

# Minutes

## The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 8 February 2024

Present:

### LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Robert Aldridge

### COUNCILLORS

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

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

## 1 Deputations

---

**a) Kirkliston Primary School Association  
(in relation to item 7.6 on the agenda – Outcome of the Statutory Consultation Proposing to Establish a New Non-Denominational Secondary School in Kirkliston and Associated Catchment Changes)**

The deputation were primarily concerned with securing the educational and well-being of Kirkliston's children now and for the future and felt that the ultimate decision on whether to establish a school in Kirkliston would have a fundamental impact on the community now and for future generations. They were further concerned that the current funding crisis would lead to the financial case being the most persuasive factor when the final decision was taken on how to proceed.

The deputation urged the Council to approve the proposal and instruct the business case for both options, but to insist on a deeper explanation now of the educational impact and operating structure that would arise from these two options and to ensure that the correct information was available to enable the best educational decision to be made for all children in Kirkliston and South Queensferry.

(see item 10 below)

**b) Safe Consumption Facility Edinburgh's Organising Committee  
(in relation to item 8.4 on the agenda – Motion by Councillor McKenzie – Safe Consumption Room and Community Drug Checking Facilities)**

The deputation felt that the criminal justice approach to problem drug use was not an appropriate solution where the police and the courts were used to punish those afflicted with addictions, and a 2014 report from the Home Office had acknowledged that the criminal justice approach was not backed by evidence. They stressed that they would like drug use to be treated as a public health issue, with the immediate focus being on reducing the overall level of harm and not attempt to prevent problem drug use through the courts and police presence.

They deputation indicated that in the UK drug users were 13 times more likely to die from an overdose in 2021 compared with the European average and the way to change this was a brick-and-mortar NHS safe consumption facility which would provide sterile needles, provide an opiate substitute treatment as a first-line treatment, provide relevant points of contact and employ qualified staff able to provide medical assistance in the case of an overdose.

The deputation urged the Council to release the outcome of the feasibility study into a Safe Drug Consumption Facility which had been commissioned on the 22 of June 2022 by the Council.

(see item 16 below)

## 2 Minutes

---

### Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 14 December 2023 as a correct record.

## 3 Leader's Report

---

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

- Council funding allocations
- Tram extension plans
- Scottish Water net zero
- ETAG Tourism Conference
- Russian invasion of Ukraine - anniversary
- Former Councillor George Hunter – Tribute
- Anchorfield – commend work done by officers
- Retirement of Chief Executive - thanks

The following questions/comments were made:

- |                       |   |                                                     |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Councillor Nols-McVey | - | EU Climate – Rising temperatures – net zero targets |
| Councillor Lang       | - | Budget Plans – Council Tax                          |
| Councillor Mumford    | - | Council Tax freeze                                  |
| Councillor Whyte      | - | Design of Leith Walk                                |
| Councillor McKenzie   | - | Dalry Road cleaning                                 |
| Councillor Kumar      | - | Youth Work Organisations funding                    |
| Councillor Bennett    | - | Tram extension consultation – Roseburn path         |
| Councillor Parker     | - | Budget – investment in climate                      |
| Councillor Bruce      | - | Balancing the budget over the next 3 years          |

|                                  |   |                                                                                                               |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron | - | Briefings from World Heritage and ETAG                                                                        |
| Councillor Macinnes              | - | Budget process - consultation                                                                                 |
| Councillor Beal                  | - | Tram extension consultation – Roseburn path                                                                   |
| Councillor Rae                   | - | Planning applications for short term lets                                                                     |
| Councillor Cowdy                 | - | School crossing patrol vacancies                                                                              |
| Councillor Mattos Coelho         | - | Outcome of a planning application – toss of a coin                                                            |
| Councillor Osler                 | - | Ambition for Million Tree City by 2030                                                                        |
| Councillor Heap                  | - | Money invested by the Council into financial institutions subsequently invested into fossil fuel institutions |
| Councillor Aston                 | - | Budget setting process                                                                                        |
| Councillor Gardiner              | - | Costs for re-run of planning hearing                                                                          |
|                                  | - | Pentland Hills Regional Park - meetings                                                                       |
| Councillor Campbell              | - | Labour Group coalition with the Liberal Democrat Group                                                        |

#### **4 Appointment to Appointment to Outside Organisation – Edinburgh Festival Fringe Ambassador**

---

Approval was to appoint the Lord Provost as Ambassador to the Edinburgh Festival Fringe Society.

##### **Motion**

To agree the appointment of the Lord Provost to the role of Edinburgh Festival Fringe Ambassador, subject to suitable terms and conditions being agreed.

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

##### **Amendment 1**

- 1) Notes that the purpose, nature and responsibilities of the Ambassador role have not been outlined by this report in detail and so Councillors are not easily

able to judge the advantages, opportunities and/or risks of appointing a Councillor to this role.

- 2) To ask officers to report to the Full Council to be held in March 2024 detailing the responsibilities of the role, and what advantages, opportunities and/or risks appointing a Councillor to this role would involve; and provide information on any other Ambassador roles Councillors are currently appointed to.

- moved by Councillor Heap, seconded by Councillor Parker

## **Amendment 2**

To continue consideration of the matter.

- moved by Councillor Mumford, seconded by Councillor Booth

In accordance with Standing Order 24(4), the Lord Provost ruled that a first vote be taken for or against Amendment 2 for continuation.

## **Voting**

### **First Vote**

The voting was as follows:

|                     |   |          |
|---------------------|---|----------|
| For Amendment 2     | - | 10 votes |
| Against Amendment 2 | - | 49 votes |

(For Amendment 2: Councillors Bandel, Booth, Burgess, Heap, McKenzie, Mumford, O'Neill, Parker, Rae and Staniforth.

Against the Amendment 2: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Cowdy, Dalglish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Doggart, Flannery, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Jones, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Work, Young and Younie.)

As the vote for continuation was lost, a second vote was then taken between the Motion by the Lord Provost Amendment 1 by Councillor Heap.

### **Second Vote**

The voting was as follows:

|                 |   |          |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion  | - | 32 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 27 votes |

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

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

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

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

## **5 Appointment to Various Committees, Boards and Working Groups**

---

### **Decision**

To appoint the following members to various working Groups:

- 1) **Committee on Pupil/Student Support** – To appoint Councillor Griffiths as Convener.
- 2) **Joint Consultative Group** – To appoint Councillor Younie in place of Councillor Ross.
- 3) **Responsible Construction Working Group** - To appoint Councillors Booth, Flannery, Mattos Coelho and Pogson.
- 4) **Edinburgh as a Feminist City Working Group** – To appoint Councillors Lezley Marion Cameron, Glasgow, O'Neill and Osler.
- 5) **Short Term Lets Working Group** – To appoint Councillor Key in place of Councillor Campbell.

## **6 Chief Executive Appointment**

---

Following the decision by Andrew Kerr, Chief Executive regarding his intention to retire from the City of Edinburgh Council on 14 June 2024, details were provided on the Recruitment and Selection Procedure to be followed for the Chief Executive Officer and approval sought for a Recruitment Committee to be convened to determine the recruitment and selection arrangements for filling the post.

## **Decision**

To agree to convene a Recruitment Committee to:

- 1) determine and enact the recruitment and selection arrangements for filling the post of Chief Executive on a permanent basis.
- 2) consider interim arrangements, as required.

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

## **7 Council Diary 2024/25**

---

Details were provided on proposed meeting dates for all Council and committee meetings from August 2024 to June 2025 which also included proposed dates for recess periods and Council meetings from August 2025 to August 2026.

### **Motion**

- 1) To agree the Council Diary for August 2024 to June 2025 as set out in appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services and authorise the Executive Director of Corporate Services to make minor adjustments, as necessary.
- 2) To agree the recess and Council meeting dates for August 2025 to August 2026 as set out in appendix 2 to the report.
- 3) To remove the proposed Council meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2024 given there is another meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June unless required for the appointment of the Chief Executive and that would then be held remotely on Teams.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

### **Amendment**

- 1) To agree the Council Diary for August 2024 to June 2025 as set out in appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services and authorise the Executive Director of Corporate Services to make minor adjustments, as necessary.
- 2) To agree the recess and Council meeting dates for August 2025 to August 2026 as set out in appendix 2 to the report.
- 3) Welcomes that “changes to the diary are proposed which aim to assist members with caring and other responsibilities by making better use of the space available and reducing meetings during school holidays” and that

“discussions are ongoing regarding business processes which could improve this further”

- 4) Notes that work is ongoing with COSLA and the Improvement Service to looking at Barriers to Elected Office and requests that these processes are aligned;
- 5) Requests an update be circulated to members on the expected timeline going forward on the Barriers to Elected Office work;
- 6) Notes that Barriers to Elected Office affect both current councillors and potential future councillors and requests that this work is aligned with induction plans for new Councillors in 2027; and
- 7) Requests a report to Policy and Sustainability Committee in May or June 2026 on how access and inclusion will be embedded in induction processes and throughout the 2027-2032 term.

- moved by Councillor Parker, seconded by Councillor Mumford

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

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To agree the Council Diary for August 2024 to June 2025 as set out in appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services and authorise the Executive Director of Corporate Services to make minor adjustments, as necessary.
- 2) To agree the recess and Council meeting dates for August 2025 to August 2026 as set out in appendix 2 to the report.
- 3) To remove the proposed Council meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2024 given there was another meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June unless required for the appointment of the Chief Executive and that would then be held remotely on Teams.
- 4) To welcome that “changes to the diary are proposed which aim to assist members with caring and other responsibilities by making better use of the space available and reducing meetings during school holidays” and that “discussions are ongoing regarding business processes which could improve this further.”

- 5) To note that work was ongoing with COSLA and the Improvement Service to looking at Barriers to Elected Office and request that these processes be aligned;
- 6) To request an update be circulated to members on the expected timeline going forward on the Barriers to Elected Office work;
- 7) To note that Barriers to Elected Office affected both current councillors and potential future councillors and request that this work be aligned with induction plans for new Councillors in 2027.
- 8) To request a report to Policy and Sustainability Committee in May or June 2026 on how access and inclusion would be embedded in induction processes and throughout the 2027-2032 term.

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

## **8 Committee Report Processes**

---

Details were provided on proposals to change Procedural Standing Orders and business processes to improve the committee process and facilitate improved decision making and improve accessibility.

### **Motion**

- 1) To agree the proposals outlined in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.6 of the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 2) To agree any change to Standing Orders would come into effect on 5 August 2024 and to delegate authority to the Executive Director of Corporate Services to take such actions and make such minor adjustments to the documents as may be necessary to implement the decision of the Council.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

### **Amendment**

#### **Moving amendment deadline in line with earlier publication of reports and motions**

Committee:

- 1) welcomes the additional time built into this process with earlier publications of reports and motions helping both Councillors and members of the public to access and consider proposals;

- 2) Believes that this should be matched by an earlier (by one day) deadline for the submission of amendments to better enable political cooperation and negotiation and to allow external groups and organisations to access amendments and enable deputation requests on that basis;
- 3) Therefore Amends 1.1 to read:

“To agree the proposals outlined in 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.5 and 4.6 of the Executive Director report. Additionally, agrees to amend Standing Order 22 to read:

  - i) At 22.3 deletes “no later than 12 noon on the working day before the meeting” and replaces with “no later than 12 noon two working days before the meeting

### **Allowing for changes to budget motions**

- 4) Additionally, Committee notes that the proposed standing orders around the budget process requests that budget motions and amendments be submitted on the same day, 6 working days before the Council meeting.
- 5) Committee notes that this does not allow for changes to be made to budgets following submission and believes this goes against the spirit of cross-party agreement to bring the deadline forward by a week in order to build time into the budget process for collaboration and negotiation
- 6) Committee acknowledges the last-minute changes to funding settlements which often occur nationally, and the challenges facing officers to ensure that multiple complex budget motions from are competent;
- 7) Therefore further amends Standing Order 22 to read:
  - ii) At 22.5 deletes all and replaces with: “That any motion or amendment to the budget meeting shall be provided to the clerk by 12pm no later than 6 working days before the Council meeting. Prior to the meeting the motions and amendments can be amended provided a final version is submitted to the clerk no later than 12pm two working days before the meeting. The exceptions detailed in Standing Order 23.3 also apply.”

This is to take effect from 9 February 2024.

- moved by Councillor Parker, seconded by Councillor Mumford

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

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

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

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

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

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To agree the proposals outlined in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.6 of the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 2) To agree any change to Standing Orders would come into effect on 5 August 2024 and to delegate authority to the Executive Director of Corporate Services to take such actions and make such minor adjustments to the documents as may be necessary to implement the decision of the Council.

## **Allowing for changes to budget motions**

- 3) Additionally, to note that the proposed standing orders around the budget process requested that budget motions and amendments be submitted on the same day, 6 working days before the Council meeting.
- 4) To note that this did not allow for changes to be made to budgets following submission and believes this goes against the spirit of cross-party agreement to bring the deadline forward by a week in order to build time into the budget process for collaboration and negotiation.
- 5) To acknowledge the last-minute changes to funding settlements which often occurred nationally, and the challenges facing officers to ensure that multiple complex budget motions from were competent.;
- 6) To therefore further amend Standing Order 22 to read:

- ii) At 22.5 deletes all and replaces with: “That any motion or amendment to the budget meeting shall be provided to the clerk by 12pm no later than 6 working days before the Council meeting. Prior to the meeting the motions and amendments can be amended provided a final version is submitted to the clerk no later than 12pm two working days before the meeting. The exceptions detailed in Standing Order 23.3 also apply.”

This is to take effect from 9 February 2024.

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

## **9 Operational Governance: Review of Grant Standing Orders**

---

Details were provided on proposed changes to Grant Standing Orders.

### **Motion**

- 1) To approve the proposed revisions to the existing Grant Standing Orders, as summarised in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 2) To adopt the Grant Standing Orders included in Appendix 2 to the report.
- 3) To note that there would continue to be an annual review of the Grant Standing Orders to ensure that they worked effectively in providing guidance, controls and regulation of the grant application and award process throughout the Council and on behalf of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board (EIJB).

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) Notes there is no mention of diversity and inclusion principles in the standing orders.
- 2) Agrees that all future changes to standing orders will include an appendix which clearly shows tracked changes.
- 3) Agrees to consider the following additions (in yellow) as suggestions for when the report comes back:

Adds to 2.4

The Council is committed to the principles of collaboration and co-production. Co-production means the real and meaningful involvement of the citizens of Edinburgh and recipients of services in delivering better outcomes. Grant

recipients shall be encouraged to communicate effectively and to work together with recipients of services and communities of interest to achieve improved outcomes **ensuring diversity and inclusion principles are met in relation to representation of individuals involved in coproduction and codesign.**

Amends 2.6 to read:

2.6 The Council **will only** ~~may~~ use arms-length bodies or other appropriate organisations or community networks to carry out grant disbursement activities on their behalf **under exceptional circumstances and when there are compelling reasons to do so and after the relevant executive committee has agreed, noting that decisions taken by committee are subject to public scrutiny while decisions taken by external organisations will not be.** The Council should have an agreement in place with such bodies that sets out the nature of the relationship, the form of accountability, how the assessment panel will be constituted, how the organisation or network is funded or will be funded, and details of the activities they will engage in. Such bodies will be subject to the standards set out in these Grant Standing Orders. ~~unless expressly agreed by the relevant Council Committee or the designated proper officer as the Council delegates in the Scheme of Delegation or otherwise.~~

Adds at 5.1.1

the application shall be assessed and evaluated by more than one Council officer or a peer group panel **and all assessment panels must reflect the communities that will benefit from the grants, including principles of diversity and inclusion in the selection of panel members.** In the case of arms-length bodies or other appropriate organisations or community networks who are disbursing funds on behalf of the Council or the EIJB such appropriate panel as is set out in the agreement with the Council.

Adds at 12.1 - Urgency

12.1 In the event that urgent requirements out-with the Council's control make it impractical for these GSOs to be followed then in order to disburse grant funding as a matter of urgency the urgency provisions set out in provision 4 of the Council's Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions where appropriate should be followed. At their discretion, the relevant Executive Director should make relevant members (e.g. ward councillors) aware of the decision taken under the urgency provisions **and report to the next available executive committee, full council or EIJB meeting.**

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

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To approve the proposed revisions to the existing Grant Standing Orders, as summarised in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 2) To adopt the Grant Standing Orders included in Appendix 2 to the report.
- 3) Welcomes changes to the Grant Standing Orders to reflect changing council priorities, including in recognition of the climate and nature emergencies.
- 4) Notes that the focus of changes relating to climate and nature in Section 8 of the Grant Standing Orders is to simply include the words “and address the nature emergency” in the preamble at 8.1, and to “encourage” funded organisations to calculate and disclose their carbon footprint as well as to complete, but not necessarily deliver, carbon reduction plans.
- 5) Further notes that merely encouraging and not requiring organisations to commit to this work does not guarantee that any of these activities will take place, and also recognises that whilst carbon reduction plans will help to tackle the climate emergency, they will not (necessarily) address the nature emergency. Therefore, requests that further revisions are made to the Grant Standing Orders to explore how these conditions can be strengthened by making them a requirement of any grant, and by specifying actions which should help to address the nature emergency in particular.
- 6) Additionally notes that the Grant Standing Orders make no reference to equality, diversity or inclusion throughout – for example, by requiring pay gap disclosure (gender, disability, race) amongst recipients where appropriate. Therefore, agrees that further revisions are made to the Grant Standing Orders to address this concern.
- 7) Agrees that a revised version of the Grant Standing Orders is presented to Full Council after these issues have been addressed.

- moved by Councillor Parker, seconded by Councillor Mumford

In terms of Standing Order 22(13), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as amendments to the motion.

At this point in the meeting the following Amendment 3 was proposed:

## **Amendment 3**

- t) Notes there is no mention of diversity and inclusion principles in the standing orders.

2) Agrees that all future changes to standing orders will include an appendix which clearly shows tracked changes.

3) Amends 2.6 to read:

2.6 The Council **will only** ~~may~~ use arms-length bodies or other appropriate organisations or community networks to carry out grant disbursement activities on their behalf **under exceptional circumstances and when there are compelling and reasons to do so and after the relevant executive committee has agreed, noting that decisions taken by committee are subject to public scrutiny while decisions taken by external organisations will not be.** The Council should have an agreement in place with such bodies that sets out the nature of the relationship, the form of accountability, how the assessment panel will be constituted, how the organisation or network is funded or will be funded, and details of the activities they will engage in. Such bodies will be subject to the standards set out in these Grant Standing Orders

4) Adds at 12.1 - Urgency

12.1 In the event that urgent requirements out-with the Council's control make it impractical for these GSOs to be followed then in order to disburse grant funding as a matter of urgency the urgency provisions set out in provision 4 of the Council's Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions where appropriate should be followed. At their discretion, the relevant Executive Director should make relevant members (e.g. ward councillors) aware of the decision taken under the urgency provisions **and report to the next available executive committee, full council or EIJB meeting.**

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

## Voting

The voting was as follows:

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

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

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

## Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To approve the proposed revisions to the existing Grant Standing Orders, as summarised in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 2) To adopt the Grant Standing Orders included in Appendix 2 to the report.
- 3) To note that there would continue to be an annual review of the Grant Standing Orders to ensure that they worked effectively in providing guidance, controls and regulation of the grant application and award process throughout the Council and on behalf of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board (EIJB).
- 4) To note there was no mention of diversity and inclusion principles in the standing orders.
- 5) To agree that all future changes to standing orders would include an appendix which clearly showed tracked changes.
- 6) To agree the following additions (in yellow) as suggestions for when the report came back:

Adds to 2.4

The Council is committed to the principles of collaboration and co-production. Co-production means the real and meaningful involvement of the citizens of Edinburgh and recipients of services in delivering better outcomes. Grant recipients shall be encouraged to communicate effectively and to work together with recipients of services and communities of interest to achieve improved outcomes ensuring diversity and inclusion principles are met in relation to representation of individuals involved in coproduction and codesign.

Amends 2.6 to read:

- 2.6 The Council will only ~~may~~ use arms-length bodies or other appropriate organisations or community networks to carry out grant disbursement activities on their behalf under exceptional circumstances and when there are compelling reasons to do so and after the relevant executive committee has agreed, noting that decisions taken by committee are subject to public scrutiny while decisions taken by external organisations will not be. The Council should have an agreement in place with such bodies that sets out the nature of the

relationship, the form of accountability, how the assessment panel will be constituted, how the organisation or network is funded or will be funded, and details of the activities they will engage in. Such bodies will be subject to the standards set out in these Grant Standing Orders. ~~unless expressly agreed by the relevant Council Committee or the designated proper officer as the Council delegates in the Scheme of Delegation or otherwise.~~

Adds at 5.1.1

the application shall be assessed and evaluated by more than one Council officer or a peer group panel **and all assessment panels must reflect the communities that will benefit from the grants, including principles of diversity and inclusion in the selection of panel members.** In the case of arms-length bodies or other appropriate organisations or community networks who are disbursing funds on behalf of the Council or the EIJB such appropriate panel as is set out in the agreement with the Council.

Adds at 12.1 - Urgency

12.1 In the event that urgent requirements out-with the Council's control make it impractical for these GSOs to be followed then in order to disburse grant funding as a matter of urgency the urgency provisions set out in provision 4 of the Council's Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions where appropriate should be followed. At their discretion, the relevant Executive Director should make relevant members (e.g. ward councillors) aware of the decision taken under the urgency provisions **and report to the next available executive committee, full council or EIJB meeting.**

- 7) To welcome changes to the Grant Standing Orders to reflect changing council priorities, including in recognition of the climate and nature emergencies.
- 8) To note that the focus of changes relating to climate and nature in Section 8 of the Grant Standing Orders was to simply include the words "and address the nature emergency" in the preamble at 8.1, and to "encourage" funded organisations to calculate and disclose their carbon footprint as well as to complete, but not necessarily deliver, carbon reduction plans.
- 9) To further note that merely encouraging and not requiring organisations to commit to this work did not guarantee that any of these activities would take place, and also recognise that whilst carbon reduction plans would help to tackle the climate emergency, they would not (necessarily) address the nature emergency. Therefore, request that further revisions be made to the Grant Standing Orders to explore how these conditions could be strengthened by

making them a requirement of any grant, and by specifying actions which should help to address the nature emergency in particular.

- 10) Additionally to note that the Grant Standing Orders made no reference to equality, diversity or inclusion throughout – for example, by requiring pay gap disclosure (gender, disability, race) amongst recipients where appropriate. Therefore, to agree that further revisions be made to the Grant Standing Orders to address this concern.
- 11) To agree that a revised version of the Grant Standing Orders be presented to Full Council after these issues had been addressed.

