect the Landscape architects, engaged by CEC, to provide plans for the proposed improvements of existing primary schools (this was promised in 2018)?
- Answer** (4) The architects will work with stakeholders to develop plans from August 2019. The final plans should be available by Easter 2020

**QUESTION NO 8**

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019**

Given the apparent lack of progress and detail around the West Edinburgh High School, can the convener please provide an update on:

- Question** (1) Proposed location of the school following the Education, Children and Families Committee decision to explore alternatives to the Ratho Station site?
- Answer** (1) Site options are still being considered. Statutory consultation would be required to establish the location and catchment area for the new school.
- Question** (2) Estimated construction completion timescales?
- Answer** (2) Latest projections indicate the new school would be required for August 2024.
- Question** (3) Funding available and funding required?
- Answer** (3) There is no funding currently allocated to the project. Depending on the size, the costs could range from £30m-£50m.
- Question** (4) How will pupils be accommodated at other schools until the project is completed, especially in light of sign-off of major new developments in this catchment?
- Answer** (4) Until 2024 pupils can be accommodated in their existing schools. A rising rolls project would be progressed for any school which has immediate accommodation issues.
- Supplementary Question** I thank the Convener for his answer. I think there will still be. despite his answers, significant concern from parents and western fringe of the city about the lack of progress on the new high school and I wondered in his answer if the Officer had taken into account the new major developments at Cammo and along the Burnshot Road when making these 2024 projections?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary. I am almost sure they have but I'll go back and check they haven't and will need to redraft the figures.

**QUESTION NO 9**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019**

Can the Convener please confirm;

- Question** (1) Who made the decision to issue letters to Primary School Headteachers regarding lack of money to provide special needs support?
- Answer** (1) The Executive Director for Communities and Families, in consultation with Head Teacher representatives, agreed that schools be communicated with by e-mail.
- Question** (2) On what date were these letters issued and on what date was a subsequent communication issued by the Council reversing the reduction in financial support?
- Answer** (2) An e-mail was sent to schools on 28 May 2019. A further e-mail advising that the devolved hours would be reinstated to 18/19 levels and the low incidence process would be advised shortly was sent on 6 June 2019. A meeting took place with HT representatives on 7 June 2019 to discuss and agree the approach for Low Incidence allocations after which a communication agreed with the Head Teacher representatives was issued to all primary HT's on 11 June 2019.
- Question** (3) Who made the decision to overturn the refusal to spend more money on additional support needs?
- Answer** (3) Following consultation with the Convener and Vice-Convener, the instruction was issued to the Executive Director for Communities and Families to reverse the decision with immediate effect.
- Question** (4) When and by what means were all elected members advised?

**Answer** (4) Following communications from Head Teachers, the Convener and Vice Convener raised the issue with officers and were advised of the email formally on 3 June 2019. The Leader and Deputy Leader were provided with a briefing on 6 June 2019.

**Question** (5) Where was the money located / from where will the spend be funded and will any sacrifices be made to accommodate this spend?

**Answer** (5) Additional resources have been identified within the budget and are currently being discussed with the Convener and Vice-Convener.

**Question** (6) Is the sum of £5million (as reported in the media) accurate?

**Answer** (6) The £5m is neither an actual nor a definitive figure but was based on the assumption that all applications received would be granted and at the highest level. All outstanding applications have since been assessed by officers and schools advised of the outcome on 24 June 2019.

**Question** (7) What was the overspend in budget last year?

**Answer** (7) The audit hours budget was overspent by £232k in 2018/19.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the convener for his answer. In terms of the answer to question 4 it would seem that only 4 Councillors in this Chamber were advised. Given that the last time I looked will have schools in our ward and I was contacted by two parent councils as well as individual parents on the sensitive issue, does he agree that it is completely unacceptable that no other elected Member was advised?

**Supplementary Answer** Sorry I was just trying to reflect on what you meant by question 4. What I was intending doing, and I was hoping you were going to ask in terms of the last question, is that, the process has just been finished in terms of looking at all the applications and the allocations and I'm sure it will be interesting, that will be a much better figure, a much better briefing to have, so what I would endeavour to do and give you a guarantee that, once this process is finished I'll organise a briefing for all councillors in this room to find out

who applied for what and what was granted, and the officers will then be able to explain if anybody's got any issues at that briefing.

**QUESTION NO 10**

**By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019**

**Question**

Further to the Convener's comments at Full Council Budget Meeting on 21st February 2019 and the subsequent establishment that Road Mole was indeed more than a just a Computer Generated Image on Twitter, can the Convener offer an update on progress being made in conducting a trial of said machine as a way to help solve Edinburgh's potholes problems?

**Answer**

Officers met with CSJ Civil Engineering to better understand the current specification, ability, productivity and availability of the "Road Mole". The technology is in its early infancy and still under its development, and therefore not currently applicable to Edinburgh. From discussions it would appear to be more suited to trunk road scenarios than urban situations. However, a site visit to Liverpool on 8 July is planned to see it in operation.

**QUESTION NO 11**

**By Councillor Staniforth for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 27 June 2019**

On the 9th June the road to Seafield Recycling Centre was closed due to safety concerns. In light of this:

**Question** (1) What was the extent of public consultation on the use of the road before the entrance on Fillyside Road was closed and the Seafield Road entrance opened?

**Answer** (1) The changes at Seafield Recycling Centre were made to maintain the health and safety of visitors to the site, as operational changes were being introduced. Consultation was undertaken as part of the planning process (site layout was included within the original planning application) therefore there was no expectation of a need for further public consultation.

**Question** (2) Why were traffic numbers so under-estimated at the site that the entrance had to be closed down?

**Answer** (2) There was no under-estimation in the forecasted use of the site. On occasion, and as can be reasonably expected, there can be peaks in use which are often weather influenced.

The site layout was designed based on analysis of previous site usage and provides an additional 100 yards of road space for vehicles to wait within the site.

For safety reasons on that particular day, when it was identified that there was a significant build-up of vehicles on the site and queuing, the decision was taken to temporarily close the site to new visitors for a short period.

Despite the Council continuing to make drivers aware of the change to the facility's access arrangements, some early users have not been adhering to the new traffic management system in place.

- Question** (3) What is being done to ensure that entry to Seafield Recycling Centre is both safe and efficient in the future?
- Answer** (3) Officers are continuing to monitor the movement of vehicles entering and leaving the site, as well as while they are on the site. Adjustments are being made to the site layout to improve vehicle movement. Officers are also drafting business continuity arrangements to allow for any future pressures should they arise.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you, Lord Provost. Does the Convener agree that actually when making significant alterations to recycling centre it would be appropriate to consult the users of the recycling centre as well rather than simply relying on statutory planning consultations?
- Supplementary Answer** Yes, I think it might have been helpful, it might have helped reduce some of the heat in the discussion once it was opened, but the simple fact of the matter is that the changes were being made for safety reasons. With the implementation of the new transfer station at that site, it was absolutely necessary to make the changes to allow some degree of separation between heavy vehicles moving around the site and the public coming in. I do appreciate that for the local population, particularly those coming from the Portobello end, there is this perception that it's a more inconvenient situation for them, however, within the site there has been an extra hundred yards put in of waiting time inside the site. So in other words in a safe area, and I hope that over time as people get used to the changes, as people start to use up sites, more and more that will be understood as to why we were doing that. I think it's a very important aspect, the question of safety in terms of people moving around with both cars, heavy loads, all of those kinds of things on a site like that.

**QUESTION NO 12**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 27 June 2019**

**Question** (1) What grass collection equipment is owned and operated by the parks and greenspaces team?

**Answer** (2) The Parks and Greenspaces team owns and operates three machines which can be used for collecting grass and/or litter, two are towed by large tractors and the third is operated by a mini tractor.

**Question** (2) On what basis is any such equipment deployed across the four localities?

**Answer** (2) This equipment is not deployed on a geographical basis, but rather it is used mainly on sports pitches across the city, in situations where the grass is too long and the clippings would interfere with play if left.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much and I thank the Convener for the answers that she provided. In her answer she rightly identified the need for grass collection on sports fields because otherwise they risk being unplayable, but I know for a number of different reasons the grass-cutting has been later this year and certainly in my ward, and I know in others we have had pretty significant swathes of open green space which have been left with huge piles of grass, leaving them unusable for people who are not necessarily even playing sports but just wanting to use and enjoy these areas. So does the Convener think there is perhaps a case for looking at some additional capital investment for more of these machines so that grass collection in these open areas where it's feasible to do so becomes the norm rather than the exception?