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

## **10 Rolling Actions Log – May 2015 to December 2024**

---

### **Decision**

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:

**Action 3** – Scheme of Delegation 2023

**Action 5** – Sewage in Edinburgh’s Waterways – Motion by Councillor Caldwell

**Action 6(1) & (2)** – Consideration of Private Business – Motion by Councillor Lang

**Action 7(1) & (2)** – Critical Risks – Motion by Councillor Mowat

**Action 9** – Co-operative Council – Motion by Councillor Day

**Action 10** – Governance Documentation

**Action 11** – Annual Performance Report 2022/23 – referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

**Action 12** – Motion by Councillor Davidson – Sexual Health Services in Edinburgh

**Action 13** – Motion by Councillor Day – Tram Inquiry

**Action 14** – Motion by Councillor Jones – More Public Toilets for Portobello

- 2) To otherwise note the outstanding actions.

(Reference - Rolling Actions Log – May 2015 to December 2023, submitted)

## 11 Outcome of the Statutory Consultation Proposing to Establish a New Non-Denominational Secondary School in Kirkliston and Associated Catchment Changes

---

Details were provided out the outcomes of a statutory consultation proposing the establishment of a new non-denominational secondary school in Kirkliston.

### **Motion**

- 1) Agrees that a new non-denominational secondary school could be established on the site of the existing Kirkliston Leisure Centre.

However, Council requests that:

- 2) Other site options for a new non-denominational secondary school continue to be explored with further informal consultation carried out with the local communities as necessary.
- 3) A report to the Education, Children and Families Committee is prepared that further addresses the concerns which remain surrounding education provision and quality for a new non-denominational secondary school in Kirkliston.

- moved by Councillor Graham, seconded by Councillor Dalgleish

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) notes that 74% of people in Kirkliston who responded to the statutory consultation opposed the option of building a new secondary school on the site of the current leisure centre.
- 2) notes the response received from Education Scotland which also raised concerns over building a school on the proposed site.
- 3) notes that previous consultations have shown significant majorities in both Queensferry and Kirkliston against the alternative option of extending Queensferry High School.
- 4) notes the approach which was made to the Scottish Government and the letter received from the Minister for Planning of 16 November 2023 which has now been provided to all councillors.
- 5) therefore agrees not to proceed with officers' recommendations at this stage, and instead requests a report to Education, Children & Families Committee within two cycles which:
  - a) provides information on the indicative costs associated with building a school on any of the greenbelt sites shown in the November 2022

consultation paper given some landowners have expressed a willingness to sell land for the purpose of building a new secondary school, without any conditions associated with additional house building.

- b) sets out the implications of preparing and submitting a 'planning permission in principle' application on any of the greenbelt sites shown in the November 2022 consultation paper.
- 6) requests that ward councillors continue to be kept fully informed and engaged as work on the above report proceeds.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Younie

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To approve that a new non-denominational secondary school could be established on the site of the existing Kirkliston Leisure Centre and note that associated catchment changes would be needed prior to the new school opening.
- 2) To note that the delivery of a new non-denominational secondary on the site of the existing Kirkliston Leisure Centre was currently an unfunded pressure in the capital programme and will be subject to approval of a full business case by the appropriate executive committees.
- 3) To note that the business case to be developed would require to be considered alongside other feasible options to address capacity requirements in order to ensure best value had been fully considered in the decision-making process.

- moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

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

### **Voting**

The vote was taken by calling the roll.

The voting was as follows:

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

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Bandel, Booth, Bruce, Burgess, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalglish, Day, Daggart, Faccenda, Graham, Heap,

Jenkinson, Jones, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Mumford, Munro, O'Neill, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Rust, Staniforth, Walker, Watt and Whyte.

For Amendment 1: Lord Provost, Councillors Aston, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Caldwell, Campbell, Davidson, Dixon, Dobbin, Flannery, Gardiner, Glasgow, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, Osler, Ross, Thornley, Work and Younie.)

In the division, 29 members having voted for the Motion (as adjusted) and 29 members for Amendment 1, the Lord Provost gave his casting vote for Amendment 1.

### **Decision**

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Lang.

(Reference - Report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

### **Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Young made a non- financial declaration of interest as a parent affected by the proposals in the report and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

## **12 Outcome of the Statutory Consultation Process on the Proposal to Replace St Catherine's RC Primary School on the South Neighbourhood Office Site on Captain's Road**

---

Details were provided on the outcome of the statutory consultation undertaken regarding the proposed relocation of St Catherine's Roman Catholic (RC) Primary School to a new site on the South Neighbourhood Office site on Captain's Road.

### **Decision**

Approve the proposal to replace St Catherine's RC Primary School on the South Neighbourhood Office site on Captain's Road.

(Reference - Report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## **13 Outcome of the Statutory Consultation Proposing to Establish a New Non-denominational Primary School and Nursery Classes at Builyeon Road and Undertake Primary School Catchment Changes in Queensferry**

---

Details were provided on the outcome of statutory consultation undertaken the establishment of a new primary school at Builyeon Road in Queensferry to

accommodate the additional children expected from new homes and to relieve pressure from existing primary schools.

### **Motion**

- 1) To agree that the proposal to establish a new non-denominational primary school at Builyeon Road be progressed.
- 2) To agree the recommendation to adopt Option 1 in the report by the Executive Director of Place (the transferring of the Ferrymuir area and the west section of South Scotstoun to the new school's catchment area) as described in the statutory consultation paper.
- 3) To agree that a sibling guarantee be applied according to the terms set out in the report.

- moved by Councillor Graham, seconded by Councillor Dalglish

### **Amendment**

- 1) To agree that the proposal to establish a new non-denominational primary school at Builyeon Road be progressed.
- 2) To agree the recommendation to adopt Option 1 in the report by the Executive Director of Place (the transferring of the Ferrymuir area and the west section of South Scotstoun to the new school's catchment area) as described in the statutory consultation paper.
- 3) That a sibling guarantee be applied according to the terms set out in the report but with the removal of the six year time limit, to ensure younger children from families with multiple eligible children are not excluded.

- moved by Councillor Young, seconded by Councillor Davidson

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Graham:

- 1) To agree that the proposal to establish a new non-denominational primary school at Builyeon Road be progressed.
- 2) To agree the recommendation to adopt Option 1 in the report by the Executive Director of Place (the transferring of the Ferrymuir area and the west section of South Scotstoun to the new school's catchment area) as described in the statutory consultation paper.

- 3) To agree that a sibling guarantee be applied according to the terms set out in the report but with the removal of the six year time limit, to ensure younger children from families with multiple eligible children were not excluded.

(Reference - Report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## **14 Support and Advice for the Student Community – Motion by Councillor Parker**

---

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

“Council:

- 1) Celebrates Edinburgh’s history as a University city, noting that there are c.80,000 students in the city from a number of universities and colleges.
- 2) Notes that whilst students are not eligible to receive support from all aspects of Council services, there are some which they are eligible for support from, and some which are especially relevant to them – for example, applying for a Council Tax discount.
- 3) Notes that the Council does not currently produce any specific materials for the student community, despite the fact that students make up a significant percentage of the population.

Therefore, Council:

- 4) Agrees that Council officers should engage with Student Associations / Student Unions to co-produce targeted materials for its website, welcoming students to the city, outlining what support the Council can offer to them, addressing FAQs students might have about Council services, providing guidance about what rights students have (for example, in terms of employment or housing), and signposting to other relevant organisations.
- 5) Agrees that these materials will be cognisant of the needs of mature students, international students, student carers, student parents and disabled students in their focus and scope, and also include ideas about how students can be involved in their local community, including work and volunteering opportunities.”

### **Decision**

To note that the motion had been withdrawn.

## 15 Connected Communities - Impact of Funding Allocations – Motion by Councillor Kumar

---

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

- “1) Notes the decision taken at Education, Children, and Families Committee on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2023 to allocate funding for ‘Connected Communities’.
- 2) Regrets that decisions were made without appropriate understanding of the impact on organisations and resulting continuity of services.
- 3) Regrets that full committee papers were not available for public scrutiny and transparency due to conflicting advice.

Agrees to:

- 4) Complete an analysis of the impact of the above allocation including geographical and locality impact of the funding; impact on services due to the introduction of new strands; impact on new eligibility criteria.
- 5) Include a detailed explanation about what is / isn't confidential information to help increase transparency, accountability, and consistency of council and committee decisions.
- 6) Include a detailed explanation of what advice was given to council officers and the convener in relation to why the item was 'B Agenda', and why this was applied to this Connected Committees Grant report but hasn't been applied to any other third party grants reports including one at the Housing Homelessness and Fair Work committee two weeks earlier on 5<sup>th</sup> December.
- 7) Agrees to publish the full list of funded and non-funded organisations including how much was applied for and how much was awarded for each organisation.
- 8) Agrees to publish a geographical analysis of how much funding was received, as a percentage and as a cash figure:
  - By ward
  - By SIMD decile
- 9) Agrees to publish the explanation as to why both EVOG and LAYC did not have the same criteria applied to their funding awards as all other organisations.”

## **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Kumar.

- moved by Councillor Kumar, seconded by Councillor Campbell

## **Amendment 1**

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes Education, Children and Families Committee approved the recommendations for the award of the Connected Communities Grant Programme on 18 December 2023 and agreed a lessons learnt report to be produced and yearly progress reports to the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 2) Notes Elected Members agreed the eligibility criteria at Full Council on 28 September which included:
  - a) the separate managed fund under section 4.4, for intermediary organisations (LAYC and EVOC) to avoid them competing with direct delivery organisations;
  - b) Streamlining the funds into 3 existing Funding Strands from the previous 5 funding priorities;
- 3) Notes Education, Children and Families Committee members attended a briefing on 12 December 2023 where they were provided with:
  - a) graphs tables and pie charts showing geographical and locality impact in addition to comparisons to the current grant programme;
  - b) heat maps demonstrating where the new funding is going in comparison to the previous grant programme and shows a closer correlation to areas impacted by lower SIMD.
- 4) Acknowledges that the Children, Education and Justice Services directorate do not publish unsuccessful organisations applying to grant programmes, in line with other funding bodies and is also consistent with the process for contract awards.
- 5) Commends the partnership working between Council officers, LAYC and EVOC to develop the 2024-27 Connected Communities Grants Programme.”

- moved by Councillor Graham, seconded by Councillor Dalgleish

## **Amendment 2**

Council

Replaces points 2 and 3 of the motion by Councillor Kumar with:

"Welcomes the fact that a significant number of community-based organisations that were not funded in the previous iteration of the connected communities fund are now in receipt of council funding.

Notes that numerous organisations have contacted Education, Children and Families Committee members welcoming the approach that was taken this year.

Thanks, LAYC and EVOG for their work on the Connected Communities Fund and all they do to promote youth work and community development in the city."

Renumber accordingly.

- moved by Councillor Young, seconded by Councillor Thornley

## **Amendment 3**

Deletes all of the motion by Councillor Kumar and replaces with:

"Council notes:

- 1) The decision taken at Education, Children, and Families Committee on 18th December 2023 to allocate funding for 'Connected Communities'.
- 2) The decision to treat some information regarding allocations of funding to individual organisations as confidential and on a "B Agenda".

Council further notes:

- 3) An explanation about what is / isn't confidential information was provided verbally at a previous Committee meeting.
- 4) An explanation of what advice was given to council officers and the Convener in relation to why this item was placed on a 'B Agenda', was provided verbally at the Committee meeting.

Council understands:

- 5) The impact of the above allocation including geographical and locality impact of the funding; impact on services due to the introduction of new strands; impact on new eligibility criteria - will only be fully understood after time has been given for all the services to bed in.

Council agrees:

- 6) To publish the full list of funded and unfunded organisations.
- 7) That many organisations provide services stretching outside their local area, and some across the entire city, so analysis of how much funding was received by Ward or SIMD decile is unlikely to provide an accurate picture or be helpful in assessing benefits to individual communities.
- 8) To publish the explanation as to why both EVOC and LAYC did not have the same criteria applied to their funding awards as all other organisations.”

- moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), the Motion and Amendments 2 and 3 were adjusted and accepted as amendments to Amendment 1.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

|                               |   |          |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion                | - | 26 votes |
| For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) | - | 30 votes |
| Abstentions                   | - | 1        |

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

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

Abstentions: Councillor Faccenda.)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor Graham:

- 1) To note Education, Children and Families Committee had approved the recommendations for the award of the Connected Communities Grant Programme on 18 December 2023 and agreed a lessons learnt report to be produced and yearly progress reports to the Education, Children and Families Committee.

- 2) To agree to include in the lessons learned report the following from the motion:
  - a) a detailed explanation about what is / isn't confidential information to help increase transparency, accountability, and consistency of council and committee decisions.
  - b) a detailed explanation of what advice was given to council officers and the convener in relation to why the item was 'B Agenda', and why this was applied to this Connected Committees Grant report but hasn't been applied to any other third party grants reports including one at the Housing Homelessness and Fair Work Committee two weeks earlier on 5th December.
  - c) Agrees to publish the full list of funded organisations including how much was applied for and how much was awarded for each organisation.
  - d) the explanation as to why both EVOC and LAYC did not have the same criteria applied to their funding awards as all other organisations."
- 3) To note Elected Members agreed the eligibility criteria at Full Council on 28 September which included:
  - a) the separate managed fund under section 4.4, for intermediary organisations (LAYC and EVOC) to avoid them competing with direct delivery organisations;
  - b) Streamlining the funds into 3 existing Funding Strands from the previous 5 funding priorities.
- 4) To note Education, Children and Families Committee members attended a briefing on 12 December 2023 where they were provided with:
  - a) graphs tables and pie charts showing geographical and locality impact in addition to comparisons to the current grant programme;
  - b) heat maps demonstrating where the new funding is going in comparison to the previous grant programme and shows a closer correlation to areas impacted by lower SIMD.
- 5) To acknowledge that the Children, Education and Justice Services directorate did not publish unsuccessful organisations applying to grant programmes, in line with other funding bodies and was also consistent with the process for contract awards.

- 6) To commend the partnership working between Council officers, LAYC and EVOG to develop the 2024-27 Connected Communities Grants Programme.
- 7) To note the request for data analysis at paragraph (4) and (8) of the motion but that this should only come if the Impact Assessment Report (when published) prompted a need for further scrutiny.
- 8) To welcome the fact that a significant number of community-based organisations that were not funded in the previous iteration of the connected communities fund were now in receipt of council funding.
- 9) To note that numerous organisations had contacted Education, Children and Families Committee members welcoming the approach that was taken this year.
- 10) To thank, LAYC and EVOG for their work on the Connected Communities Fund and all they did to promote youth work and community development in the city.
- 11) To further note the decision to treat some information regarding allocations of funding to individual organisations as confidential and on a “B Agenda”.
- 12) To further note an explanation about what was / wasn’t confidential information was provided verbally at a previous Committee meeting.
- 13) To further note an explanation of what advice was given to council officers and the Convener in relation to why this item was placed on a ‘B Agenda’, was provided verbally at the Committee meeting.
- 14) To further note that many organisations provided services stretching outside their local area, and some across the entire city, so analysis of how much funding was received by Ward or SIMD decile was unlikely to provide an accurate picture or be helpful in assessing benefits to individual communities.

### **Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Caldwell made a non-financial declaration of interest as an as a member of the Pilmeny Development Project and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

Councillor Dagleish made a non- financial declaration of interest in the above item as a member of the Pilmeny Development Project.

Councillor Davidson made a non-financial declaration of interest as a member of Corstorphine Community Centre and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

Councillor Dobbin made a non-financial declaration of interest in the above item as a member of the Board of Spartans FC.

Councillor Faccenda made a non-financial declaration of interest in the above item as a member of the Board of Management of the Citadel Youth Centre.

Councillor McNeese-Mechan made a non-financial declaration of interest in the above item as a member of the Board of Multi Cultural Family Base.

Councillor Nols-McVey made a non-financial declaration of interest as a member of Board of Management of the Citadel Youth Centre and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

## **16 Edinburgh Eye Hospital – Motion by Councillor Davidson**

---

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

“Council Notes:

- 1) The Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion was designated as “Not Fit for Purpose” in 2014.
- 2) A replacement building was approved in 2018 which was then cancelled by the Scottish Government in 2020.
- 3) That despite the clear urgency of the situation no funding was provided for a new Edinburgh Eye Hospital in the recent Scottish Government budget.
- 4) The Scottish Government have informed health boards that no capital funding for new projects will be provided in the next two years.

Council believes:

- 5) That the failure to provide a new facility is having a severely detrimental effect on patients including increased cancellation of appointments and a severe shortage of outpatient facilities.
- 6) Edinburgh deserves a state-of-the-art Eye Hospital which is in an accessible location for patients travelling from across the City.
- 7) The decision by the Scottish Government to withhold capital funding for new projects not only endangers the Eye Hospital project but also brings into question plans for a new Cancer Centre at the Western General and an elective centre at St John’s Hospital.

Therefore, Council requests:

- 8) That the Council leader urgently writes to the Scottish Government requesting that funding is identified for a new Eye Hospital for Edinburgh and asking for clarity as to the status of other major NHS Lothian Capital Projects.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Davidson.

- moved by Councillor Davidson, seconded by Councillor Bennett

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To delete paragraph 7) in the motion by Councillor Davidson and replace with:

“The decision by the Scottish Government to withhold capital funding from NHS Lothian for two years not only endangers the Eye Hospital project but also a new National Treatment Centre at St John’s Hospital, a new Cancer Centre at the Western General Hospital, development of the Royal Edinburgh Hospital and investment in Edinburgh’s primary care General Practice premises.”

- 2) To delete paragraph 8) in the motion and replace with:

“That the Council leader urgently writes to the Scottish Government requesting that funding is provided, not only for a new Eye Hospital for Edinburgh, but that NHS Lothian receives the necessary funding to deliver all planned capital projects.”

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

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) Under ‘Council Notes’ in the motion by Councillor Davidson, adds after point 4.

“5) with concern that were the Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion in Edinburgh to close without being replaced with a new modern facility this would require patients to have to travel to Glasgow for eye assessments and operations, often in emergency circumstances and with conditions that would limit their ability to travel safely.

6) with further concern the additional expenditure costs and excessive travel time to Glasgow if this facility was not replaced within the Capital city.

7) that with more housing developments being planned throughout the city over the coming years, Edinburgh has the potential to overtake

Glasgow in as Scotland's most populated city, therefore maintaining an eye hospital here is absolutely imperative.

- 2) Renumber the remaining paragraphs accordingly then add after the renumbered point 10:

“11) That the Council Leader also asks the Scottish Government to indicate, should the Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion not be replaced:

- a) what impact assessment has been undertaken regarding the need for patients in Edinburgh and East of Scotland to have to travel to Glasgow for eye appointments and surgery.
- b) what impacts there would be for specialist training for eye surgery.
- c) what assessments Ministers have made on other Ophthalmology services and treatments.”

- moved by Councillor Bruce, seconded by Councillor Munro

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Davidson:

- 1) To note the Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion was designated as “Not Fit for Purpose” in 2014.
- 2) To note a replacement building was approved in 2018 which was then cancelled by the Scottish Government in 2020.
- 3) To note that despite the clear urgency of the situation no funding was provided for a new Edinburgh Eye Hospital in the recent Scottish Government budget.
- 4) To note the Scottish Government had informed health boards that no capital funding for new projects would be provided in the next two years.
- 5) To note with concern that were the Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion in Edinburgh to close without being replaced with a new modern facility this would require patients to have to travel to Glasgow for eye assessments and operations, often in emergency circumstances and with conditions that would limit their ability to travel safely.

- 6) To note with further concern the additional expenditure costs and excessive travel time to Glasgow if this facility was not replaced within the Capital city.
- 7) To note that with more housing developments being planned throughout the city over the coming years, Edinburgh had the potential to overtake Glasgow in as Scotland's most populated city, therefore maintaining an eye hospital here was absolutely imperative
- 8) To believe that the failure to provide a new facility was having a severely detrimental effect on patients including increased cancellation of appointments and a severe shortage of outpatient facilities.
- 9) To believe Edinburgh deserved a state-of-the-art Eye Hospital which was in an accessible location for patients travelling from across the City.
- 10) To believe the decision by the Scottish Government to withhold capital funding from NHS Lothian for two years not only endangered the Eye Hospital project but also a new National Treatment Centre at St John's Hospital, a new Cancer Centre at the Western General Hospital, development of the Royal Edinburgh Hospital and investment in Edinburgh's primary care General Practice premises.
- 11) To request that the Council leader urgently writes to the Scottish Government requesting that funding be provided, not only for a new Eye Hospital for Edinburgh, but that NHS Lothian receives the necessary funding to deliver all planned capital projects.
- 12) To request that the Council Leader also asks the Scottish Government to indicate, should the Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion not be replaced:
  - a) what impact assessment had been undertaken regarding the need for patients in Edinburgh and East of Scotland to have to travel to Glasgow for eye appointments and surgery.
  - b) what impacts there would be for specialist training for eye surgery.
  - c) what assessments Ministers had made on other Ophthalmology services and treatments.

## 17 Safe Consumption Room and Community Drug Checking Facilities – Motion by Councillor McKenzie

---

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

“Council –

Commends the work of Cllr Davidson and Cllr McFarlane in bringing forward these urgent issues in 2022.

Is reminded that there were 113 drug-related deaths in Edinburgh in 2022.

Notes that Council:

- agreed on 22 June 2022 “to work with partners in health and criminal justice to provide a report to the Policy & Sustainability Committee into the feasibility of supporting an official Overdose Prevention Centre trial in the City”
- requested on 15 December 2022 “a report to Policy & Sustainability Committee on the publication of findings from the study exploring the implementation of an Edinburgh Drug Checking Service at the earliest possibility.
- agreed on 28 September 2023 “to reaffirm the Council’s commitment in June 2022 to support the principle of a safe consumption room and community drug checking facilities for Edinburgh” and “to commit to support rapid action on the feasibility study”.

Regrets that rapid action has not been taken, and that the timeline for receipt of the feasibility study has been repeatedly extended.

Regrets that on the eventual completion of the feasibility study, it was not presented to the Policy & Sustainability Committee as agreed.

Agrees:

- 1) The feasibility study will be published in full on the Council’s website by the end of 9 February 2024.
- 2) A report containing the feasibility study and next steps will come to the next meeting of the Policy & Sustainability Committee on 12 March, allowing for public discussion and scrutiny.
- 3) The Council Leader will request an urgent meeting with the Minister for Drugs and Alcohol Policy to discuss the feasibility study and to identify funding sources.

- 4) The outcome of this meeting will be included in the report to the Policy & Sustainability Committee on 12 March.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor McKenzie.

- moved by Councillor McKenzie, seconded by Councillor Heap

### **Amendment**

Council

Adds in point 3) of the motion by Councillor McKenzie:

“including the health spokespeople or a nominated councillor from each party.”

- moved by Councillor Davidson, seconded by Councillor Bennett

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McKenzie:

- 1) To commend the work of Councillor Davidson and Councillor McFarlane in bringing forward these urgent issues in 2022.
- 2) To be reminded that there were 113 drug-related deaths in Edinburgh in 2022.
- 3) To note that Council:
  - a) agreed on 22 June 2022 “to work with partners in health and criminal justice to provide a report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee into the feasibility of supporting an official Overdose Prevention Centre trial in the City.”
  - b) requested on 15 December 2022 “a report to Policy and Sustainability Committee on the publication of findings from the study exploring the implementation of an Edinburgh Drug Checking Service at the earliest possibility.”
  - c) agreed on 28 September 2023 “to reaffirm the Council’s commitment in June 2022 to support the principle of a safe consumption room and community drug checking facilities for Edinburgh” and “to commit to support rapid action on the feasibility study”.

- 4) To regret that rapid action had not been taken, and that the timeline for receipt of the feasibility study had been repeatedly extended.
- 5) To regret that on the eventual completion of the feasibility study, it was not presented to the Policy and Sustainability Committee as agreed.
- 6) To agree the feasibility study would be published in full on the Council's website by the end of 9 February 2024.
- 7) To agree a report containing the feasibility study and next steps would come to the next meeting of the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 12 March, allowing for public discussion and scrutiny.
- 8) To agree the Council Leader would request an urgent meeting with the Minister for Drugs and Alcohol Policy and to include the health spokespeople or a nominated councillor from each party, to discuss the feasibility study and to identify funding sources.
- 9) To agree the outcome of this meeting would be included in the report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 12 March.

## **18 Scottish Government Funding – Motion by Councillor Lang**

---

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

“Council

- 1) Notes the analysis undertaken by council finance officers showing a £1.4 million shortfall arising from the failure of the Scottish Government to properly fund a 5% council tax freeze in Edinburgh.
- 2) Notes that same analysis has concluded Edinburgh's revenue grant from the Scottish Government is declining by £10 million.
- 3) Notes the announcement of the UK Government on 24 January of an additional £600 million for councils in England which the Scottish Parliament Information Centre has concluded will generate an additional £45 million to the Scottish Government in Barnett consequentials.
- 4) Endorses the position of COSLA that it is essential for the Scottish Government to pass all this additional funding to Scottish councils without any conditions on direction on how this money should be spent.
- 5) Agrees that the Council Leader should write to the First Minister to set out the position of the Council and seek urgent confirmation of the position of the

Scottish Government before the Council meets to set its budget on 22 February.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Ross

### **Amendment**

- 1) In point 1) of the motion by Councillor Lang, delete from "properly" and replace with "use funding assumptions specific to each council's circumstances with regard to Council Tax Reduction and collection rates, resulting in Edinburgh being offered freeze funding equivalent to around a 4.6% Council Tax increase rather than equivalent to a 5% increase as anticipated."
- 2) In point 2) of the motion, after "£10 million" insert "in notional terms, taking into account existing or new commitments, even though in cash terms the Local Government Circular 8/23 proposes £988.629m in grant funding for 2024-25 compared to £956.335m in 2023-24, an increase of £32.3m".

- moved by Councillor Biagi, seconded by Councillor Macinnes

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

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

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

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

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

## Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lang:

- 1) To note the analysis undertaken by council finance officers showing a £1.4 million shortfall arising from the failure of the Scottish Government to properly fund a 5% council tax freeze in Edinburgh.
- 2) To note that same analysis had concluded Edinburgh's revenue grant from the Scottish Government was declining by £10 million in notional terms, taking into account existing or new commitments,
- 3) To note the announcement of the UK Government on 24 January of an additional £600 million for councils in England which the Scottish Parliament Information Centre had concluded would generate an additional £45 million to the Scottish Government in Barnett consequentials.
- 4) To endorse the position of COSLA that it was essential for the Scottish Government to pass all this additional funding to Scottish councils without any conditions on direction on how this money should be spent.
- 5) To agree that the Council Leader should write to the First Minister to set out the position of the Council and seek urgent confirmation of the position of the Scottish Government before the Council met to set its budget on 22 February.

## 19 Edinburgh as a Fair Trade City – Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

---

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

“Council notes:

Edinburgh has held Fair Trade City Status since 2004, officially promoting and supporting fair trade and helping the city to work towards fair trade goals, including Fairtrade Fortnight, held annually.

Fair Trade is a movement to better prices, fair terms of trade and improved working conditions to farmers, producers, and workers in the developing world.

Fair Trade communities play a key role in raising awareness of the link between trade and poverty. Engaging with Fairtrade Fortnight helps protect people and planet, and buying Fairtrade products makes trade fairer for those in lower income countries.

Fair Trade supports trade justice and contributes towards climate justice.

Fairtrade Standards encourage producers to protect the environment by improving soil, planting trees, conserving water, and avoiding pesticides, whilst Fair Trade's climate academies help farmers share best practices and learn the latest agricultural methods to adapt to conditions.

Fair Trade Fortnight 2024 will take place from Monday 9th September – Sunday 22nd September, and marks the 30th birthday of the FAIRTRADE mark in the UK.

Council further notes that

The Edinburgh City Fair Trade Steering Group and Scottish Fair Trade Forum are bidding to bring a global Fair Trade Conference to Edinburgh in August 2025.

The conference theme is the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and the importance of Fair Trade as a central element in achieving many of these goals.

The conference will also highlight the importance of Edinburgh, where the International Fair Trade Charter was launched, as a Fair Trade City and Scotland as a Fair Trade Nation.

Council agrees:

To endorse and meaningfully support the bid to host the Global Fair Trade conference in Edinburgh in 2025, subject to an update in the Policy and Sustainability Committee business bulletin to highlight any costs that would be incurred;

To promote and participate in Fair Trade Fortnight 2024; and

Asks the Lord Provost to mark the 20th anniversary of Edinburgh achieving Fairtrade City Status in an appropriate manner.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron.

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

### **Amendment 1**

To add at the end of the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron:

“Agrees to add an update to the Policy and Sustainability business bulletin on progress in implementing the ‘Fair Trade Policy Statement’ of 2021 within three cycles.”

- moved by Councillor Beal, seconded by Councillor Bennett

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To insert as a new paragraph 4) in the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron:

“While Fair Trade plays a significant role in local communities, the greatest advances in improving incomes in lower income countries have been due to increasing global freetrade, providing opportunities that previously did not exist.”

- 2) To add to the end of the third last paragraph of the motion:

“Recognising the valuable work undertaken by Edinburgh International Conference Centre, by stepping in to run the Convention Bureau, which allows such events to take place in Edinburgh, whether at the EICC or elsewhere.”

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Whyte

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

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

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

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

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

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron:

- 1) To note Edinburgh had held Fair Trade City Status since 2004, officially promoting and supporting fair trade and helping the city to work towards fair trade goals, including Fairtrade Fortnight, held annually.

- 2) To note Fair Trade was a movement to better prices, fair terms of trade and improved working conditions to farmers, producers, and workers in the developing world.
- 3) To note Fair Trade communities played a key role in raising awareness of the link between trade and poverty. Engaging with Fairtrade Fortnight helped protect people and planet, and buying Fairtrade products made trade fairer for those in lower income countries.
- 4) To note Fair Trade supported trade justice and contributed towards climate justice.
- 5) To note Fairtrade Standards encouraged producers to protect the environment by improving soil, planting trees, conserving water, and avoiding pesticides, whilst Fair Trade's climate academies helped farmers share best practices and learn the latest agricultural methods to adapt to conditions.
- 6) To note Fair Trade Fortnight 2024 would take place from Monday 9th September – Sunday 22nd September, and mark the 30th birthday of the FAIRTRADE mark in the UK.
- 7) To further note the Edinburgh City Fair Trade Steering Group and Scottish Fair Trade Forum were bidding to bring a global Fair Trade Conference to Edinburgh in August 2025.
- 8) To further note the conference theme was the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and the importance of Fair Trade as a central element in achieving many of these goals.
- 9) To further note the conference would also highlight the importance of Edinburgh, where the International Fair Trade Charter was launched, as a Fair Trade City and Scotland as a Fair Trade Nation.
- 10) To agree to endorse and meaningfully support the bid to host the Global Fair Trade conference in Edinburgh in 2025, subject to an update in the Policy and Sustainability Committee business bulletin to highlight any costs that would be incurred, recognising the valuable work undertaken by Edinburgh International Conference Centre, by stepping in to run the Convention Bureau, which allowed such events to take place in Edinburgh, whether at the EICC or elsewhere.
- 11) To agree to promote and participate in Fair Trade Fortnight 2024.
- 12) To ask the Lord Provost to mark the 20th anniversary of Edinburgh achieving Fairtrade City Status in an appropriate manner.

- 13) To agree to add an update to the Policy and Sustainability business bulletin on progress in implementing the 'Fair Trade Policy Statement' of 2021 within three cycles.

## **20 Data Literacy Rollout – Motion by Councillor Younie**

---

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

“Council

- 1) Welcomes the upcoming rollout of data literacy training to CEC staff members and recognises the enormous benefit for the Council as a whole.
- 2) Commends the rollout due to the importance of offering additional training opportunities, especially in data literacy, to staff in the organisation.
- 3) Identifies the benefits which this could also bring to young people in education if they are offered the opportunity.
- 4) Requests:
  - a) Officers, while conducting the rollout to staff, take stock of what modules and learning could be provided to high school pupils.
  - b) Identifies what additional support high schools may need to provide these learning opportunities.
  - c) Identify whether it would be possible to offer this learning even more widely, in future, to the public.
  - d) Requests updates to Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee business bulletin on the progress of, and learning from, the rollout.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Younie.

- moved by Councillor Younie, seconded by Councillor Davidson

### **Amendment 1**

To add at paragraph 4 of the motion by Councillor Younie:

“(e) Asks that elected members be included in the rollout of Data Literacy Training.”

- moved by Councillor Graham, seconded by Councillor Day

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To insert at the end of paragraph 4(a) of the motion by Councillor Younie:  
  
“ and others, this to include how the Council could make learning modules publicly available through e-learning and/or recordings of in person/online learning sessions on the Council website.”
- 2) To amend after paragraph 4(a) of the motion:  
  
“(b) Identify which businesses provide support for data education for young people (and others).  
  
(c) Identify how such businesses, particularly in the FinTech sector, could partner with schools to provide such education in a way that requires minimal teacher time being diverted from other learning;
- 3) To insert in paragraph 4(d) of the motion:  
  
“six-monthly” between “Requests” and “updates”.

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Whyte

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

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Younie:

- 1) To welcome the upcoming rollout of data literacy training to CEC staff members and recognise the enormous benefit for the Council as a whole.
- 2) To commend the rollout due to the importance of offering additional training opportunities, especially in data literacy, to staff in the organisation.
- 3) To identify the benefits which this could also bring to young people in education if they were offered the opportunity.
- 4) To request that officers, while conducting the rollout to staff, take stock of what modules and learning could be provided to high school pupils and others, this to include how the Council could make learning modules publicly available through e-learning and/or recordings of in person/online learning sessions on the Council website.
- 5) To identify which businesses provided support for data education for young people (and others).

- 6) To identify how such businesses, particularly in the FinTech sector, could partner with schools to provide such education in a way that required minimal teacher time being diverted from other learning.
- 7) To request six-monthly updates to Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee business bulletin on the progress of, and learning from, the rollout.
- 8) To ask that elected members be included in the rollout of Data Literacy Training.

## **21 Bin Hubs Noise Mitigation – Motion by Councillor Mitchell**

---

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

“Council:

- 1) Regrets the detrimental impact on residents’ amenity caused by the bin hubs, and

Council therefore agrees:

- 2) adjustments and/or interventions should be urgently considered to mitigate against the noise generated by glass recycling bins,
- 3) noise mitigations for all bin lids should be considered as well,
- 4) and an update shall be provided to Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles via the Business Bulletin or as part of a Communal Bin Review report.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Mitchell.

- moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor Munro

### **Amendment 1**

Replace point 1 in the motion by Councillor Mitchell with:

- “1(a) Our city-wide communal bin review project is grouping together recycling and waste bins with the aim of improving recycling provision and waste collection reliability for around 130,000 of our residents.
- 1(b) The first phase of the project has been a great success, and has led to a massive drop (85%) in the number of overflowing mixed recycling bin reports to the Council.

1(c) Notes, however, this success has involved many residents having to compromise and a few having to accept unwanted changes to the areas around their homes which have left them feeling some amenity has been lost.”

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To delete paragraph 1) in the Motion by Councillor Mitchell and replace with:  
“1) Regrets the detrimental impact on some residents’ amenity caused by bin hubs, especially in instances where those residents maintain the bin hubs are sited inappropriately.”
- 2) To insert after paragraph 1) in the Motion:  
“2) Understands that more frequent collections were introduced to reduce instances of overflowing communal bins, but that some residents are adversely affected by the noise of consistent early-morning collections.”
- 3) To renumber the original paragraphs 2) and 3) in the motion.
- 4) Thereafter to insert in the Motion:  
“5) Officers should investigate whether routing demands can allow for emptying of bin hubs to start later in the morning, and/or whether routes can be amended, rotated or reversed so that the same residents’ bins are not always collected first and the early collections are distributed more equitably.”
- 5) To renumber original paragraph 4) accordingly.

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

### **Amendment 3**

To delete paragraph 1) in the Motion by Councillor Mitchell and replace with:

“Recognises the need to provide accessible waste and recycling services.”

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Parker

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

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

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted) - 22 votes  
For Amendment 3 (as adjusted) - 38 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Cowdy, Davidson, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Flannery, Jones, Lang, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 3 (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dalgleish, Day, Dixon, Dobbin, Faccenda, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Meagher, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Staniforth, Walker, Watt and Work.)

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 3 by Councillor Bandel:

- 1) To recognise the need to provide accessible waste and recycling services
- 2) To note the city-wide communal bin review project was grouping together recycling and waste bins with the aim of improving recycling provision and waste collection reliability for around 130,000 of residents.
- 3) To note the first phase of the project had been a great success, and had led to a massive drop (85%) in the number of overflowing mixed recycling bin reports to the Council.
- 4) To note, however, this success had involved many residents having to compromise and a few having to accept unwanted changes to the areas around their homes which had left them feeling some amenity has been lost.
- 5) To understand that more frequent collections were introduced to reduce instances of overflowing communal bins, but that some residents were adversely affected by the noise of consistent early-morning collections.
- 6) To ask officers to investigate whether routing demands could allow for emptying of bin hubs to start later in the morning, and/or whether routes could

be amended, rotated or reversed so that the same residents' bins were not always collected first and the early collections were distributed more equitably.

- 7) To agree that adjustments and/or interventions should be urgently considered to mitigate against the noise generated by glass recycling bins.
- 8) To agree that noise mitigations for all bin lids should be considered as well.
- 9) To agree that an update should be provided to Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles via the Business Bulletin or as part of a Communal Bin Review report.

## **22 Closure of Radical Road, Holyrood Park – Motion by Councillor Burgess**

---

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes the closure of the Radical Road, a Public Right of Way, in Holyrood Park by Historic Environment Scotland since 2018 stating health and safety reasons;
- 2) Notes that concerned residents have contacted councillors, a public meeting held and almost 4,000 signatures on a public petition gathered in a matter of weeks, calling for urgent re-opening;
- 3) Notes that ScotWays, Ramblers Scotland, The Edinburgh Geological Society, Mountaineering Scotland and The Cockburn Association support the re-opening;
- 4) Therefore requests that the Transport and Local Access Forum considers this matter at the earliest opportunity, including whether access rights under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 apply to Holyrood Park and what actions the Council and Scottish Government could take on the matter, and that it reports its findings to the Council’s Transport Environment Committee.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

## **Amendment**

To add at the end of the motion by Councillor Burgess:

“Council

- 5) Notes that the King’s Stables Road entrance to West Princes Street Gardens has been closed since 2019 due to the known risk of rockfall from the Castle rockface.
- 6) Notes that St Cuthbert’s Churchyard is now the interim and sole access route for delivery of event infrastructure for West Princes Street Gardens.
- 7) Notes that on 13 October 2022, in order to ensure health and safety and minimise the environmental risk to St. Cuthbert’s Churchyard, the Culture and Communities Committee agreed to limit major events at West Princes Street Gardens and the Ross Bandstand to four events each year while officers continued to pursue solutions to the rockfall with Historic Environment Scotland.
- 8) Notes that no solutions have yet been identified.
- 9) Requests that the matter of access at King’s Stable Road is also considered at the Transport and Local Access Forum at the earliest opportunity and these findings are also included in a report back to the Council’s Transport Environment Committee.”

- moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Dagleish

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

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Burgess:

- 1) To note the closure of the Radical Road, a Public Right of Way, in Holyrood Park by Historic Environment Scotland since 2018 stating health and safety reasons.
- 2) To note that concerned residents had contacted councillors, a public meeting held and almost 4,000 signatures on a public petition gathered in a matter of weeks, calling for urgent re-opening.
- 3) To note that ScotWays, Ramblers Scotland, The Edinburgh Geological Society, Mountaineering Scotland and The Cockburn Association supported the re-opening.

- 4) To therefore request that the Transport and Local Access Forum consider this matter at the earliest opportunity, including whether access rights under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 applied to Holyrood Park and what actions the Council and Scottish Government could take on the matter, and that it report its findings to the Council's Transport Environment Committee.
- 5) To note that the King's Stables Road entrance to West Princes Street Gardens had been closed since 2019 due to the known risk of rockfall from the Castle rockface.
- 6) To note that St Cuthbert's Churchyard was now the interim and sole access route for delivery of event infrastructure for West Princes Street Gardens.
- 7) To note that on 13 October 2022, in order to ensure health and safety and minimise the environmental risk to St. Cuthbert's Churchyard, the Culture and Communities Committee agreed to limit major events at West Princes Street Gardens and the Ross Bandstand to four events each year while officers continued to pursue solutions to the rockfall with Historic Environment Scotland.
- 8) To note that no solutions had yet been identified.
- 9) To request that the matter of access at King's Stable Road is also considered at the Transport and Local Access Forum at the earliest opportunity and these findings are also included in a report back to the Council's Transport Environment Committee.

## **23 Forth Green Freeport - Non-Domestic Rates Relief Funds – Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey**

---

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

“Notes the projected additional income to CEC from the retention of the uplift of Non-Domestic Rate associated with the Forth Green Freeport (FGFP).

Recognises that these are projections, and the projected level of income is not guaranteed, nonetheless agrees that any income should be spent on projects with a lasting value to the city.

Recognises that the Outline Business Case (OBC) states that the expectation is that the FGFP will create 50k jobs and notes that there is a skills shortage in Edinburgh, which has been exacerbated by the housing emergency.

Recognises that additional housing will be needed to provide homes for additional workers, and that acceleration of housing development at Granton Waterfront is a

key aspiration for the city and therefore a significant proportion of the additional resources should be used to support delivery of more social housing across the waterfront.

Further recognises that providing sustainable transport links will be crucial to unlocking the full development potential at Granton Waterfront.

Therefore agrees that Full Business Case (FBC) for the FGFP should set out the Council's intention to use the retained non domestic rates to support a business case for an extension of the Tram to Granton and accelerate the completion of the full northern loop (line 1C), linking between the Newhaven and Granton termini providing sustainable transport into the Freeport area. This should be aligned with investment in affordable housing to accelerate development of Granton Waterfront."

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey.

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

### **Amendment 1**

Council notes the text of the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey but considers it premature.

Notes that political Groups were consulted at the recent FGFP APOG and that a full report on the FGFP Final Business Case is to be presented to the Policy and Sustainability Committee in March when an officer assessment will be provided of indicated areas of future spend for any retained uplift in non-domestic rates realised by the Council. This is likely to give broad indicative headings, including public transport, in line with the feedback given by councillors of all Parties at the APOG.

Notes that this presents an opportunity to finance social-rent and affordable housing across the entirety of Edinburgh and requests the FGFP report to Policy and Sustainability Committee outlines a suite of options for Councillors, including how the projected receipts could have the greatest social-justice impact.

Notes that all five parties supported the declaration of a Housing Emergency in December 2023 and that Green Freeport legislation allows Housing expenditure under the heading "Regeneration and/or the development of 'live work play' assets within the Green Freeport Travel to Work Area".

Notes that the Council has declared a Climate Emergency and that the Council Climate Action Plan (2021) calls for greater coastal protections, which may be pertinent to north Edinburgh including the Granton Waterfront Housing development and the Green Freeport worksites.

Council agrees that the proper governance process is that Committee should consider this matter with full information available as part of consideration of the Final Business Case.

Deletes paragraph 6 of the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey and replaces with:

Notes that at the most recent FGFP Sounding Board, consideration was made to eligible areas of spend for non-domestic rates, based on guidance from the Scottish Government. Given this, officers set out proposals on how funding might be utilised, including; housing for workers, coastal infrastructure works, investment in the development of new workspaces, programmes aimed at addressing skills gaps and a community benefit fund.

Agrees the Final Business Case will be presented to the Policy and Sustainability Committee in March when an officer assessment will be provided of indicated areas of future spend for any retained uplift in non-domestic rates realised by the Council.”

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

## **Amendment 2**

1) Deletes all instances of “Forth Green Freeport” and replaces with “Forth ‘Green’ Freeport” in the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey

2) Adds to paragraph 2) of the motion:

“and expresses scepticism that this level of income will be realised as part of the Forth ‘Green’ Freeport.”

3) Adds to paragraph 3) of the Motion:

“and expresses scepticism that this number of jobs will be created as a result of the Forth ‘Green’ Freeport.”

4) Deletes the final paragraph of the Motion and replaces with:

“Therefore, agrees that Full Business Case (FBC) for the FGFP should enable the Council to use the retained non-domestic rates to support spending which drives forward council priorities including affordable housing, sustainable transport and responding to the climate and nature emergencies. Believes this should include the creation of a business case for an extension of the Tram to Granton and accelerate the completion of the full northern loop (line 1C), linking between the Newhaven and Granton termini providing sustainable

transport into the Freeport area. This should be aligned with investment in affordable housing to accelerate development of Granton Waterfront, as well as relevant climate mitigation, adaptation and nature strategies.”

- moved by Councillor Mumford, seconded by Councillor Parker

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

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

|                              |   |          |
|------------------------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion (as adjusted) | - | 26 votes |
| For Amendment 1              | - | 33 votes |
| Abstentions                  | - | 1        |

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

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

Abstentions: Councillor McKenzie.)