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you for your supplementary Councillor Lang. As you'll be aware the move towards using this equipment only in terms of sports pitches, is a decision that was taken

previously at Committee. I am happy to ask officers to come back and have a conversation with you and I about what you've just raised about it, but I suspect that it goes beyond the scope of your question in terms of the capital cost, what other services you might have to cut in order to do that, to do as you outlined and so on but I am certainly happy to have that conversation and I would propose that we do so post recess.

**QUESTION NO 13**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the  
Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 27 June 2019**

**Question** (1) 1. What percentage of streets have been treated for weeds this year, broken down by ward?

**Answer** (1) Percentage of herbicide application on streets - up to 18 June in 2018 and 2019:

<b>Ward</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
1	80%	75%
2	60%	100%
3	100%	20%
4	100%	100%
5	25%	5%
6	60%	0%
7	100%	50%
8	30%	0%
9	50%	0%
10	85%	30%
11	35%	50%
12	40%	30%
13	30%	30%
14	40%	50%
15	65%	10%
16	70%	10%
17	65%	5%

**Question** (2) How do these figures compare to this time in (a) 2018 and (b) 2017?

**Answer** (2) The table above compares 2018 and 2019. In 2017 this work was recorded in spray log books and it has not been possible to collate this information in time to respond to this request.

**Question** (3) What further resources are being allocated to weed clearance over the next three months?

**Answer** (3) 6 quad bikes fitted with spraying equipment will be operational when weather conditions permit.

**Question** (4) Can the Council's weed control policy be uploaded to the section of the website relating to weed control?

**Answer** (4) This will be uploaded by the end of June 2019.

**Question** (5) How many complaints or requests for weed clearance have been received so far this year, broken down by ward?

**Answer** (5) There have been approximately 65 contacts with the Council about excessive weeds since January 2019. In addition, there have been 10 further contacts relating to the treatment of weeds. The breakdown below shows the number of contacts recorded on Confirm by ward. The remaining 25 have not been recorded by ward.

<b>Wards</b>	<b>Volume</b>
01-Almond	5
02-Pentland Hills	1
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	3
04-Forth	2
05-Inverleith	5
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	2
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	3
10-Meadows/Morningside	1
11-City Centre	7
12-Leith Walk	2
13-Leith	5
14-Craigentinny/Duddingston	6
15-Southside/Newington	2
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	4
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>50</b>

**Supplementary Question** I'm rather hesitant about asking this question due to the answer Councillor Laidlaw received but I'll give it a try. Lord Provost I have to say I do think that there is a risk that the Administration comes across as slightly dismissive of this as an issue. I don't think I'm the only one who looks at parts of the city and thinks it is becoming something of Day of the Triffids frankly, and we now know why because the level of weed control is well down compared to 2018 and in fact some wards have had no streets treated whatsoever over the course of the last six months. So whatever the reasons behind it, can the Convener clarify whether in reality, has the team that deals with this got the capacity to catch up and if it does when will that be done by?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Yes it does have the capacity to catch up and it will be doing so now that the weather has cleared and we're able then to actually apply the weed killer. As I mentioned earlier last year we introduced quad bikes, that allows us to move much further and faster, I think at about four times the rate that is allowed by people operating on foot. So we are able to cover large areas quite quickly now that the weather is clear that allows us to apply it that catch up will happen. I would say though, it's worthwhile drawing attention to the written answer that has been provided which is an honest question, we've had 65 complaints since the beginning of this year. Given the weather, given the scale of that, I don't believe that that is an enormously high figure. Yes do we have to respond to it, of course, there is no question about this Administration being dismissive of concerns but what this Administration is doing is trying to be realistic and the context that we've been operating in has been incredible weather rain pattern over the last month which has delayed an awful lot of the work that would have been done. We're now in a position where this could actually get on and get that work done. There is no question that we are dismissing this, there is no question that we're underestimating this, but we have to reflect the reality of how we're able to operate in this area and that is highly weather dependent. I think the fact that we're into the second year of quad bike use will make a difference and over the coming years we'll see that happening more and more, but we have to accept the fact that this is highly dependent on external factors over which I unfortunately have no control.