## **Decision**

To approve the following Amendment 1 by Councillor Day:

- 1) To note the following text of the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey but consider it premature:
  - a) To note the projected additional income to CEC from the retention of the uplift of Non-Domestic Rate associated with the Forth Green Freeport (FGFP).
  - b) To recognise that these were projections, and the projected level of income was not guaranteed, nonetheless to agree that any income should be spent on projects with a lasting value to the city.
  - c) To recognise that the Outline Business Case (OBC) stated that the expectation was that the FGFP would create 50k jobs and note that

there was a skills shortage in Edinburgh, which had been exacerbated by the housing emergency.

- d) To recognise that additional housing would be needed to provide homes for additional workers, and that acceleration of housing development at Granton Waterfront was a key aspiration for the city and therefore a significant proportion of the additional resources should be used to support delivery of more social housing across the waterfront.
  - e) To further recognise that providing sustainable transport links would be crucial to unlocking the full development potential at Granton Waterfront.
- 2) To note that political Groups were consulted at the recent FGFP APOG and that a full report on the FGFP Final Business Case was to be presented to the Policy and Sustainability Committee in March when an officer assessment would be provided of indicated areas of future spend for any retained uplift in non-domestic rates realised by the Council. This was likely to give broad indicative headings, including public transport, inline with the feedback given by councillors of all Parties at the APOG.
  - 3) To note that this presented an opportunity to finance social-rent and affordable housing across the entirety of Edinburgh and request the FGFP report to Policy and Sustainability Committee outline a suite of options for Councillors, including how the projected receipts could have the greatest social-justice impact.
  - 4) To note that all five parties supported the declaration of a Housing Emergency in December 2023 and that Green Freeport legislation allowed Housing expenditure under the heading “Regeneration and/or the development of ‘live work play’ assets within the Green Freeport Travel to Work Area”.
  - 5) To note that the Council had declared a Climate Emergency and that the Council Climate Action Plan (2021) called for greater coastal protections, which might be pertinent to north Edinburgh including the Granton Waterfront Housing development and the Green Freeport worksites.
  - 6) To agree that the proper governance process was that Committee should consider this matter with full information available as part of consideration of the Final Business Case.
  - 7) To note that at the most recent FGFP Sounding Board, consideration was made to eligible areas of spend for non-domestic rates, based on guidance from the Scottish Government. Given this, officers set out proposals on how funding might be utilised, including; housing for workers, coastal infrastructure

works, investment in the development of new workspaces, programmes aimed at addressing skills gaps and a community benefit fund.

- 8) To agree the Final Business Case would be presented to the Policy and Sustainability Committee in March when an officer assessment would be provided of indicated areas of future spend for any retained uplift in non-domestic rates realised by the Council.

## **24 Transient Visitor Levy (Tourist Tax) Community Work – Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey**

---

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

- “1) Notes the TVL legislative process continues to progress with an expectation of implementation and revenue generation by 2026.
- 2) Notes the Council’s latest consultation on the details of Edinburgh’s plans has now closed and a report with the findings will be presented in due course.
- 3) Notes there are a number of proposals in the consultation which are about managing tourism in the city better, investing in infrastructure, culture and supporting industry to meet better standards of works conditions alongside other improvements for the benefit of the city.
- 4) However, Council also notes the importance of ensuring the revenue delivers for tangible benefits for residents across entire city.
- 5) Council therefore agrees that when the consultation responses are reported to committee, this includes developed proposals to allocate significant resource, with broad parameters for spending across communities and established governance principles and procedures for doing so. These options should include but not be limited to:
  - a) a minimum of percentage of the total revenue each year from the TVL to be ring-fenced and shared across every Council-run school’s Parent Council. This would allocate budgets for local projects and initiatives to allow Parent Councils to invest in facilities within and outwith the school and take measures to close the attainment gap. This funding would be given to each Parent Council with distribution weighted towards schools with higher catchment of SIMD 1-4 and highest levels of free school meal entitlements.
  - b) a minimum of percentage of the total revenue each year from the TVL to be ring-fenced and shared across the entire City to increase budgets for Community Grants funds to allow communities to invest in their local

priorities. This funding would be allocated across every locality and neighbourhood, with allocations weighted towards neighbourhoods with the highest levels of SIMD 1-4.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey.

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor McNeese-Mechan

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To delete from paragraph 2 of the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey and replace with:
  - “2) that the proposed spending purpose suggested in the motion appears not to comply with the purposes allowed for allocating spending within the draft Bill on a Transient Visitor Levy being submitted to the Scottish Parliament by SNP Scottish Government Ministers;
  - 3) that the Council has submitted a response to the consultation on the Bill, following debate and a division, within the last six months;
  - 4) that proper governance processes would mean that any spending decisions, should funds be generated, would be a matter for the Budget process or Committee reports at the point the funds become available and would require to be within the allowable purposes determined should any Bill be enacted”
- 2) Add as an addendum to the above:
  - “5) Agrees that Council should have the maximum flexibility in allocating any revenue generated from the Transient Visitor Levy, as was agreed in the Council submission to the consultation process of the draft Bill on the transient Visitor Levy.”
  - 6) agrees the Leader of the Council should write to the Minister for Local Government, Planning and Community Empowerment, and other relevant opposition party spokespeople in the Scottish Parliament, to ask for the Bill to be amended at either Stage 2 or 3 in order to remove this restriction on how the money would be spent.”

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Lang

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) At paragraph 2) of the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey, deletes “consultation” and replaces with “engagement survey”

2) Deletes paragraphs 3) and 4) of the Motion and replaces with:

“3) Notes there are a number of proposals in the survey which are about managing tourism in the city better, and that these are informed by the recommendations around broad categories for TVL spending which were approved at Policy & Sustainability committee in August 2023, though regrets that these include proposed spending on “Industry Growth and Resilience” and “Promotion and Marketing” despite there being a clear need to ensure that any additional revenue raised from TVL delivers tangible benefits for residents across the city in support of the wider visitor economy and not just to further inflate the tourism industry.”

Adds (new) 4)

“4) Notes that the engagement on TVL to date represents “informal engagement” as outlined in the report at Policy & Sustainability committee in August 2023, and Business Bulletin update at the meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2024, and that a formal consultation on TVL spending will follow later this year, informed by the engagement work to date.”

3) Deletes paragraph 5) of the Motion and replaces with:

“5) Council therefore agrees that when feedback from the survey is reported to committee, that report should also include developed proposals around mechanisms for spending TVL revenue in such a way to ensure spending across the city with a weighting towards areas with the highest levels of SIMD 1-4, and that these options should include ideas for Community Grants processes, including via participatory budgeting models, and other mechanisms such as directing spending through Parent Councils and Community Councils.”

- moved by Councillor Parker, seconded by Councillor Rae

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

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

|                              |   |          |
|------------------------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion (as adjusted) | - | 17 votes |
| For Amendment 1              | - | 33 votes |
| For Amendment 2              | - | 9 votes  |
| Abstentions                  | - | 1        |

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

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

For Amendment 2: Councillors Bandel, Booth, Burgess, Heap, Mumford, O'Neill, Parker, Rae and Staniforth.

Abstentions: Councillor McKenzie.)

## **Decision**

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Day as follows:

- 1) To note the TVL legislative process continued to progress with an expectation of implementation and revenue generation by 2026.
- 2) To note that the proposed spending purpose suggested in the motion appeared not to comply with the purposes allowed for allocating spending within the draft Bill on a Transient Visitor Levy being submitted to the Scottish Parliament by SNP Scottish Government Minister.
- 3) To note that the Council had submitted a response to the consultation on the Bill, following debate and a division, within the last six months.
- 4) To note that proper governance processes would mean that any spending decisions, should funds be generated, would be a matter for the Budget process or Committee reports at the point the funds became available and would require to be within the allowable purposes determined should any Bill be enacted.
- 5) To agree that Council should have the maximum flexibility in allocating any revenue generated from the Transient Visitor Levy, as was agreed in the Council submission to the consultation process of the draft Bill on the transient Visitor Levy.
- 6) To agree the Leader of the Council should write to the Minister for Local Government, Planning and Community Empowerment, and other relevant opposition party spokespeople in the Scottish Parliament, to ask for the Bill to be amended at either Stage 2 or 3 in order to remove this restriction on how the money would be spent.

## 25 Water of Leith Basins Water Quality – Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey

---

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

- “1) Council notes ongoing concerns around water quality in the Water of Leith basins, River Almond, and Figgate Burn basins.
- 2) Council calls on the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and on Environmental Standards Scotland to carry out monitoring of water quality and report this data to the Council.
- 3) Council requests a report within 3 cycles including any information obtained through environmental agencies or obtainable by the Council’s own services to test for sewage bacteria in the Water of Leith basins, River Almond, and Figgate Burn basins.

This report should outline:

- a) the outcome of bacterial testing in the Water of Leith basins, River Almond, and Figgate Burn basins, with current contamination levels
- b) whether the sewage-contaminated silt constitutes illegal deposition of sewage solids under Scottish Water's CAR licence.
- c) how a timeline can be established for ongoing water quality monitoring and testing for CSO discharges.
- d) what enforcement action can be taken against Scottish Water if they are found to have failed to comply with the CAR licence terms.

Further agrees the report includes information on the Council’s complaints process regarding statutory nuisance using legal frameworks proactively to address community concerns and the investigatory process following complaints from the community.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey.

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor McNeese-Mechan

## **Amendment 1**

To add at the end of paragraph (1) of the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey:

“Council further notes with concern that Surfers Against Sewage have identified high levels of dangerous bacteria in the Figgate Burn, causing contamination to a popular beach and swimming destination. Surfers Against Sewage have also claimed that there is no reporting of contamination caused by overflow pipes at beaches such as Portobello.”

- moved by Councillor Meagher, seconded by Councillor Jenkinson

## **Amendment 2**

1) To add new paragraph 2) to the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey:

“Notes the Council’s declaration of a Nature Emergency at its meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> February 2023, and the well-documented disbenefits for ecosystems and biodiversity of sewage in our waterways.”

2) To add a new paragraph 3) to the Motion:

“Also notes the inextricable link between Scotland’s sewage scandal and the climate emergency with extreme weather increasing the risk of sewage overflows, as seen in communities in Edinburgh.”

3) To renumbers accordingly.

4) To add under now paragraph 5) of the Motion:

e) An update on the installation of various screens, chambers, pipeworks and monitors on 28 of Edinburgh’s CSOs earmarked in the ‘Improving Urban Waters Routemap’.

f) Any other relevant parallel activity from the Edinburgh & Lothians Strategic Drainage Partnership.

5) To add to the Motion:

“6) Requests the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee writes to the relevant Environment minister outlining support for a Clean Water Act, including upgrades to our Victorian sewage network and a clamp down on discharges, and with an ambition to ensure every CSO is monitored and a blue flag system which incentivises cleaner fresh water for all.”

- moved by Councillor Caldwell, seconded by Councillor Thornley

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

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey:

- 1) To note ongoing concerns around water quality in the Water of Leith basins, River Almond, and Figgate Burn basins.
- 2) To further note with concern that Surfers Against Sewage had identified high levels of dangerous bacteria in the Figgate Burn, causing contamination to a popular beach and swimming destination. Surfers Against Sewage had also claimed that there was no reporting of contamination caused by overflow pipes at beaches such as Portobello.
- 3) To note the Council's declaration of a Nature Emergency at its meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> February 2023, and the well-documented disbenefits for ecosystems and biodiversity of sewage in the waterways.
- 4) To also note the inextricable link between Scotland's sewage scandal and the climate emergency with extreme weather increasing the risk of sewage overflows, as seen in communities in Edinburgh.
- 5) To call on the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and on Environmental Standards Scotland to carry out monitoring of water quality and report this data to the Council.
- 6) To request a report within 3 cycles including any information obtained through environmental agencies or obtainable by the Council's own services to test for sewage bacteria in the Water of Leith basins, River Almond, and Figgate Burn basins.

This report should outline:

- a) the outcome of bacterial testing in the Water of Leith basins, River Almond, and Figgate Burn basins, with current contamination levels
- b) whether the sewage-contaminated silt constitutes illegal deposition of sewage solids under Scottish Water's CAR licence.
- c) how a timeline can be established for ongoing water quality monitoring and testing for CSO discharges.
- d) what enforcement action can be taken against Scottish Water if they are found to have failed to comply with the CAR licence terms.

- e) an update on the installation of various screens, chambers, pipeworks and monitors on 28 of Edinburgh's CSOs earmarked in the 'Improving Urban Waters Routemap'.
  - f) any other relevant parallel activity from the Edinburgh & Lothians Strategic Drainage Partnership
- 7) To further agree the report include information on the Council's complaints process regarding statutory nuisance using legal frameworks proactively to address community concerns and the investigatory process following complaints from the community.
- 8) To request the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee write to the relevant Environment minister outlining support for a Clean Water Act, including upgrades to the Victorian sewage network and a clamp down on discharges, and with an ambition to ensure every CSO was monitored and a blue flag system which incentivised cleaner fresh water for all.

## **26 Building Risk at Anchorfield – Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey**

---

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

- "1) Council notes with concern that residents were forced to Leave their homes at Anchorfield following safety fears for the building.
- 2) Council notes with disappointment that despite initial notification of the issues to the Council on 3<sup>rd</sup> December and with the Council writing to all residents on 13<sup>th</sup> December advising them that the Council would engage a Framework Contractor in order to make safe the building, Residents were instructed to leave their properties with one hour's notice on 22<sup>nd</sup> January.
- 3) Further notes the ongoing perimeter of the building has resulted in road closures and traffic chaos, just months after the road reopened following construction works.
- 4) Requests a report within one cycle to the Finance and Resources Committee, which will be referred to the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee outlining:
  - a) All information held on the extent of damage to the building.
  - b) All information held on the potential causes of damage to the building.

- c) All information held on engagement with Trams to Newhaven in order to identify if the construction of the tram line has resulted in the building becoming unstable.
  - d) The end-to-end timeline which identified the damage including all communication with residents and business.
  - e) An expected date for residents and businesses having full use of their properties and plans for traffic management during any works.
- 5) Further requests that this report includes details of insurance cover of the tram project, all cases settled and all cases outstanding awaiting settlement of residents' claims against the Council/Tram project for damage done to property."

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey.

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

### **Amendment 1**

To delete all from paragraph 2) of the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey and replace with:

"Council notes the extensive engagement that was done with residents to ensure public safety, after a structural report was provided to officers by owners who were trying to progress works privately.

Understands a Residents Meeting was held on 1<sup>st</sup> February, at Leith Library to discuss the current position, the next steps and to answer questions from Residents.

Council would like to thank the residents for their cooperation at this difficult time and agrees that the Council Leader arrange a community meeting to speak through any concerns with residents and local members, and that an update is provided in the report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee."

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Jenkinson

### **Amendment 2**

1) After paragraph 2) of the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey, insert:

- "3) Understands that a structural engineer has been appointed by the insurers of the Trams to Newhaven project and they are awaiting confirmation of when they can access the building. Officers have been

working closely with Edinburgh Shared Repairs Service, residents, ward councillors and local businesses to progress matters.

- 2) Deletes paragraph 3) of the Motion,
- 3) Renumbers accordingly.
- 4) In the new paragraph 4), delete c) and reorder accordingly.
- 5) In the new paragraph 5) [the final paragraph], delete all and replace with:  
  
“5) Further requests that this report respects the Owner Controlled Insurance Policy (OCIP) in place for the Trams to Newhaven Project and notes that there is a separate claims process established by the project through which all claims are determined.”

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

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

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

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

|                               |   |          |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion (as adjusted)  | - | 26 votes |
| For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) | - | 33 votes |

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

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

## Decision

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor Day:

- 1) To note with concern that residents were forced to Leave their homes at Anchorfield following safety fears for the building.
- 2) To note the extensive engagement that was done with residents to ensure public safety, after a structural report was provided to officers by owners who were trying to progress works privately.
- 2) To understand that a Residents Meeting was held on 1<sup>st</sup> February, at Leith Library to discuss the current position, the next steps and to answer questions from Residents.
- 3) To thank the residents for their cooperation at this difficult time and agree that the Council Leader arrange a community meeting to speak through any concerns with residents and local members, and that an update be provided in the report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee.
- 4) To understand that a structural engineer had been appointed by the insurers of the Trams to Newhaven project and they were awaiting confirmation of when they could access the building. Officers had been working closely with Edinburgh Shared Repairs Service, residents, ward councillors and local businesses to progress matters.
- 5) To request a report within one cycle to the Finance and Resources Committee, which would be referred to the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee outlining:
  - a) All information held on the extent of damage to the building.
  - b) All information held on the potential causes of damage to the building.
  - c) The end-to-end timeline which identified the damage including all communication with residents and business.
  - d) An expected date for residents and businesses having full use of their properties and plans for traffic management during any works.
- 6) To further request that this report respects the Owner Controlled Insurance Policy (OCIP) in place for the Trams to Newhaven Project and notes that there was a separate claims process established by the project through which all claims were determined.

## 27 Enhanced Support Bases – Motions by Councillors Mumford and Davidson

---

The Lord Provost ruled that the following items, 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 motions by Councillors Mumford and Davidson were submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

### a) By Councillor Mumford

“Council:

- 1) Expresses concern about recent press reports regarding young people whose applications to Enhanced Support Bases have been refused and the impact this may have on young people with additional support needs and their families;
- 2) Welcomes initial reassurances from Senior Council Officers that ESB provision has not been stopped;
- 3) Requests an urgent briefing note to confirm this and clarify the situation regarding ESB provision going forward, including details of communication with providers and parents, and any relevant financial information about funding of ESB provision, ahead of the 14<sup>th</sup> February budget motion deadline.”

### b) By Councillor Davidson

“Council believes:

- 1) That children and young people with additional support needs have a right to the same educational opportunities as all other children and young people.
- 2) That in line with Getting it Right for Every Child Principles educational provision for young people with additional support needs should reflect their individual requirements whether that be in mainstream or alternative settings.
- 3) Education Support Bases are an invaluable part of educational landscape which allow children and young people with additional support needs to receive tailored support in many subjects whilst taking advantage of many of the opportunities that mainstream provisions can offer them.

- 4) Families of children with additional support needs often face additional challenges during the transition period between primary school and high school and when there is significant anxiety amongst this community of parents the local authority has a duty to provide reassurance.

Council notes:

- 5) Concerns expressed to elected members from a significant number of parents about the provision of additional support needs education in the city.
- 6) A significant number of parents received official rejection letters following the 30<sup>th</sup> January deadline for full council motions and following the last meeting of Education, Children and Families Committee.”

## **Motion**

The following composite motion was submitted:

“Council believes:

- 1) That children and young people with additional support needs have a right to the same educational opportunities as all other children and young people.
- 2) That in line with Getting it Right for Every Child Principles educational provision for young people with additional support needs should reflect their individual requirements whether that be in mainstream or alternative settings.
- 3) Enhanced Support Bases are an invaluable part of educational landscape which allow children and young people with additional support needs to receive tailored support in many subjects whilst taking advantage of many of the opportunities that mainstream provisions can offer them.
- 4) Families of children with additional support needs often face additional challenges during the transition period between primary school and high school and when there is significant anxiety amongst this community of parents the local authority has a duty to provide reassurance.

Council notes:

- 5) Concerns expressed to elected members from a significant number of parents about the provision of additional support needs education in the city.
- 6) A significant number of parents received official rejection letters following the 30<sup>th</sup> January deadline for full council motions and following the last meeting of Education, Children and Families Committee.

- 7) Senior Council Officers have confirmed to elected members that ESB provision has not been stopped but there has not yet been public confirmation of this.
- 8) Full council is not meeting again until the 21st March and Education, Children and Families Committee is not meeting again until the 16th April. Leaving families in a state of significant anxiety for a long period of time.

Therefore council agrees:

- 9) That an urgent communication plan needs to be executed in order to reassure families of children with ASN that Enhanced Support Bases are being retained.
- 10) That an updated briefing note containing further information including details of communication with providers and parents, and any relevant financial information about funding of ESB provision be circulated ahead of the 14th February budget motion deadline.
- 11) An urgent briefing is held within the next week for Education, Children and Families Committee members and other relevant members including finance leads updating them on the ASN review and the current situation regarding placement applications for children with additional support needs.
- 12) An update report is provided to the next Education, Children and Families Committee on the status of the Additional Support Needs Review. This should include a comparison of the number and outcome of applications to enhanced supports bases and other alternative provisions between this year and last.
- 13) Officers will make urgent contact with families rejected for ESBs or other alternative provisions to discuss their concerns.”

- moved by Councillor Davidson, seconded by Councillor Burgess

### **Amendment**

To add to the composite motion as moved by Councillor Davidson:

“Agrees that the update report on the status of the Additional Support Needs Review, should also include a detailed breakdown of the provision and support provided currently at Education Support Bases, and a comparison of what will be provided in the new Education Support Provision that will be available in all schools. This should include:

- The number of hours within the school day that each child currently is/will be able to access support from staff.

- The number of hours within the school day that each child currently is/will be able to access a safe and supportive space.
- Details of how additional safe, supported space will be provided within existing school footprints
- The ratio of staff support to the number of children supported.
- Whether staff supporting the ESP will be additional, specialist trained staff or contained within existing school staffing levels
- Details of guarantees for children and young people in ESB that this will continue through their senior phase including entitlement to ESP
- Whether there will be PSA staff available to support children and young people during lunchtime and break periods.
- Details of the equalities impact assessment into this change.
- Details of the funding that will be available to support this change including current budget and planned budget for next year.
- Confirmation that there will be no cap on places available.
- Information about availability or any other changes to Secondary Resource Provision.”

- moved by Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Kumar

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted composite motion by Councillor Davidson:

- 1) To believe that children and young people with additional support needs had a right to the same educational opportunities as all other children and young people.
- 2) To believe that in line with Getting it Right for Every Child Principles educational provision for young people with additional support needs should reflect their individual requirements whether that be in mainstream or alternative settings.
- 3) To believe enhanced Support Bases were an invaluable part of educational landscape which allowed children and young people with additional support

needs to receive tailored support in many subjects whilst taking advantage of many of the opportunities that mainstream provisions could offer them.

- 4) To believe families of children with additional support needs often faced additional challenges during the transition period between primary school and high school and when there was significant anxiety amongst this community of parents the local authority had a duty to provide reassurance.
- 5) To note concerns expressed to elected members from a significant number of parents about the provision of additional support needs education in the city.
- 6) To note a significant number of parents received official rejection letters following the 30th January deadline for full council motions and following the last meeting of Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 7) To note Senior Council Officers had confirmed to elected members that ESB provision had not been stopped but there had not yet been public confirmation of this.
- 8) To note Full council was not meeting again until the 21st March and Education, Children and Families Committee was not meeting again until the 16th April. Leaving families in a state of significant anxiety for a long period of time.
- 9) To agree that an urgent communication plan needed to be executed in order to reassure families of children with ASN that Enhanced Support Bases were being retained.
- 10) To agree that an updated briefing note containing further information including details of communication with providers and parents, and any relevant financial information about funding of ESB provision be circulated ahead of the 14th February budget motion deadline.
- 11) To agree an urgent briefing be held within the next week for Education, Children and Families Committee members and other relevant members including finance leads updating them on the ASN review and the current situation regarding placement applications for children with additional support needs.
- 12) To agree an update report be provided to the next Education, Children and Families Committee on the status of the Additional Support Needs Review. This should include a comparison of the number and outcome of applications to enhanced supports bases and other alternative provisions between this year and last.
- 13) To agree officers would make urgent contact with families rejected for ESBs or other alternative provisions to discuss their concerns.

- 14) To agree that the update report on the status of the Additional Support Needs Review, should also include a detailed breakdown of the provision and support provided currently at Education Support Bases, and a comparison of what would be provided in the new Education Support Provision that would be available in all schools. This should include:
- The number of hours within the school day that each child currently is/will be able to access support from staff.
  - The number of hours within the school day that each child currently is/will be able to access a safe and supportive space.
  - Details of how additional safe, supported space will be provided within existing school footprints
  - The ratio of staff support to the number of children supported.
  - Whether staff supporting the ESP will be additional, specialist trained staff or contained within existing school staffing levels
  - Details of guarantees for children and young people in ESB that this will continue through their senior phase including entitlement to ESP
  - Whether there will be PSA staff available to support children and young people during lunchtime and break periods.
  - Details of the equalities impact assessment into this change.
  - Details of the funding that will be available to support this change including current budget and planned budget for next year.
  - Confirmation that there will be no cap on places available.
  - Information about availability or any other changes to Secondary Resource Provision.

## **28 150th Anniversary of the Heart of Midlothian Football Club – Motion by Councillor Fullerton**

---

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

“Council notes that 2024 is the 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Heart of Midlothian Football Club.

Hearts took their name from the Old Tolbooth (tax house) of Edinburgh that stood just across the road from the City Chambers here in the High Street which was

known as the very heart of Midlothian. The Club's history is fascinating - from when 16 players took off their boots to join McCrae's Battalion in 1914 to 1922 when the Club's War Memorial at Haymarket was unveiled before a crowd of 35,000. Today the Club, along with their Charity Big Hearts, reach out to over 9,000 people each year. They help combat social isolation, boost physical and mental health and bring community resources together to offer children and adults free opportunities to help them live a safe and fulfilling life. 'The Kinship Care' programme provides valuable advice and peer support to children and their carers as does the 'Football and Edinburgh Memories' which tackles dementia amongst older people. That's just a taste of how Hearts can change lives.

Council asks that the Lord Provost mark this significant 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary in an appropriate way."

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

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Fullerton.

## **29 Centenary of the Edinburgh Gilbert and Sullivan Society – Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron**

---

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

"Council notes that the Edinburgh Gilbert and Sullivan Society is celebrating its Centenary this year. Celebrations include the hosting of a Centenary Ceilidh with the Edinburgh Branch of the Royal Scottish Country Dance Society at the Laurieston Hall on Saturday 24<sup>th</sup> February.

Founded in December 1924 as an appreciation society, the Edinburgh Gilbert and Sullivan Society (EDGAS) began annual public performances in 1946. EDGAS also perform concerts ranging from orchestral singalongs of the operas to smaller concert party visits to a variety of venues, such as churches and nursing homes.

For more than 20 years EDGAS has been invited by Seafarers UK Scotland to sing in its annual Usher Hall concert with the Band of HM Royal Marines.

Council congratulates EDGAS on its Centenary year and asks the Lord Provost to mark this important milestone in an appropriate way."

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

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron.

## 30 Edinburgh's Hogmanay – Motion by Councillor Walker

---

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

“Council

- 1) Celebrates the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Edinburgh's Hogmanay tradition and the successful four-day programme of live music, world-famous Street Party, fireworks, and free family events which together hosted 95,000 people.
- 2) Welcomes the much-anticipated return of the Torchlight Procession after a 4-year absence, with 20,000 participants creating a 'river of fire' through the Old Town.
- 3) Commends the £57,500 in donations raised from ticket and torch sales at the Torchlight Procession which will go towards projects tackling homelessness in Edinburgh.
- 4) Appreciates the curated approach to utilising venues across the city, especially council-owned venues such as the Assembly Rooms and Ross Bandstand, to present a flexible programme of free events across a range of genres, the First Footing events, which attracted over 18,000 people on 1<sup>st</sup> January, being a particular highlight.
- 5) Hopes that further Council venues can open their doors for next year's programme, including venues across the city.
- 6) Thanks Council officers and staff, the organisers, the talented performers, the emergency services and all the partners, contractors and suppliers for their energy, time, and commitment which resulted in an outstanding four-day programme.
- 7) Asks the Lord Provost to recognise this achievement in an appropriate manner.”

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

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Walker.

### **31 Boroughmuir Rugby Football Club Under 18s – Motion by Councillor Cowdy**

---

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

“Council notes the impressive win by Boroughmuir Rugby Football Club, U18, Boys team against Stirling County at the National Youth Cup Final held at the Scottish Gas Murrayfield on 17<sup>th</sup> December and that the 36-17 victory won the club its 4<sup>th</sup> consecutive U18 National Youth Cup.

Council further notes the club also won the conference for all ages, U15 -18, so were recently declared Scottish National 1 Club Champions for 2023/24.

Council recognises the beneficial impact of team sports within communities across Edinburgh and that the efforts of Boroughmuir Rugby Football Club in promoting its “one club, one culture, one community” ethos are a great asset to the city.

Council therefore asks the Lord Provost to convey congratulations to the U18 team for their Cup win, and to all the teams for their wonderful achievement in Conference, and appreciation to the club for consistently providing a positive environment in which team sports can thrive.”

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

#### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Cowdy.

#### **Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Cowdy made a transparency statement in the above item as a coach of the Boroughmuir under 18's rugby team.

### **32 Questions**

---

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

### **33 Proposed Acquisition of Completed Homes Across Edinburgh - referral from the Finance and Resources Committee**

---

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 Paragraphs 6, 8 and 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the acquisition of 199 new homes at various locations in Edinburgh upon completion, to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of the funding package.

### **Decision**

To approve the funding package for the acquisition of 199 new homes at various locations in Edinburgh upon completion, as detailed in the report by the Executive Director of Place.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee of 25 January 2024 (item 32: referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

## **34 Contract Award - Social Care Operating System - referral from the Finance and Resources Committee**

---

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 Paragraphs 8 and 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the Contract Award for the Social Care Operating System to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of prudential borrowing.

### **Decision**

To approve the prudential borrowing as detailed in the report by the Executive Director of Place.

(References: Finance and Resources Committee of 25 January 2024 (item 33: referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

## Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 32 of 8 February 2024)

### QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024

#### Question

Please provide detailed drawings for the central site at Picardy Place which show:

- a) Width and slope of all pedestrian and cycle paths
- b) Design of planned tactile paving or other means to segregate these spaces.
- c) Planned surface treatment of all cycle paths and pedestrian areas
- d) Planned signage and surface marking to provide information and warnings to cyclists and pedestrians
- e) Location and design of all junction and crossing points where pedestrians and cyclists will be interacting with each other and with other traffic on the boundaries of this site.
- f) Location of all other fixed features including lamp posts and hostile vehicle bollards in relation to the designated pedestrian areas and cycle paths

#### Answer

The drawings requested were placed online in November 2023: <http://tinyurl.com/23w5kbsb>

They may also be accessed via the internal intranet: [https://edinburghcouncil-my.sharepoint.com/:f/g/personal/9054858\\_edinburgh\\_gov\\_uk/EuqxqsoalLRJuznQu82ilvgBoPN8nluMqNa3TjZ6w9dXeQ?e=LprOL9](https://edinburghcouncil-my.sharepoint.com/:f/g/personal/9054858_edinburgh_gov_uk/EuqxqsoalLRJuznQu82ilvgBoPN8nluMqNa3TjZ6w9dXeQ?e=LprOL9)

## QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor McFarlane for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

### **Question**

To ask for an update on the Council's work to form a network of cleanliness champions as reported in the April 2023 Street Cleansing Performance Report.

### **Answer**

Whilst a definitive list of groups which the Council works with has not yet been created, officers work closely with all Friends of Parks groups, The Water of Leith Conservation Trust, Keep Porty Tidy, other resident groups, and individuals that come forward on an ad hoc basis.

Kits are provided on request. For one off requests, the kits are provided on the basis that they should be returned once the activity is complete. Where repeat requests are received, a kit will be provided to keep. The Council will restock kits when required.

From 1 January 2023 – 31 December 2023, 276 requests for clean up kits for litter picks were received. The table below provides a summary of the requests by location.

Details on how to request a kit are here:

<https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/springclean>

### QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor McFarlane for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

With regard to manholes and utility covers installed as part of the Trams to Newhaven Project:

**Question** (1) How many defects have been identified?

**Answer** (1) 15 project defects raised and of these 15, 11 have been corrected.

**Question** (2) Why have so many covers installed alongside TTN works failed causing significant noise issues for residents and poor pedestrian / cycle experience?

**Answer** (2) Of the chamber covers installed, only a small percentage have failed with the majority of these being repaired already. Noisy covers do not necessarily mean a defect and work is ongoing to identify any issues and to rectify these in due course.

**Question** (3) Will these defect repairs be undertaken as part of the TTN snagging list and what is the timescale for repair?

**Answer** (3) The outstanding 4 defects will be repaired, however any chambers owned by 3<sup>rd</sup> party utility companies will need to be rectified by them

**Supplementary Question** Thanks to the TEC Convener for his answer. Can I just ask, he's stated that noisy covers do not necessarily mean a defect, so can he just expand on what exactly he means by that, because I think the residents up and down Leith Walk would absolutely consider that a defect, thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

So I would tend to agree with Councillor McFarlane, and I have to say I was, I wasn't expecting to get this far in agenda, so we tend to agree with, and I was also hoping my questions weren't going to be first, I tend to agree, I think part of the issue we have on Leith Walk is that the way that the street's been laid out is, normally manholes would be in the centre of the carriageway, but now they're in the line of the wheel track and I think that's what's exacerbating what might've been a less noticeable problem, but that's a fair question and I'll get an answer back to you about that, thank you.

## QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Macinnes for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) Can the Convener indicate clearly who is responsible for the failure to provide specific budget proposals to allow political groups to pursue revenue raising and savings options instead of the proposals brought forward by the council administration to cut school budgets by £8.2m a year by the end of this Council term?

**Answer** (1) As part of the budget development process, the corporate leadership team, collectively agree based on the revenue framework budget gap, targets for each directorate to put forward budget proposals to executive committee as agreed by members to address the budget gap on a sustainable basis. This process has been followed and where proposals have been rejected, alternatives to a balanced budget have been put forward, resulting in the need for no further proposals for 24/25.

**Question** (2) Can they indicate why the £14m additional Scottish Government funding for Education appears not to be being applied in full but instead is being used to create this £8.2m funding cut to our schools?

**Answer** (2) The £14.4m of additional funding relates to the costs arising from the teachers pay agreement covering the period April 2022 to July 2024. This additional funding will be applied in full to the Education budget to match the additional costs arising from the 28-month pay agreement.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you, a brief supplementary. I wonder if the Convener can elaborate a little bit on the answer and see whether or not she thinks that this process has been an acceptable one around the budget or whether or not she believes that there need to be considerable lessons learned and changes made.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I thank Councillor Macinnes for the question. I absolutely think that this has been an acceptable process that was subject to review last year after them not liking that one, officers have worked incredibly hard on this, you know they got the council tax freeze bombshell dropped on them as we were heading up to our November report where they're expected to put forward their initial proposals. So suddenly everything changed at the last minute, I think they've done a really good job adapting to that, now of course, of course, there's always improvements that can be made, there's always more, that can be done and they have heard at Finance, at both Finance and Resources Committees, that officers are more than happy to take that away and to help design for future going forward that they would also like to take consultation about the medium term financial plan, I think that the response from officers for this year and for the coming years, proposals for coming years, have been absolutely exemplary and so I would stand up for the process given the circumstances that were landed on them, absolutely.

**QUESTION NO 5**

**By Councillor McFarlane for answer  
by the Convener of the Planning  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 8 February 2024**

To request an update on the situation at 107 - 115  
Fountainbridge concerning:

**Question** (1) When the decanted residents who have been out of their properties since the tragic explosion in 2019 might expect to be able to regain access to their properties?

**Answer** (1) When Completion Certificates under the Building (Scotland) Act 2003 have been accepted.

**Question** (2) What Building Standards matters are still outstanding or unresolved what is the Council doing to bring said matters to a speedy conclusion?

**Answer** (2) Further details of sound transmission between properties, where new floors have been constructed, are required. A structural report has been requested. Gas Safe and electrical certification has been sought.

**Question** (3) Why no Section 42 notice was provided to residents at the time of the Dangerous Building Notice?

**Answer** (3) The building was evacuated by emergency services at the time (Police / Fire Service). There is no requirement to issue a Section 42 notice in circumstances where the occupants are not in the building.

**Question** (4) Despite the Dangerous Buildings Notice stating that no building warrant was required, why are additional standards now being applied before the residents can re-enter their properties?

**Answer** (4) There is no requirement for a building warrant where works are carried out under a dangerous buildings notice. Where works are not carried out in accordance with the notice, a warrant may be required for these. The notice required that the floor be reinstated. The sound testing indicates that the floor construction is not performing as well as a floor construction that would be expected in a traditional tenement and therefore has not been reinstated in a manner that is acceptable. A warrant may not be required if adequate sound test information can be provided.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you to the Planning Convener for their answer, just for the public record, if they can reiterate that they do, they will offer that support to the residents who are looking to get back into their properties as soon as possible and the support of officers, thank you.

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you, Councillor Macfarlane, yes, yes, I can guarantee that, I know in between getting the report residents back into their home, Councillors, particularly in the city centre, will be keen to hear progress, that's why I've asked members of building standards, to start providing regular updates to city centre Councillors on that and will do everything I can in my capacity to make sure these residents get back into the properties as soon as possible. Thank you, Lord Provost.

**QUESTION NO 6**

**By Councillor McKenzie for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

*Referring to Historic Child Abuse Claims as referred to in  
Item 7.7 at the Finance and Resources Committee of 3  
March 2022*

**Question** (1) How many survivors of abuse whilst in the care of Edinburgh Council have claimed for redress or compensation?

**Answer** (1) Since the introduction of the Limitation Bill (Scotland) Act 2017, the Council has received a total of 71 civil litigation claims.

Some of the claims received may be on behalf of former Council structures (e.g. the City of Edinburgh Council is the successor Authority to the former Lothian Regional Council and former Edinburgh District Council) with varying levels of insurance coverage.

The national redress scheme for Scotland provides redress as part of the overall Cosla contribution and not specifically Edinburgh. The most recent report in relation to costs and awards is via this link: [Redress Scotland publishes 2022-23 annual report and accounts – Redress Scotland](#),

**Question** (2) How many survivors have had their claim settled with Edinburgh Council?

**Answer** (2) 13 civil litigation claims have been settled, the remaining ones are either closed or going through the claims process.

We cannot comment on Redress cases however the link above may provide some information on the Cosla settlement(s).

**Question** (3) What is the total cost of such claims settled (including insurance settlements)?

**Answer** (3) £2,197,618.01 including insurance settlements (i.e. not through Redress Scotland).

- Question** (4) What is the estimated number of children who suffered abuse in Edinburgh's Council's care?
- Answer** (4) We are unable to provide an estimate at this stage.
- Question** (5) What is the estimated compensation and redress costs of settling the outstanding claims?
- Answer** (5) We are unable to provide an estimate of costs at this stage for ongoing cases.
- Question** (6) What have been the legal costs (internal and external) incurred in settling these claims to date?
- Answer** (6) £1,230,735.55 (including insurance settlements).
- Supplementary Question** Thank you, Lord Provost. This answer, we've got 13 civic litigations settled out of 71 suggesting that 58 claims are either closed that outstanding, what's the exposure to the Council and is this addressed in our committed reserves?
- Supplementary Answer** So I would say that that's quite a detailed question, I wouldn't answer that straight off the top of my head, I think we'll need to refer that to officers and ask them to put out an answer in writing, thank you.

## QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor McKenzie for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

*In relation to abuse allegations in Edinburgh's Council's  
Secure Units (including St Katherine's and elsewhere).*

**Question** (1) How many survivors of alleged abuse whilst in the care of Edinburgh Council's Secure Facilities have claimed for redress or compensation?

**Answer** (1) Since the introduction of the Limitation Bill (Scotland) Act 2017, the Council has received a total of 10 civil litigation claims in relation to Edinburgh Secure Services (ESS).

Some of the claims received may be on behalf of former Council structures (eg the City of Edinburgh Council is the successor Authority to the former Lothian Regional Council and former Edinburgh District Council) with varying levels of insurance coverage.

The national redress scheme for Scotland provides redress as part of the overall Cosla contribution and not specifically Edinburgh. The most recent report in relation to costs and awards is via this link: [Redress Scotland publishes 2022-23 annual report and accounts – Redress Scotland](#),

**Question** (2) How many survivors have had their claim settled with Edinburgh Council?

**Answer** (2) The number of claims settled is low and cannot be provided as it may identify individuals.

**Question** (3) What is the total cost of such claims settled (including insurance settlements)?

**Answer** (3) We are unable to provide this information as the number of claims which have been settled is low and provision of figures may lead to individuals being identified.

**Question** (4) What is the estimated number of children who suffered alleged abuse in Edinburgh's Council's Secure Facilities?

**Answer** (4) We are unable to provide an estimate at this stage.

- Question** (5) What is the estimated compensation and redress costs of settling the outstanding claims?
- Answer** (5) We are unable to provide an estimate of costs at this stage for ongoing cases.
- Question** (6) What have been the legal costs (internal and external) incurred in settling these claims to date?
- Answer** (6) £131,178.24
- Supplementary Question** The same question actually in this case, there are 10 claims, we don't know how many actually have been settled, it's not shown in the answer so again the question is what's the exposure and is this committed in reserves?
- Supplementary Answer** Thank you Lord Provost and I would give a similar answer to Councillor McKenzie as to the similar question that he asked previously and refer it to officers for him to get an answer as best as they can at this stage on that, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 8**

**By Councillor McKenzie for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

*In relation to the alleged abuse by Sean Bell and redress  
and compensation schemes agreed by the Council.*

**Question** (1) How many survivors of alleged abuse by Senior Manager Sean Bell have claimed for redress or compensation?

**Answer** (1) Since the introduction of the Council's Redress Scheme until its closure, the Council has received a total of seven claims.

**Question** (2) How many survivors have had their claim settled with Edinburgh Council?

**Answer** (2) Four claims have been settled; the remaining ones are closed.

**Question** (3) What is the total cost of such claims settled (including insurance settlements)?

**Answer** (3) The total cost is £461,250.00. The Council met these costs in full, without settlement contributions from insurance providers.

**Question** (4) What is the estimated number of people who suffered alleged abuse by Sean Bell?

**Answer** (4) Reference is made to the publicly available Report to Full Council which was made on 28 October 2021 and contains at appendix 1 full details of the investigation that was conducted and the evidence that was provided by the witnesses. It is very difficult to estimate numbers but to provide as much information as possible reference is made to section 5.2.2 in that report that refers to allegations made by 'three different women' and 'several other women' who have suffered some form of abuse.

**Question** (5) What is the estimated compensation and redress costs of settling the outstanding claims?

**Answer** (5) The Redress Scheme ran from 5 September 2022 until 4 March 2023 and is now closed. It is therefore not anticipated that there will be further costs to settle outstanding claims.

**Question** (6) What have been the legal costs (internal and external) incurred in settling these claims to date?

**Answer** (6) The total external legal costs were £64,980.60. Internal legal costs concerning the redress scheme are included with other costs associated with the earlier independent inquiry and finance resource will require to be assigned to provide an accurate figure concerning internal costs.

**Supplementary Question** So the answer on this one states that 4 cases have been settled out of 7, 3 have been closed, so the question is to ask the reasons for the closures of those three cases.

**Supplementary Answer** Happy to answer Councillor McKenzie's question, I will refer that to officers, the reasons that they have been closed may be individual to people that have made the claims, in which case we would absolutely not be disclosing anything, but I'll leave that with officers to make absolutely sure that any answer given is appropriate, thank you.

## QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor McKenzie for answer  
by the Convener of the Education,  
Children and Families Committee at a  
meeting of the Council on 8 February  
2024**

### **Question**

How many allegations of abuse or safeguarding failures relating to children have been reported directly or otherwise to Edinburgh Council since January 2013?

### **Answer**

Legislation requires a multi-agency learning review (previously known as a significant case review) to take place when a child has died or has sustained significant harm or risk of significant harm.

When one or more of the following apply:

- abuse or neglect is known or suspected to be a factor in the child's death or the sustaining of or risk of significant harm
- the child is on, or has been on, the Child Protection Register or was a care experienced child (i.e. looked after or receiving aftercare or continuing care from the local authority). This is regardless of whether abuse or neglect is known or suspected to be a factor in the child's death or sustaining of significant harm, unless it is absolutely clear to the Child Protection Committee that the child having been on the CPR or being care experienced has no bearing on the case.
- the child's death is by suicide, alleged murder, culpable homicide, reckless conduct, or act of violence.

Details of numbers that have taken place since 2013:

|      | ICR (Inter-agency Referral) | SCR (Significant Case Review) | LR (Learning Review) |
|------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| 2013 | 0                           | 0                             | N/A                  |
| 2014 | 2                           | 0                             | N/A                  |
| 2015 | 2                           | 1                             | N/A                  |
| 2016 | 2                           | 0                             | N/A                  |
| 2017 | 5                           | 1                             | N/A                  |
| 2018 | 1                           | 1                             | N/A                  |
| 2019 | 3                           | 0                             | N/A                  |
| 2020 | 1                           | 0                             | N/A                  |
| 2021 | 1                           | 0                             | N/A                  |
| 2022 | 1                           | 0                             | N/A                  |
| 2023 | N/A                         | N/A                           | 2                    |

**Supplementary Question**

So the list that's given in answer to this question is a list of serious case reviews, but that isn't the question that was asked, so I would just in this case, just ask if the Convener could return to the question and answer it rather than providing a table of serious case reviews, thanks.

**Supplementary Answer**

I will relay that information to the Convener as soon as she returns to work, thank you.

## QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Parker for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) What specific outputs / outcomes / resources resulted from the Thriving Greenspace study?

**Answer** (1) The primary outcome is the [Thriving Greenspaces 2050 Strategy](#) (which was presented to Culture and Communities Committee in 2023).

Following this, the Edinburgh Nature Network has been created, with over 200 nature network actions illustrated on the online Edinburgh Nature Network (ENN) storymap [Edinburgh Nature Network \(arcgis.com\)](#). This is split across the city, highlighting a range of actions identified to improve biodiversity and increase connectivity through stepping stone habitats across 7 habitats and 7 ecosystem services.

The data informing these opportunities and actions was derived from information held by partner organisations and gathered through workshops with 30 different organisations, including SWT and the University of Edinburgh.

Several of these actions involve HRA land, discussions are on-going to focus on HRA land as part of ENN delivery.

The first ENN pilot project in Leith, funded by greenspace scotland's 'Nature in Parks' grant programme, took place last year. The locations selected for the Leith pilot were based on ENN actions to improve habitat connectivity and considered spaces with low biodiversity and considered existing user groups, accessibility and visitation of these spaces. This resulted in new proposals for parks which were co-designed with the local community and would result in net gains of biodiversity for each location.

The pilot is tied in with the Cables Wynd housing project, where native bulb planting will form part of the project. Native species selection also forms part of the Coatfield Lane project and there are on-going discussions to support housing projects to consider ecological interventions.

Council officers work closely with The Conservation Volunteers (TCV) (this work has been half funded by the Council and half by NatureScot). This has furthered community engagement in conservation initiatives, informed by the ENN and includes creating five new meadows this year alongside other initiatives including orchard planting.

- Question** (2) What is the total area of greenspace managed by the Council, and what proportion of that is Housing Revenue Account (HRA) land?
- Answer** (2) Total area of greenspace is 2,146 hectares of which 550 (26%) is associated with HRA.
- Question** (3) In total, how many projects resulting from the Thriving Greenspaces study have been completed or are planned on HRA land?
- Answer** (3) This is difficult to quantify as HRA land can occur in between connections with other types of land which means any land in between (HRA or otherwise) will benefit from biodiversity increases and other ecosystem services.
- There are currently close to 1,000 Living Landscape features across the city, many of which exist on HRA land. The data, however, does not differentiate some of this land between different Council designations. A map is being developed to address this
- Question** (4) Parks and Greenspace staff maintain HRA land. What proportion of the Parks & Greenspace total annual budget comes from the HRA to maintain HRA greenspace?
- Answer** (4) The Parks and Greenspace service has an annual forecast of £6.59m, of which £1.72m is charged to the HRA. This equates to approximately 26% of the total forecast.

**Question** (5) Does Parks and Greenspace apply the same or similar standards to monitor landscape quality of HRA land as they do for Parks and Greenspace land (e.g. Park Quality Assessment or Green Flag Award)?

**Answer** (5) The Parks and Greenspace operational maintenance standards apply to HRA land. Additionally, biodiversity and ecological requirements also apply to HRA development

**Question** (6) In line with a climate justice approach, the Edinburgh Nature Network / Thriving Greenspace project recognizes the need for ecosystem services to be prioritized in disadvantaged areas “where access to nature and quality greenspace will provide benefits to people that need it most”. What is the total number of interventions recommended across the city on the Nature Networks maps, and how many / what percentage of these are on HRA land?

**Answer** (6) At present, more than 200+ actions have been identified across the city across the Nature Network maps. For the reasons described in Q3, the extent to which HRA land is affected by connectivity actions is difficult to quantify.

Many of the Council’s interventions have occurred in disadvantaged areas and this was one of the reasons Leith was selected as the pilot to deliver a number of ENN actions. Low SIMD is also part of the inclusion criteria for ENN expansion in our current bid application to support the delivery and upscaling of the Linking Leith’s Parks project.

Now that it has been developed, the delivery of the ENN is relatively recent, so the focus was initially on parks. However, the focus is now moving towards other types of land, including HRA.

Council officers are working to ensure that any new interventions and features have longevity and remain in a condition which benefits biodiversity for years to come. For this reason, estate-wide operational change of management and training arrangements are being progressed for parks and greenspace maintenance teams.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Yeah, thank you so just looking at question 5 in particular, it does say that the same operational maintenance standards apply to HRA land and the same biodiversity and ecological requirements apply to HRA development, which is good, but part of the question was also about the monitoring of those, so the question, the follow-up is, is the monitoring of HRA land the same as that of parks and green space and where does that monitoring and evaluation sit within the Council's governance?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you, Councillor Parker, for your question and in broad terms, I really welcome the question because I've been out to look at some of the projects that have been listed in the appendix that's been provided to you and I've always been impressed by officers work in making sure not only that they're looking at the fabric of buildings but they're also looking at the environment in which we place those buildings. So I cannot at the moment respond specifically to your supplementary question, but I will certainly, certainly get that information to you just as soon as possible, but I would I do welcome your question because it celebrates the work that is done, so thank you.

**QUESTION NO 11**

**By Councillor Parker for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) For the past 5 years, what has been the annual spend of the Neighbourhood Environment Programme under the HRA?

**Answer**

(1)

| <b>Year</b>                          | <b>Expenditure</b> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 2023/24 – Forecast Spend to 31 March | £2.3m              |
| 2023/23                              | £3.499.9m          |
| 2021/22                              | £0.907m            |
| 2020/21                              | £0.274.6m          |
| 2019/20                              | £2.354.2m          |

**Question**

(2) For the past 5 years, please can the Convener provide a list of individual projects delivered by the HRA Neighbourhood Environment Programme which includes:

- a) Project address
- b) Description of project goals and resulting outputs
- c) Area covered (m<sup>2</sup>)
- d) Capital cost
- e) Year installed
- f) Photographs of resulting landscapes (where available)
- g) Amount of land converted from greenspace to hard standing (m<sup>2</sup>)
- h) Amount of land converted from hard standing to greenspace (m<sup>2</sup>)

- j) Amount of land converted to high biodiversity / natural planting (m<sup>2</sup>).
- k) Details of resident involvement in design process

In cases where larger projects contain substantial sub-projects, please provide breakdown information

**Answer**

- (2)** A summary of the projects completed in the last five years is attached in Appendix 1.

Details of the area covered (m<sup>2</sup>), amount of land converted from greenspace to hard standing (m<sup>2</sup>), the amount of land converted from hard standing to greenspace (m<sup>2</sup>), and the amount of land converted to high biodiversity / natural planting (m<sup>2</sup>). is not held.

Photographs are not held for all projects. However if there are particular projects of interest, please let the Head of Housing Operations know and any photographs available will be provided.

Until financial year 2020/21, Locality Housing officers carried out community consultation for each of the schemes. Since 2021/22, Locality Housing Officers carry out consultation for projects with an estimated value of up to £20,000. Projects valued more than £20,000 are progressed through Lot 6 on of the Professional services framework, with consultation carried out for each project.

**Question**

- (3)** What KPIs are attached to the HRA Neighbourhood Environment Programme and do any of these relate to climate mitigation, climate adaptation, or nature / biodiversity?

**Answer**

- (3)** Neighbourhood Environment Programme (NEPs) schemes are currently built in line with RIBA standard forms and timelines of development. At each stage of a project's RIBA development, the Council's Landscape Architects, Engineers and project managers must make sure that all the relevant design, building standards and environmental standards are built into each aspect of the project. On every project, officers strive to achieve a biodiversity net gain, but this is dependent on the scope and perimeters of a project, and what the residents want.

**Question** (4) What standards are in place to evaluate the quality of landscapes delivered through the HRA Neighbourhood Environment Programme (e.g. the Park Quality Assessment or Green Flag Award used for Parks & Greenspace land)

**Answer** (4) NEPs schemes are currently built in line with RIBA standard forms and timelines of development. At each stage of a project's RIBA development, the Council's Landscape Architects, Engineers and project managers must make sure that all the relevant design, building standards and environmental standards are built into each aspect of the project.

The standards for each project are assessed and developed during the RIBA standard form of development. If the project is to be delivered within a parkland and is to be delivered to the green flag standard, this will be captured and built into the designs at concept and final design stages of the RIBA development.

During construction, the Council's Estate Improvement Programme Quantity Surveyor ensures quality assurance on project completion by undertaking site inspections on all completed projects. Sign off takes into account final costs, materials, specification, timescale and quality of finish.

**Question** (5) What are the current arrangements for community / resident involvement in deciding what HRA Neighbourhood Environment Programme projects are taken forward in each area?

**Answer** (5) Traditionally Neighbourhood Networks, Community Council's or other community forums have been used to present project proposals and design/estimate costs approved against investment criteria. Where Neighbourhood Networks or other community forums are not in operation within a ward/locality, project proposals, design and estimates would be presented to Ward Councillors by the relevant Housing Team Leader to seek approval.

**Question** (6) What are the current governance arrangements around the HRA Neighbourhood Environment Programme, and when is the programme due for retendering?

**Answer** (6) NEPs forms part of the Housing and Property Framework, (Lot 16). There are currently 7 contractors that sit on the Framework. All works are tendered (unless the works are deemed an emergency and are under £10,000 (at which time the works will be awarded directly to the 1<sup>st</sup> contractor on the framework)), with all 7 contractors invited to tender through the quick quote process on Public Contracts Scotland. The current Housing and Property Framework ends in November 2024 at which time the new framework will be tendered.

**Question** (7) What is the mechanism to update / introduce new KPIs to the HRA Neighbourhood Environment Programme and when could this happen?

**Answer** (7) Any new KPI's must be presented to the contractors at the tender stage of the framework. If additional KPI's are to be added to framework after award, there has to be universal agreement from all contractors on the framework and approval from the Council's procurement team.

**Supplementary Question** Yeah, thank you. So as part of question 2, I asked about land that gets converted from greenspace to hardstanding, land that was converted from hardstanding to green space and land converted to high biodiversity or natural planting, and it's confirmed that we don't hold data or information about that. Given the risks associated with urban creep and the general loss of green space we've seen across the city, do we know why that information isn't currently held and what can we do to ensure that it is held and monitored going forward?

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you Councillor Parker for your supplementary question and I suppose I refer to my previous answer in the in the broadest sort of terms, and I agree that that is something that we do need to monitor, and I'm sure you'll support me in making sure that we have some sort of mechanism that's enables us to provide that sort of information, because the environment that people live in is important to them as human beings, but of course it's also important for bio and nature diversity, so I very much welcome your question, thank you.

| HOUSING AND PROPERTY EXTERNAL FRAMEWORK (LOT 16) 2020 to 2024 (NEP's) |                                                                                                                                                    |            |                       |                   |           |            |                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|----------------|
| HP number                                                             | Project Name                                                                                                                                       | Locality   | CONTRACTOR            |                   | Work type | Start Date | Nett           |
| 567a                                                                  | Dumbiedykes External Access upgrade Project 2021 - Design                                                                                          | South East | AHR Architects        | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 20/08/2021 | £ 89,100.00    |
| 567b                                                                  | Dumbiedykes External Access upgrade Project 2021                                                                                                   | South East | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 20/08/2021 | £ 1,049,480.22 |
| 568                                                                   | Stenhouse Bin Nest Installation project 2021                                                                                                       | South West | Maxi Construction Ltd | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 09/08/2021 | £ 154,083.29   |
| 569a                                                                  | Gracemount Civic Square Renovation Project 2021 final design                                                                                       | South East | Collective Architects | Completed         | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 30,000.00    |
| 569b                                                                  | Gracemount Civic Square Renovation Project 2021 - Delivery                                                                                         | South East | Maxi Construction Ltd | EIP's Delivery    | EIP/NEP   | 06/05/2022 | £ 415,343.63   |
| 569c                                                                  | Gracemount Civic Square Renovation Project 2021 - Mural Design and Delivery                                                                        | South East | Faithful and Gould    | Completed         | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 17,523.00    |
| 569d                                                                  | Gracemount Civic Square - New Lanterns for the new lighting columns - supplied and installed by Steve Francy Lighting Engineer - Internal transfer | South East | Internal Transfer     | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 06/05/2022 | £ 6,800.00     |
| 571a                                                                  | Laichfield Landscape Renovation 2021 - Design - DES-001-2020                                                                                       | South West | AHR Architects        | Completed         | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 30,995.00    |
| 571b                                                                  | Laichfield Landscape Renovation 2021 - Delivery                                                                                                    | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 05/04/2022 | £ 364,807.58   |
| 572a                                                                  | Northfield Drive and Grove Marketing Signage                                                                                                       | North East | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 13/08/2021 | £ 2,190.50     |
| 572b                                                                  | Northfield Drive and Grove Feasibility Study                                                                                                       | North East | Collective Architects | Completed         | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 21,381.75    |
| 572c                                                                  | Northfield Drive and Grove Final Design - SOC090                                                                                                   | North East | Thomas and Adamson    | EIP's Development | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 156,423.00   |
| 572d                                                                  | Northfield Drive and Grove - Delivery                                                                                                              | North East | P1 Solutions Limited  | EIP's Delivery    | EIP/NEP   | TBC        | £ 1,167,298.00 |
| 573                                                                   | 35 to 39 Ferry Road Drive - Rear Garden Upgrade Project 2021 - retender under new design                                                           | North West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 09/08/2022 | £ 55,892.14    |
| 575                                                                   | Carnegie Court - Double gate installation Project 2021                                                                                             | South East | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 20-Jul-21  | £ 3,568.00     |
| 581                                                                   | Calder Park - Foot Path Upgrade Project 2021                                                                                                       | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 08-Jun-21  | £ 77,836.57    |
| 582                                                                   | St Stephens Court Binstore Project 2021                                                                                                            | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 9,828.00     |
| 583                                                                   | Calder Place Sheltered Housing Project 2021                                                                                                        | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 09/08/2022 | £ 88,793.15    |
| 584                                                                   | Saughton Mains Sheltered Housing Project 2021                                                                                                      | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 09/08/2022 | £ 49,069.51    |
| 585                                                                   | Kingsknowe Place Sheltered Housing Project 2022 - Design - SOC212                                                                                  | South West | Atkins Limited        | Completed         | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 105,000.00   |
| 585                                                                   | Kingsknowe Place sheltered Housing Project 2023 delivery                                                                                           | South West | P1 Solutions Ltd      | EIP's Delivery    | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 21,808.87    |
| 586                                                                   | Hailesland Park - Resurfacing and Lighting Project 2021 - Design - SOC127                                                                          | South West | Atkins Limited        | EIP's Development | EIP/NEP   | 16/04/2023 | £ 28,000.00    |
| 588                                                                   | Westburn Phase 1 and 2 Community Space regeneration project 2021                                                                                   | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | TBC        | £ 77,864.48    |
| 589                                                                   | Calder Gardens Estate Improvements                                                                                                                 | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 22/06/2022 | £ 40,779.38    |
| 617                                                                   | NEPs Design 2021 - SOC083                                                                                                                          | Various    | Hirst Architects      | Completed         | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 38,345.50    |
| 622                                                                   | Temporary Signs advertising Community Consultation - Moredun Green Space                                                                           | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   |            | £ 1,350.00     |
| 628                                                                   | Ramp installation Moncrieff House Project 2021                                                                                                     | South East | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 15/10/2021 | £ 6,799.00     |
| 629                                                                   | Ramp installation Forteviot House Project 2021                                                                                                     | South East | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 15/10/2021 | £ 6,796.00     |
| 630                                                                   | Ramp installation Moredunvale House Project 2021                                                                                                   | South East | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP   | 15/10/2021 | £ 6,799.00     |

|        |                                                                                                                              |                |                      |                   |         |            |   |            |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------|------------|---|------------|
|        |                                                                                                                              |                |                      |                   |         |            |   |            |
|        |                                                                                                                              |                |                      |                   |         |            |   |            |
| 631    | Ramp installation Marytree House Project 2021                                                                                | South East     | P1 Solutions Limited | Completed         | EIP/NEP | 15/10/2021 | £ | 6,799.00   |
| 632    | Ramp installation CastleView House Project 2021                                                                              | South East     | P1 Solutions Limited | Completed         | EIP/NEP | 15/10/2021 | £ | 6,799.00   |
| 633    | Ramp installation Little France House Project 2021                                                                           | South East     | P1 Solutions Limited | Completed         | EIP/NEP | 15/10/2021 | £ | 6,799.00   |
| 636a   | Ratho Main Street Main Street - Rear garden and drying green upgrade project 2021 - Delivery                                 | South West     | P1 Solutions Limited | Completed         | EIP/NEP | TBC        | £ | 85,893.47  |
| 637a   | Ratho North Street - access to garages Upgrade Project 2021 - Works included in the returned price for HP0636                | South West     |                      | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            |   | 0%         |
| 636    | Ratho Main Street Main Street - Rear garden and drying green upgrade project 2021 - Design - SOC119                          | South West     | Atkins Limited       | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 9,750.00   |
| 637    | Ratho North Street - access to garages Upgrade Project 2021 - Design - SOC118                                                | South West     | Atkins Limited       | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 7,000.00   |
| 638    | Laverochbank Terraced Garden and Step Upgrade Project 2021                                                                   | North West     | P1 Solutions Limited | EIP's Delivery    | EIP/NEP | TBC        | £ | -          |
| 639    | West Pilton Grove Hard and Soft Landscaping Project 2021                                                                     | North West     | P1 Solutions Limited | Completed         | EIP/NEP | 09/08/2022 | £ | 22,590.38  |
| 640    | West Pilton Park Car Parking area Upgrade Project 2021                                                                       | North West     | P1 Solutions Limited | Completed         | EIP/NEP | 04/05/2022 | £ | 34,058.21  |
| 641    | Fortiovoit House - Street lighting Upgrade                                                                                   | South East     | CEC Street Lighting  | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            |   | 0%         |
| 642    | Moredun Multi's - Hard and Soft Landscaping - Design - SOC121                                                                | South East     | Atkins Limited       | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 59,750.00  |
| 642.01 | Moredun Multi's - Hard and Soft Landscaping - Drainage assessment                                                            | South East     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP | 04/05/2022 | £ | 250.00     |
| 642.02 | Moredun Multi's - Hard and Soft Landscaping - Delivery                                                                       | South East     | P1 Solutions         | EIP's Delivery    | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 858,702.98 |
| 643    | Moredun Multi's - Community Growing - Design - SOC122                                                                        | South East     | Atkins Limited       | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 9,000.00   |
| 643.01 | Moredun Multi's - Community Growing - Delivery - See HP0642.02, project was included in the tender                           | South East     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | -          |
| 666    | Community Notice Boards - Retender - <i>Tendered under HP0723 Various NEP's Projects across localities Project 2022</i>      | All Localities | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 158,413.13 |
| 676    | Gateside hub water and Waste connections, <i>Tendered under HP0723 Various NEP's Projects Across Localities Project 2022</i> | North West     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 36,424.87  |
| 677    | 60 - 62 Ferry Road Dr front garden renovation                                                                                | North West     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 11,239.08  |
| 678    | 40-42 Captains Road - Fencing Upgrade, <i>Tendered under HP0723 Various NEP's Projects Across Locality Project 2022</i>      | South East     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 18,035.39  |
| 691    | Newcraighall Mounds - Design - SOC213                                                                                        | North East     | Atkins Limited       | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 5,350.00   |
| 692    | Oxgangs Broadway - Hand Rail Installation                                                                                    | South West     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 1,260.00   |
| 695    | Great Michael Square - Unsafe Wall Demolition                                                                                | North West     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 1,485.00   |
| 697    | Kirkliston (Glebe) - UnSafe Wall                                                                                             | North West     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 6,597.45   |
| 699    | 6 to 8 Loganlea Slab installation                                                                                            | North East     | P1 Solutions Ltd     | Completed         | EIP/NEP | 15/07/2022 | £ | 5,223.15   |
| 703    | 3-5 Telford Drive - Street Lighting up to Telford Path                                                                       | North West     | CEC Street Lighting  | EIP's Development | EIP/NEP |            |   | 0%         |
| 704    | Saunders Street - Public Realm Improvements - SOC261                                                                         | North West     | Atkins Limited       | EIP's Development | EIP/NEP |            | £ | 15,000.00  |

|     |                                                                                                                                 |            |                       |                   |         |   |           |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------|---|-----------|
| 719 | 25 Moredun Park View - Garden Upgrade                                                                                           | South East | P1 Solutions Ltd      | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 6,388.20  |
| 721 | Laichfield Landscape Improvements Phase 2 - Design - SOC270                                                                     | South West | Atkins Limited        | EIP's Development | EIP/NEP | £ | 33,775.00 |
| 722 | Stenhouse Bin Nest Installation project Phase 2 - Design - SOC190                                                               | South West | Atkins Limited        | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 20,000.00 |
| 722 | Stenhouse Bin Nest Installation project Phase 2                                                                                 | South West | Maxi Construction Ltd | Delivery          | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |
| 723 | 39 Clovenstone Park - Tree Planting and Kick rail removal, tendered under Various NEP's Projects across Localities project 2022 | South West | P1 Solutions Ltd      | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 29,996.95 |
| 736 | Inchcolm Court - Hedging, Shrub and Tree Planting                                                                               | North West |                       | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 2,710.50  |
| 737 | Willowbrae - Parking, Access and Landscape Redevelopment - SOC300                                                               | North East | Atkins Limited        | EIP's Development | EIP/NEP | £ | 28,000.00 |
| 738 | Southhouse Square - Estate Redevelopment - SOC301                                                                               | South East | Atkins Limited        | EIP's Development | EIP/NEP | £ | 72,000.00 |
| 739 | Boswell Dr - Park Land Environmental Improvements - SOC303                                                                      | North West | Atkins Limited        | EIP's Development | EIP/NEP | £ | 5,887.00  |
| 742 | Calder's Sheltered Housing Community Benefit                                                                                    | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |
| 743 | Oxgangs Green                                                                                                                   | South West | P1 Solutions Limit    | EIP's Delivery    | EIP/NEP | £ | 34,000.00 |
| 749 | Abbeyhill - Emergency Planter and Wall Works                                                                                    | South East | P1 Solutions Limit    | EIP's Delivery    | EIP/NEP | £ | 6,887.00  |
| 750 | 12 Magdalene Avenue - Communal Binstore fence installation                                                                      | North East | P1 Solutions Limit    | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 8,478.60  |
| 753 | NW Week of Action - Community Benefit                                                                                           | North West | P1 Solutions Ltd      | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |
| 755 | Gilmerton Community Council - Community Garden - Community Benefit                                                              | South East | P1 Solutions Ltd      | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |
| 766 | Emergency Works Coatfield Lane                                                                                                  | North East | P1 Solutions Ltd      | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 3,211.00  |
| 775 | 39 Ferniehill Grove and Dr - Estate Wall Improvements                                                                           | South East |                       | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |
| 782 | Oxgangs House Bin Nest Installation                                                                                             | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP |   |           |
| 785 | Moredun Environmental Works - SOC223                                                                                            | South East | Faithful and Gould    | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP |   |           |
| 787 | 18 Oxgangs Crescent Bin Chute Closures Path Upgrade and car park upgrade                                                        | South West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 37,934.11 |
| 789 | Oxgangs Crescent - Car Park, Footpath and Communal Waste Installation - SOC500                                                  | South West | Atkins Limited        | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |
| 791 | Muirhouse Community Garden                                                                                                      | North West | P1 Solutions Limited  | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 28,037.23 |
| 792 | 10-12 and 24-26 Granton Medway                                                                                                  | North West | P1 Solutions Limited  | EIP Delivery      | EIP/NEP | £ | 90,820.00 |
| 796 | Restalrig Avenue - Fencing Upgrade                                                                                              | North East |                       | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP |   |           |
| 798 | Moira Park - Landscape Improvements - Design - SOC428                                                                           | North East | Atkins Limited        | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP | £ | 4,000.00  |
| 799 | Kirklands - Landscape and estate Improvements - Design - SOC429                                                                 | North West | Atkins Limited        | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |
| 825 | Northfield Drive and Grove - Emergency Render Removal                                                                           | North East | P1 Solutions Ltd      | Completed         | EIP/NEP | £ | 5,570.80  |
| 826 | Crewe RoD Gardens Play Park - Access Upgrade                                                                                    | North West |                       | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP |   |           |
| 827 | Great Michael Rise - Access Improvements                                                                                        | North West |                       | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP |   |           |
| 829 | Hallsland Park Landscape Improvements - Phase 2 - SOC485                                                                        | South West | Atkins Limited        | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |
| 834 | Granton Medway Open Space Development - SOC501                                                                                  | North West | Atkins Limited        | EIP Development   | EIP/NEP | £ | -         |

Key:

Purple – Completed

Blue - Under Construction

Yellow- In Development

Green - Awaiting authorisation/approval

**QUESTION NO 12**

**By Councillor Rae for answer by the  
Convener of the Housing,  
Homelessness and Fair Work  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) What is the total number of voids as of 8<sup>th</sup> February 2024?

**Answer** (1) There were 1,286 void Council properties as of 29 January 2024. This is the most up to data available at the time of preparing the answer to this Question.

**Question** (2) What is the total cost to the Council of providing temporary accommodation for 1500 households?

**Answer** (2) The cost of 1,500 homeless households, based on the average cost of all temporary accommodation, would be £18,624,408.

**Question** (3) What proportion of the money spent on private temporary accommodation in 2023 was spent on accommodation that is legally unsuitable under the Unsuitable Accommodation Order?

**Answer** (3) In 2022/23, the proportion of money spent on Unsuitable Accommodation was 57%. In 2023/24, this is forecast to be 62%.

**Question** (4) What prioritization criteria exist for selecting which voids to bring back into use? For instance, are properties of certain sizes or in certain areas of the city targeted first?

**Answer** (4) To reduce the overall number, new voids and voids that require less repair work are prioritised so these can be turned around more quickly for relet. However, officers are also working on longer-term voids.

**Question** (5) What are the current main barriers for bringing voids back into use quicker?

- Answer** (5) The main barriers are:
- a) Utility issues: no energy supply to carry out repair work caused by meter debt or faulty meters. There are sometimes lengthy delays when dealing with utility companies and also with reliability when repair / replacement of meters is required.
  - b) Condition of properties and scale of repair works required: voids are received in an increasingly poor condition and as properties age, more work is required to return them to a lettable standard. The average cost of a void has increased 45% from 2021/21 to 2023/24.
  - c) Resources: tackling the void backlog whilst also dealing with approximately 100 new voids every month requires significant officer, trade operative and contractor resource to repair and re-let these properties

**Question** (6) Against the projection for “reduction in voids to normal turnover” as detailed in the latest HSIP update, what progress has been made against the October 2023 and December 2023 targets?

**Answer** (6) This projection has been revised to a target of 3% of total stock by March 2025. This is following a review of assumptions, including the number of new voids each month which is higher than the number initially included in the plan.

The total number of voids has reduced from 1,416 on 18 September 2023, to 1,286 on 29 January 2024.

**Question** (7) What is the plan for the forecasted remaining 566 voids in October 2024 as detailed in the “reduction in voids to normal turnover” targets in the latest HSIP update?

**Answer** (7) The target is to achieve and maintain a void rate of around 3% of total stock by March 2025, which would be considered a normal turnover rate.

**Question**

**(8)** Of the 4,920 households in temporary accommodation as of 24 November 2023:

- a) How many households contain children?
- b) How many children are in those households?
- c) Of those households, how many are in:
  - i) social sector accommodation;
  - ii) Bed and Breakfast accommodation;
  - iii) hostels;
  - iv) hotels;
  - v) PSL accommodation;
  - vi) other accommodation
- d) What is the average length of stay for those households currently in temporary accommodation?
- e) What is the average length of stay for households with children currently in temporary accommodation?
- f) What is the longest amount of time a household with children currently in temporary accommodation has been in temporary accommodation?
- g) What is the breakdown by ethnicity of those households currently in temporary accommodation?

**Answer**

- (8)** ) How many households contain children - 1,540
- b) How many children are in those households - 3,141
- c) Of those households, how many are in:
- i) social sector accommodation - 306
  - ii) Bed and Breakfast accommodation - 29
  - iii) hostels - 0
  - iv) hotels - 21
  - v) PSL accommodation - 836
  - vi) other accommodation - 348
- d) What is the average length of stay for those households currently in temporary accommodation? The average length of stay is 720 days (all cases); and 564 days (excluding PSL pre-April 2020 households accommodated under the previous PSL contract where accommodation was provided as a settled accommodation option).
- e) What is the average length of stay for households with children currently in temporary accommodation? The average length of stay is 691 days (all cases); and 677 days (excluding PSL cases pre-April 2020 as noted above).
- f) What is the longest amount of time a household with children currently in temporary accommodation has been in temporary accommodation? The longest amount of time is 5,726 days for a closed PSL case; 3,103 days (excluding PSL cases pre-April 2020 as noted above) (household rehoused on 27 November 2023); and 2,945 days for the next longest household with children.
- g) What is the breakdown by ethnicity of those households currently in temporary accommodation? See table below.

|                   |               | No           | %             |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| White             | Scottish      | 2,296        | 46.7%         |
|                   | English       | 43           | 0.9%          |
|                   | Welsh         | 3            | 0.1%          |
|                   | Other British | 333          | 6.8%          |
|                   | Irish         | 30           | 0.6%          |
|                   | Polish        | 322          | 6.5%          |
|                   | Roma          | 5            | 0.1%          |
|                   | Other         | 377          | 7.7%          |
| Ukrainian         |               | 26           | 0.5%          |
| Mixed             |               | 117          | 2.4%          |
| Black             | African       | 274          | 5.6%          |
|                   | African Other | 182          | 3.7%          |
|                   | Caribbean     | 41           | 0.8%          |
|                   | Black         | 32           | 0.7%          |
|                   | Black Other   | 21           | 0.4%          |
|                   | Asian         | 93           | 1.9%          |
| Asian             | Pakistani     | 30           | 0.6%          |
|                   | Indian        | 43           | 0.9%          |
|                   | Bangladeshi   | 20           | 0.4%          |
|                   | Chinese       | 91           | 1.8%          |
|                   | Asian Other   | 93           | 1.9%          |
| Arab              |               | 267          | 5.4%          |
| Other             |               | 232          | 4.7%          |
| Gypsy / Traveller |               | 23           | 0.5%          |
| Refused to Answer |               | 14           | 0.3%          |
| Not Recorded      |               | 5            | 0.1%          |
| <b>Total</b>      |               | <b>4,920</b> | <b>100.0%</b> |
| <b>BME Total</b>  |               | <b>2,196</b> | <b>44.6%</b>  |

**QUESTION NO 13**

**By Councillor Rae for answer by the  
Convener of the Housing,  
Homelessness and Fair Work  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) Which organisations were invited to participate in the initial sectoral engagement workshop on development of the Housing Emergency Action Plan on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2023?

**Answer** (1) The City of Edinburgh Council services – Housing, Homelessness, Policy and Insight, Children’s Services, Revenues and Benefits

- Shelter
- Prospect Community Housing Association
- Fresh Start
- Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership
- Cyrenians
- Bethany Christian Trust
- Wheatley Group
- Viewpoint Housing
- Rock Trust
- Crisis

**Question** (2) When were invitations for that workshop issued?

**Answer** (2) 8 December 2023

**Question** (3) How many and which groups were able to attend the session, and how many and which groups were unable to attend / sent apologies?

- Answer**                   **(3)** The City of Edinburgh Council invitees all attended. In addition, representatives attended from:
- Fresh Start
  - Prospect Community Housing Association
  - Bethany Christian Trust
  - Wheatley Group
  - Viewpoint Housing
- Two organisations advised they were unable to attend:
- Crisis
  - Shelter confirmed attendance but were then unable to attend
- The following organisations did not respond to the invitation sent:
- Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership
  - Rock Trust
- Question**                   **(4)** How were the groups invited to participate in the workshop selected, and how was it ensured that these groups represented a wide range of demographics, including all protected characteristics?
- Answer**                   **(4)** It was not the intention for the workshop on the 21 December to cover all possible voices, or to focus on tenant rights. Various 3<sup>rd</sup> sector colleagues were invited to this workshop so that the discussion could focus on homelessness, welfare rights, children’s and adult issues. Given the timescales available after the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on 5 December, it was important to organise some early meetings to start identifying possible actions. Attendees were advised of this.
- This was one of three workshops held before Christmas, with the other two sessions with Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee.
- Further workshops have been held, with one for the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board, one for Education, Children and Families Committee.
- Question**                   **(5)** How was the voice of tenants and tenants’ organisations profiled in that workshop session?

**Answer** (5) The focus of the workshop was on other issues therefore there were no tenant representatives in attendance,.

**Question** (6) What plans are there for further workshop meetings, and who will be invited to those?

**Answer** (6) Individual workshops have been organised for each political group, with some of these held already.

Other workshops are arranged to cover specific issues including:

#### **Tenant rights**

- Edinburgh Tenants Federation
- Living Rent Edinburgh
- Scottish Refugee Council
- Scottish Human Rights Commission
- End Poverty Edinburgh
- Disability Advisory Group

#### **Human rights**

- City of Edinburgh Council Corporate Parenting
- Edinburgh Patients Panel
- NHS Public Health
- EVOC
- Alcohol and Drug Partnership
- LGBTQ representatives
- Gypsy Traveller representatives
- Edinburgh and Lothian Region Equality Council
- Community Justice Scotland

#### **Partnerships**

- Edinburgh Affordable Housing Partnership
- EdIndex Board
- Homes for Scotland

#### **Homelessness**

- Shelter Scotland
- Edinburgh Cyrenians
- Simon Community
- Four Square

**QUESTION NO 14**

**By Councillor Dobbin for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) Of the 1,118 Voids assigned for letting as of December 2023 (1,351 less 233 not lettable) what is the current number, ie how many of these Voids have been returned into service.

**Answer** (1) As at 29 January 2024, there were 1,286 voids, with 219 unable to be let, leaving a total of 1,067.

**Question** (2) How many properties have been returned as Voids and will be re-let since the last report in December.

**Answer** (2) Our records show there have been 180 new voids from December 2023 to 29 January 2024, with 162 new lets over the same period.

**Question** (3) What is the planned schedule for the 1,118 Voids for letting being returned to rental earning.

**Answer** (3) The target is to achieve and maintain a void rate of around 3% of total stock by March 2025, which would be considered a normal turnover rate.

**Question** (4) Of the 82 (of the 233) Voids for Disposal, how many properties are expected to be purchased with the proceeds and over what timeline.

**Answer** (4) It is not possible to give exact figures or timeframes as this is dictated by the constantly changing housing market.

House prices, the availability of properties on the market, and mortgage interest rates etc all influence what can be bought or sold and over what timeframe.

Approximately 4 homes are purchased for every 3 sold. Using the actual figures for Acquisition and Disposal sales and purchases to date, the Council would expect to purchase in the region of 106 new homes.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Yes, on the answer to question 3, the target is to achieve a void rate of around 3% of total stock, what is that actual number please?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Again I very much welcome both questions about voids, because I am very pleased to say that we're turning a tanker round and that we are now down to 1,272 voids, which is not, of course acceptable, but work is progressing at relative speed to address those concerns. In terms of the question about numbers, I have seen the number but my memory and now my laptop have failed me, I will, of course, get that information to you as soon as possible Councillor Dobbin and I do thank you for your question.

**QUESTION NO 15**

**By Councillor Thornley for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) When he expects design work on the agreed pedestrian crossing on Clermiston Road to conclude?

**Answer** (1) Assessment and prioritisation of the proposed pedestrian crossing programme will be undertaken as part of the broader 2024/25 road safety delivery programme. This will be considered at Transport and Environment Committee in April.

Until the service budget is known (internal and external funding) and the programme review is complete it is not possible to offer information on the design phase.

(The wider design programme will be a function of priority and the requirements for Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO). Schemes that require traffic orders will take longer to design and deliver).

**Question** (2) When he expects installation work to begin?

**Answer** (2) As noted above, the broader pedestrian crossing installation programme will be reported to the Transport and Environment Committee in April and will be subject to available funding.

**QUESTION NO 16**

**By Councillor Aston for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question**

What on-street assessments have been carried out on paved and slabbed surfaces which have been jet washed, to identify whether there has been any deterioration in condition – e.g. to grouting, dislodging of paving stones, etc – which may cause hazards?

**Answer**

Target footways are subject to a visual pre-works assessment. Areas that may be problematic (due to surface type or condition) are not cleaned.

Works are carried out using high specification surface cleaning equipment, designed to be most efficient at lower pressure/high temperature (Steam) settings, which are broadly similar to those used for sensitive and historic stone cleaning.

The works are predominantly undertaken using a ‘Skater’, that allows larger areas to be cleaned per hour. This is supported by spot cleaning via a steam lance, at low pressure/high temperature and followed with a soft wash.

The process does not lift or damage healthy pointing and does not compromise the stability of the paving stones.

Although problematic areas, like loose/uneven slabs, or areas of poor/missing grouting, should be identified pre-works, any issues noted by the operatives are reported to the relevant service and will not be cleaned.

Each area is walked post clean to visually audit the quality of the works. No instances have been noted where the integrity of the footway surface has been compromised by the works.

**QUESTION NO 17**

**By Councillor Aston for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question**

How many bin collections have been missed in the 'red list' streets identified as most affected by pavement parking, since enforcement was first intimated to households in December 2023?

**Answer**

This information is held, but accessing it would require detailed analysis on a street by street basis, alongside analysis of complaints received.

Like me, I am sure you would urge residents to park responsibly to help ensure our waste team can do its job.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Yes, so I thank the Convener for his response, I'm also happy to urge folk to park responsibly, just in terms of the data on those missed bin collections, can you give assurances that that will be taken into account when looking at further interventions that are needed to ensure that the pavement parking ban is going smoothly?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Absolutely, with the benefit of hindsight, I think this has really been quite useful data for other councils right across Scotland, which will hopefully follow us and Lord Provost if you don't mind I'd really like to say that I'm really proud of the work the parking and media teams did rolling out the ban and also to the way Councillors here have supported it and also to the way residents in the city, right across the city have also respected it, so it's been really good for the city actually so thank you Lord Provost

**QUESTION NO 18**

**By Councillor Mumford for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

- Question** (1) How many hot meals are prepared for Full Council meetings?
- Answer** (1) There are 80 meals served on the day of each Full Council meeting.
- Question** (2) Do we record the amount of food waste from Full Council catering and if so what is the average level of wastage?
- Answer** (2) The waste is not recorded, however officers have confirmed that there is minimal waste.
- Question** (3) What has been the highest, lowest and mean average cost of catering lunches for Full Council meetings since May 2022?
- Answer** (3) From May 2022 to Dec 2023 there were 17 Full Council meetings. The average cost per meeting was £1,511.90. The highest cost was £1,654 and the lowest cost was £1,358.
- Question** (4) What has been the highest, lowest and mean average carbon footprint of lunches at Full Council since May 2022?
- Answer** (4) This information is not recorded.
- Question** (5) What is the annual cost of providing hot beverages and biscuits in the members lounge and when was this last reviewed?
- Answer** (5) The cost of providing hot beverages and biscuits in the members lounge from April 2023 to date is £14,775. The cost increases in line with the Council's annual fees and charges but there has been no other review of the service provided.

**QUESTION NO 19**

**By Councillor Aston for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question**

Given recent repeated instances of vehicles becoming stuck attempting to drive into Greenside Lane, what steps does the Council take proactively to inform online map and satnav providers of new road layout and access arrangements?

**Answer**

The Council does not directly inform online map or satnav providers of new road layout and access arrangements.

The Council's gazetteer is updated and then it is exported and uploaded to the One Scotland Gazetteer (OSG) which is the repository for all 32 Scottish Councils' gazetteers (this is hosted by the Improvement Service). Councils can upload to the OSG as often as they like but must make at least a monthly update (as per the OSG conventions). The OSG is consumed by the Office of the Scottish Road Works Commissioner for inclusion in the Scottish Road Works Register. The Improvement Service also supply the Gazetteer to the Ordnance Survey monthly from where they consume the data into their OS Highways product. This product is available for purchase by interested parties (e.g. sat nav firms among others).

**Supplementary Question**

Yes, again, thank you to the Convener for his response. I just wonder if, given that we've had yet another incident of this happening since I imagine that's happened after he filed this response to the question, whether he wonders if possibly some other approach, whether that involves the Council being more proactive or finding some other method, is what's needed to deal with problems like this.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

The short answer is yes, I mean on Greenside Lane specifically, I don't have an Apple device or do actually, I have an iPad, but I understand that Apple satnav has now been updated. the Council now have a bollard to put in position at Greenside Lane, a cast iron one that reflects the heritage status of the area apparently, and that's going to be installed tomorrow, so that's something we can all look forward to, and hopefully that will let drivers see that they can't drive down steps after all, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 20**

**By Councillor Thornley for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

Further to my question at the Council's meeting of 23rd June 2023;

**Question**           **(1)** Will the speed limit reductions from 40mph to 30mph on Queensferry Road, Glasgow Road, South Gyle Access and South Gyle Broadway be implemented by the end of March as he indicated was the intention?

**Answer**           **(1)** Due to competing demands and resource challenges, the speed limit change from 40mph to 30mph will not be delivered by the end of March 2024. However, detailed design and road safety audits are expected to be complete by April 2024.

**Question**           **(2)** If not, when will they be implemented?

**Answer**           **(2)** Subject to available funding, the implementation programme is expected to commence in Summer 2024. This speed limit reduction programme includes over 20 principal routes and is expected to take up to 12 months to complete. The staged delivery programme is yet to be prepared.

I accept that residents will be concerned about this latest delay.

**QUESTION NO 21**

**By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) What proportion of individuals who have approached the Advice Shop since 23rd October 2023 (i.e. after the 2023 EPC Annual Update) have had concerns around heating and energy?

**Answer** (1) A recent [report](#) to Policy and Sustainability Committee provided a summary of the number of people who have sought advice from the Council's Advice Service. A review of the data held by the Advice Service shows that there have been 65 referrals to other agencies for advice on fuel and energy. In addition, records show that the level of possible fuel debt from those who have engaged with the service is around £20,000 for the period from July to December 2023. However, it is important to note that many people who seek advice will do so for more than one reason and therefore this may not reflect the full impact of fuel and energy concerns.

**Question** (2) Does the Council's Advice Shop hold figures of referrals or uptake to benefits to mitigate fuel and energy insecurity?

**Answer** (2) As noted above, there have been 65 referrals to other organisations for energy advice.

**Question** (3) With the Fuel Insecurity Fund completely cut in the draft Scottish Government 2024/25 Budget and the announcement by the UK Government to stop the one-off Cost of Living Payment after Spring, what plans (and liaison with other agencies and advice services) are being formed to assist and signpost Edinburgh residents through the Cost of Living crisis in 2024?

**Answer** (3) An organisational review of the Housing and Homelessness service is currently underway. This proposes to integrate family and household support with welfare rights advice to enhance the support provided by the Council. In addition, a review of Local Outcome Improvement Plans (LOIPs) is focused on strengthening the partnership approach to welfare related support.

**Question** (4) How often is the list of 'Warm and Welcoming Spaces' on the Council website updated?

**Answer** (4) The website is updated when we receive information from partners and organisations. In Autumn, officers sent out a call via existing networks to partners, community organisations and all organisations already represented on the website to encourage the submission of new entries and updates. Content is therefore added on a regular basis.

**Question** (5) What signposting and/or advertising for 'Warm and Welcoming Spaces' has taken place over 2023 and early 2024?

**Answer** (5) Signposting and advertising takes place locally across the city on an ongoing basis by organisations involved in the Warm Welcome initiative. In addition to that, a launch for the initiative was held at Central Library in December. It is also being promoted through the following:

- iThrive Edinburgh booklet
- Circulation of webpage to community groups and organisations end of 2023
- Libraries actively promoting throughout winter

**Supplementary Question** Yes, thank you Lord Provost, thank you to the Convener for her answer. As dystopian as this supplementary may be, is there scope for further advertising of warm and welcoming spaces and the advice shop on public transport and through partners like Essential Edinburgh, thank you.

**Supplementary Answer** My sincere apologies, just a minor domestic emergency, I felt compelled, and I do apologise, would you mind repeating your question and I promise I'll never do that again.

**Councillor  
Caldwell**

Not a problem, thank you. In terms of further advertising, warm and welcoming spaces and the advice shop, first, thank you for your answers there, would there be scope for working with partners in transport or Essential Edinburgh etc to ensure that gets advertised further if not for this , for next winter?

**Councillor  
Meagher**

Thank you so much and in broad terms, yes, of course, and I really welcome a kind of creative approach to how we might as a whole Council advertise the warm and welcoming spaces, wouldn't it be great, just as a wee codicil if we didn't need them because people's fuel bills were sufficiently low that they could afford to heat their own homes, and we didn't live in what we've got used to calling a cost of living crisis, but it seems to be a cost of living permanent situation rather than a crisis, but yes, of course and thank you for your suggestion.

**QUESTION NO 22**

**By Councillor Kumar for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

The Education, Children and Families Committee is yet to get an update on Family Swim Sessions at Braidburn Pool benefiting children and young people with additional support needs. This action is now overdue.

**Question** (1) What engagement has the Convenor had with families impacted by this?

**Answer** (1) To date no families have approached me directly on this matter. However, I would be pleased to meet any families who would like to discuss this issue with me.

**Question** (2) What are her plans to mitigate the impact?

**Answer** (2) Edinburgh Leisure (EL) is currently catering for over 100 families with their sessions at Gracemount Leisure Centre, and on average, around 60 people attend over the course of 3 sessions each Saturday. EL book the families in on request and the sessions are sustainable in terms of staffing and are working well. EL will have to introduce charges for the sessions in order to sustain when the (additional) funding received from CEC runs out.

For the families that can't attend Gracemount Leisure Centre for the reasons mentioned above, a separate solution is required. On a Thursday evening at Braidburn Special School, another company have a weekly 4-6pm let. The proposal is that the family swim sessions take place from 6.15-7.15pm, directly after this session on a Thursday evening. A lifeguard already in attendance for this company can stay for an additional hour to support the family swim sessions A second person may also need to be present to operate equipment such as the hoist while the lifeguard watches the people in the pool. This person could be a second member of staff from the company running the 4pm-6pm let.

## **Cost**

Braidburn School – costs including 2 staff and a concessionary hourly rate for pool use for the year is approximately £3,000. (less if we don't pay for the pool). This would cover a 1-hour session every Thursday.

In total, around £20,000 would be required annually to pay staff and pool costs for both venues. This would increase with pay rises/increased pool costs.

## **Next Steps**

- Scope out the possibility of families paying to participate in family swimming if no other funding is available.
- Ask the families unable to participate at Gracemount if the Thursday evening slot at Braidburn is a suitable alternative.
- Investigate a mechanism for families to book/pay for the Thursday evening sessions at Braidburn, perhaps using the Spydus booking system.
- Consider the best mechanism for promoting the Braidburn sessions to ensure that the families who need it most have the opportunity to attend.

### **Supplementary Question**

Thank you Lord Provost, just a reminder to the Convener that the action on Braidburn pool, including a briefing note or a position statement, is now overdue, so can I please encourage her to circulate this as soon as possible.

### **Supplementary Answer**

Yes, I will inform the Convener and make sure that that information is given to you.

**QUESTION NO 23**

**By Councillor Kumar for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

Councillors have now been informed the removal of all Education Welfare Officers (EWOs) has been reversed. This is after a sustained campaign by SNP councillors, trade unions and others and Labour voting with Conservative and Liberal Democrat Councillors consistently over the last 11 months to proceed with the removal of this vital service.

Elected members have been informed that funding to reverse the cut to EWOs will come out of the PEF funding or existing DSM budget which will mean more cuts to education not approved by Councillors.

**Question** (1) Why was the consultation not carried out or an impact assessment not completed before proposals to cut this vital service and that the reversal of these cuts will not simply be taken from other parts of school or education budgets?

**Answer** (1) Consultation was carried out in 2021, reported to Committee in March 2022, with field work in 10 schools as part of the Thematic Review of Attendance. This review confirmed that there were different models to promote attendance in place across the city and that an integrated model should be considered. The different models included authority-funded support from the EWO service – available only to a select number of schools, as well as PEF funded support for Pupil Support Officers. The review concluded that the EWO service was only one approach and that leadership, clarity of processes and an effective timetable were all crucial factors.

The decision to make the saving was agreed in Full Council.

**Question** (2) Can the Convener confirm where this funding is coming from?

**Answer**

- (2) As stated above, the proposal to reduce funding for Education Welfare Service was reversed and all associated funding will be reinstated corporately in 2024/25. Any reference to this being funded from PEF or Devolved School Funds was in relation to the other means of maximising attendance.

Full provision of £0.6m for the reversal of this saving is included in the draft revenue budget for 2024/25. This is one of a number of measures proposed in the draft revenue budget and a full reconciliation of proposed adjustments and funding measures is included in Appendix 2 to the [Revenue Budget Framework and Medium-Term Financial Plan MTFP 2024-29 further update report](#) which will be considered by the Finance and Resources Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2024.

An update report from the Executive Director of Children, Education and Justice Services on Maximising Models of Attendance will be considered at the next meeting of the Education, Children and Families Committee in April 2024.

**QUESTION NO 24**

**By Councillor Kumar for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

At the Policy and Sustainability meeting on 9th of January, elected members were informed that 'individual consultations have taken place' for individual budget proposals and similarly that a 'comprehensive budget stakeholder engagement' is taking place.

At the Education, Children and Families Committee on 23rd January, elected members were informed that 'we don't consult widely' but we select a representative group of around maximum of 6 Head Teachers.

**Question** (1) Can you confirm which statement is correct?

**Answer** (1) Consultation with Headteachers is well established in the City of Edinburgh via the Headteacher Executive and Edinburgh Learns Boards. The former is a group of experienced secondary Headteachers representing each locality, with a Chair and Vice; and in the case of primary schools, a committee of experienced primary Headteachers, with a Chair. Strategic and operational issues are discussed at various meetings, and the Exec and Board Headteachers represent the whole forum of 123 schools, through consultation at their locality meetings and by email. Finance and Staffing Boards each have a Headteacher representative per sector. Issues are often discussed in advance in localities, with the consensus being passed on to the Headteacher representative, to convey at meetings with officers. At Budget Setting, a short life Budget Reference Group is set up with members from the Headteacher Executive plus the Finance Board members (3 Headteachers plus Finance Officers and Education Officers). The nature of budget setting means that discussions must remain confidential, however in 2024, the proposals from 2023 were largely what was still on the table and it was therefore reasonable to assume that the proposals were widely known and seen as 'the least worst options.'

|                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Question</b>               | (2) Can you confirm the schools represented by the reference group highlighted at Policy and Sustainability by Officers on 9th January?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Answer</b>                 | (2) The Budget Reference Group has included representation from Headteachers of<br><br>Leith Academy, Tynecastle High School, Broughton High School, Rosevale School, Buckstone PS, Liberton PS, South Morningside PS, Davidson's Mains PS                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Supplementary Question</b> | Thank you Lord Provost. I don't think my question was answered so can the Convener please clarify which of these two statements is correct, so do we either have a comprehensive budget consultation or that we do not consult widely, which one is it?                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Supplementary Answer</b>   | I couldn't actually hear Councillor Kumar's question, could you repeat, it was about which of two statements were too happy to repeat that                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Lord Provost</b>           | It was about which of two statements were true.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Councillor Kumar</b>       | Happy to repeat that, which of this two statements is correct, so do we either have a comprehensive budget consultation or that we do not consult widely.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Councillor Watt</b>        | So if this, if this is in regard to the situation, and I'm sorry, I'm not up on the detail on this, at the Education Committee in January, so I mean my understanding is that there was a consultation whether it can be described as extensive or not, I suppose, depends on your own value judgment, so it's very, very hard to give a yes/no answer to that. I will take that away and I'll come back to Councillor Kumar on that one. |

**QUESTION NO 25**

**By Councillor Kumar for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

The Convener prevented this decision being taken in public, failed to present information following standards of normal Council reporting on grants processes and disallowed additional time to discuss and scrutinise the Connected Communities Fund. The impact of the fund allocations remain unknown, so can I ask:

**Question** (1) Was the Convener aware of the total amount of fund set aside for Managed Funds?

**Answer** (1) On 7<sup>th</sup> December 2023, prior to the briefing they committed to attending on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2023, the Convener and Elected Members were provided with the full details of the recommended awards. This included the three Funding Strands and the managed Fund. To ensure a timely award of the Connected Communities Edinburgh Grant Programme and avoid further delay with the process, Elected Members agreed to be presented with this data in advance of ECF Committee special meeting. This was a helpful opportunity for discussion and included all details regarding the Managed Fund.

**Question** (2) Was the Convener aware of the eligibility criteria and application process for these funds?

**Answer** (2) The Committee report for the recommendation of the awards was published for APM on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2023, in advance of the briefing which Elected Members attended on 12<sup>th</sup> December to consider and discuss the awards. The Convener and the Elected Members were provided with these details in the report, which states that a separate application and separate criteria were applied to the Managed Fund. The Managed Fund had previously been approved in City of Edinburgh Council meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2023.

- Question** (3) How will the Convener ensure greater transparency, accountability, and consistency of process at ECF Committee?
- Answer** (3) The Convener considers that the process followed is compliant with Grant Standing Orders. The Convener has asked Officers to consider how consistency across the Council can be achieved, ensuring the process aligns with corporate Standing Orders whilst protecting confidential information.
- Question** (4) Will the Convener commit to release all information in public, showing previous awards given under the fund, funds applied for and funds allocated through the process?
- Answer** (4) Awards are published in the public domain. This includes the awards approved for Connected Communities Edinburgh grant programme. Consistently with the previous programmes, details of unsuccessful applicants have not been published.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost, yes I do have a supplementary. The answer details that the Convener found out about the eligibility criteria, the same time as the Committee, is this correct and, if so, why did she not seek further clarity on the lack of information on the eligibility criteria.
- Supplementary Answer** Again I will relay that to the Convener, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 26**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the  
Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

It was reported in the Edinburgh Reporter on 29 June 2023 that the whole ETRO process for Spaces for People/Travelling Safely schemes had to be restarted, costing £19,425, and that the council said the sum would be claimed back from the consultants responsible for the errors.

**Question** (1) Has this sum now been received from the consultants and if not, why not?

**Answer** (1) The value of the work undertaken by the consultant between July and November 2022, to prepare the five Travelling Safely area Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs) that were advertised in November 2022, was £25,960.

Due to the errors that were subsequently discovered within these ETROs, agreement was reached with the consultant that they would only be paid 50% of this value. The reduction in the payment to the consultant was therefore £12,980. This reduced amount was paid in August 2023.

**Question** (2) What are the total costs incurred in the ETRO traffic order paperwork and advertising to date?

**Answer** (2) Work to prepare the November 2022 ETROs was undertaken between August 2021 and November 2022. The five area ETROs covered 36 individual Travelling Safely projects. The total cost for the preparation of the ETRO documentation was £152,685. The total cost of advertising the five ETROs was £16,482.

The overall total cost incurred to date is therefore £169,167.

**Question** (3) What are the total anticipated costs still to be incurred?

**Answer**

- (3)** It is important to note that the costs incurred for Travelling Safely up to 31 March 2023 were met from funding from Transport Scotland, via Sustrans.

Transport and Environment Committee has instructed that five Travelling Safely schemes that were previously included within the November 2022 area ETROs are now to be progressed separately, under scheme-specific ETROs. This was supported by your party.

Work is therefore currently underway to prepare ETRO documentation for five revised area ETROs and five scheme-specific ETROs. The first of these is expected to be advertised on 9 February, with the remainder to be advertised in a phased programme between February and May.

The estimated total cost for the preparation of the revised ETRO documentation is £50,000. The estimated total cost of advertising the 10 ETROs is £5,000.

Finally, the estimated cost of engaging and reporting on the representations received in relation to both the five November 2022 ETROs and the ten new ETROs is £50,000.

The estimated overall total cost still to be incurred is therefore £105,000.

**QUESTION NO 27**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the  
Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) Why were the miles of double yellow lines on the Lanark Road scheme removed then repainted after road surfacing, without a traffic order being in place at the time they were repainted - other than the TTRO to enable the painting?

**Answer** (1) An update on the Travelling Safely Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs) was provided to the Transport and Environment Committee, within the Business Bulletin, at its meeting on [15 June 2023](#).

During the discussion at Committee, officers confirmed that, although the November 2022 ETROs would have to be advertised again to address errors contained within them, they remain in force.

**Question** (2) How could the TTRO to enable the painting be lawful, if there was not a traffic order correctly advertised for the double yellow lines to be painted in the first place?

**Answer** (2) As above, the November 2022 ETROs remain in force.

**Question** (3) Were any vehicles ticketed or towed away to enable line painting or bollard installation?

**Answer** (3) No vehicles received a Fixed Penalty Notice nor were any vehicles relocated during the reinstatement of the bollards and double yellow lines.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you, Lord Provost, thank you to the Convener for his answer. Please can the Convener provide specific legal explanation and references, obviously not right now, to explain why the ETROs that have been withdrawn from being advertised due to errors and are being progressed in a new way, can still remain in force even though there is no accurate publicly available paperwork relating to them.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

You'll be pleased to hear I'll get a written answer to you  
Councillor Rust.

**QUESTION NO 28**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the  
Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question**            **(1)** Does the City of Edinburgh Council need an accurate traffic order that has been properly advertised in the press and on lampposts to be able to:

a)     paint double yellow lines on the road (excluding the TTRO needed for the painting process)?

b)     enforce double yellow lines on the road?

**Answer**            **(1)** Yes, it is a legal requirement to have a valid traffic order in place before any yellow lines can be placed on the road and any associated enforcement action can take place.

**Question**            **(2)** Are there any circumstances where the council does not have to have an accurate and properly advertised traffic order to:

(a)     paint double yellow lines on the road?

(b)     enforce double yellow lines on the road?

**Answer**            **(2)** No, it is a legal requirement to have a valid traffic order in place before any yellow lines can be placed on the road and any associated enforcement action can take place.

**QUESTION NO 29**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

In the week before Christmas 2023, schools were instructed to immediately send out a parent communication with a privacy notice from the office of the Service Director of Education and Chief Education Officer. It was sent to parents without any explanation other than that this was the 'latest version' of the Education Privacy Notice specific to Digital Learning and Teaching. It has been published as a separate notice to the main Education Privacy Notice.

**Question** (1) Please can you confirm how many previous versions there were that specifically covered Digital Learning and Teaching, the dates of these, and how they had been made available to children and families?

**Answer** (1) The Privacy Notice circulated before Christmas 2023 was the first privacy notice specifically covering Digital Learning and Teaching alone. Prior to that, this type of processing was covered in the main Education Privacy Notice which describes on more general terms how personal data is processed in educational settings.

**Question** (2) If there were no previous versions, why did the communication say this was a 'latest version' of Education Privacy Notice on Digital Learning and Teaching?

**Answer** (2) As explained above, this processing for Digital Learning and teaching purposes was covered in more general terms within the main Education Privacy Notice.

**Question** (3) In the privacy notice it refers to children now being visible in a Global Address List at a school level. However, it does not mention that for several years, children had been visible in the Global Address List across all Edinburgh schools. FOI reference 45964 shows that not a single child or member of staff at high risk had been hidden in this massive directory. When will every child (and their parents) and members of staff be told the extent to which their data was visible to so many others for years?

**Answer** (3) Elected Members should be made aware that this issue is complex. Concerns have been raised, and appropriate actions are being taken. This includes revision of the GAL Data Protection Impact Assessment to ensure that any identified privacy risks are assessed and mitigated as appropriate. The Council is also liaising with the UK Information Commissioner's Office over this matter. Those discussions are ongoing, and the Council will be able to provide a full response to continued enquiries once that work has concluded.

**Supplementary Question** Thanks Lord Provost. I appreciate the Convener is not here today, I thank her for the answer, but clearly the safety and security of our children and digital systems is vital. When does the Council anticipate being in a position to brief elected members on this matter?

**Supplementary Answer** I will get information from the Convener and pass it to you.

## QUESTION NO 30

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

According to FOI reference 39848, at the end of October 2022, the council's M365 Learning and Teaching system in schools, held Global Address List directory entries for:

- 55,946 children at council primary and secondary schools
- 6,853 staff
- 626 contractors working within schools/setting
- 317 teachers in training
- An unknown number of council staff from other departments with access to support and contribute to Education services
- An unknown number of staff from external suppliers like CGI

With the exception of some very young children who had been added without their knowledge and not provided with a login, everyone in the system had full visibility of the name, location and some other personal data of everyone else in the Global Address List, the means to contact them from their council address, the ability to contact them from an external email address, and the ability to see if any individual child was online and using the system at any given time.

**Question** (1) At the end of October 2022, did any of the staff with access to this system not have a full and current Protecting Vulnerable Groups (PVG) Scheme membership and if so, how many?

**Answer** (1) Roles and remits requiring PVG membership are identified during recruitment. Where roles and remits necessitate PVG membership HR recruitment teams support the fulfilling of this requirement.

Extensive interrogation of HR systems would be required to provide the requested figures. However, staff access and use of the Global Address List is appropriate to their role, including staff who require (PVG) Scheme membership.

- Question** (2) How many staff in each category were still in the system on 1 January 2024 with digital access to the majority of children in council schools?
- Answer** (2) It is not possible to provide numbers for retrospective dates. This information can only be provided as a current number.
- Question** (3) Do any of those staff not have a full and current PVG Scheme membership, and if so, how many?
- Answer** (3) Not all roles and remits within the Learning and Teaching network necessitate PVG membership. HR colleagues ensure that all staff that require a PVG membership have a membership, as part of the recruitment process and ongoing checks.
- Question** (4) In recent years, has any staff member ever raised a concern to a Headteacher or council officer that they had unnecessary visibility of every child in Edinburgh?
- Answer** (4) We do not hold information relating to a concern of this nature.
- Question** (5) In October 2022, roughly 50,000 children had access to the full directory from home when doing homework – some had this for years. Can the council confirm that there were no immediate family members with convictions for sexual or violent offences who could have had clear visibility of the easily searchable Edinburgh-wide directory and distribution lists for staff and children when legitimately assisting their children with homework?

**Answer**

- (5) We do not hold information regarding the living arrangements of each individual nor the background of people within those living arrangements. Login credentials should not be used by those who are not the intended account holder.

**Additional Relevant Information**

Significant work has been undertaken to increase security provision concerning GAL access and use, including creating individual school based Student Address Books and regular deletion of redundant user accounts. As part of this process, the GAL data protection impact assessment is currently being updated to ensure that any identified risks are assessed and mitigated as appropriate.

The GAL is subject to on-going discussions with the ICO, and a full briefing will be provided once those discussions have concluded

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thanks again to the Convener for her answer. I note it's not possible to provide numbers for retrospective dates, so I wonder if this information could be provided as a current number for today's date, thank you.

**Supplementary Answer**

Yes, I'm sure that information will be able to be relayed to you, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 31**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the  
Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 8 February 2024**

For the Spaces for People/Travelling Safely schemes, the pandemic Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs) were replaced by Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs) on 21 November 2022.

However, it was realised there were issues with the traffic order paperwork on 10 January 2023 and councillors were informed about this on 26 April 2023.

Then all advertisements and mention of the traffic orders were withdrawn from the council website in with a commitment to readvertise them correctly in a few weeks. It is now January 2024 and no traffic orders have been issued.

**Question** (1) Please can the following table be completed with a row for each Spaces for People/Travelling Safely scheme:

| Name of Spaces for People/ Travelling Safely scheme | Approximate number of metres of double yellow lines (in total covering each side of the road) that were not there before Spaces for People/Travelling Safely | Number of parking tickets issued 21 Nov 2022 to 10 Jan 2023<br><br><i>(Period when ETROs were advertised and assumed to be correct)</i> | Number of parking tickets issued 11 Jan 2023 to 26 April 2023<br><br><i>(Period when council officers were aware ETROs were incorrect but did not inform councillors)</i> | Number of parking tickets issued 26 April 2023 to 22 Jan 2024<br><br><i>(After councillors were informed paperwork was incorrect, and adverts withdrawn)</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                     |                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                              |

**Answer** (1) The information requested in the table above is not held in a form which would enable this information to be provided, as requested

- Question** (2) How do Parking Attendants know which double yellow lines are enforceable and which aren't?
- Answer** (2) Officers are aware of the limited scope of ETRO errors and remain confident that the majority of restrictions and prohibitions are adequately covered in the current experimental orders.
- Question** (3) Is it council policy to set aside their legal obligations around ensuring traffic orders are accurate and properly advertised, and instead implementing and enforcing traffic restrictions as they wish, then continuing until legally challenged?
- Answer** (3) No, it is not Council policy to set aside legal obligations. The Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders were prepared to reflect the scope of restrictions and prohibitions required to support the Travelling Safely trial. The mistakes identified are mainly in the interpretation from project plans into Schedules. Officers undertook due diligence in the preparation of the original ETRO documents, and a comprehensive review was undertaken to check each and every measure. Revised ETROs will be issued between February and May 2024.

**QUESTION NO 32**

**By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

At the point the Council declared a “Housing Emergency” in November 2023 the Council publicly declared that it was housing approximately 5,000 households in temporary accommodation. Meanwhile the officially recognised figure from the Scottish Government was approximately 3,500 households.

**Question** (1) Please provide a breakdown of the reasons/categories of households not recognised by the Scottish Government within the figures.

**Answer** (1) The table below provides a breakdown of households in temporary accommodation on 24 November 2023. As per latest information reported in the [Housing Emergency Action Plan](#) to Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on 5 December 2023, there were 4, 920 households in temporary accommodation.

Of those 3,823 households had presented as homeless and would therefore be included in Scottish Government Temporary Accommodation figures.

Work is underway to ensure that commissioned services temporary accommodation data is captured in the Scottish Government figures in future. This involves transferring data to another IT system.

Other categories are monitored regularly to determine whether it is appropriate to remain in temporary accommodation and a homeless assessment arranged if necessary.

| <b>Category / Reason</b>                                                                                                                                    | <b>Total No of Households</b> | <b>No in Unsuitable Accommodation</b> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Not Included in Scottish Government Figures</b>                                                                                                          |                               |                                       |
| Housing Advice Case - includes households seeking advice only and households where eligibility is still to be determined.                                   | 164                           | 90                                    |
| Management Case – includes households decanted whilst work is ongoing in their tenancy.                                                                     | 12                            | 5                                     |
| Refugee Schemes – includes households accommodated under refugee schemes.                                                                                   | 19                            | 0                                     |
| Commissioned Services – includes households in temporary accommodation provided by third sector partners.                                                   | 469                           | 0                                     |
| No case recorded – includes households from Lothian and Edinburgh Abstinence Programme and ineligible households funded by Social Work colleagues.          | 43                            | 17                                    |
| PSL – Pre April 2020 – includes households accommodated under the previous PSL contract where accommodation was provided as a settled accommodation option. | 390                           | 0                                     |
| <b>Total</b>                                                                                                                                                | <b>1,097</b>                  | <b>112</b>                            |
| <b>Included in Scottish Government Figures</b>                                                                                                              |                               |                                       |
| Homeless Assessment – includes households who have presented as homeless.                                                                                   | <b>3,823</b>                  | <b>1,091</b>                          |
| <b>Total Number in Temporary Accommodation</b>                                                                                                              |                               |                                       |
|                                                                                                                                                             | <b>4,920</b>                  | <b>1,203</b>                          |

**Question** (2) Please also indicate for both the recognised and unrecognised households how many are being accommodated in unsuitable “bed and breakfast” accommodation.

**Answer** (2) Please see column three in the table above.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost. We heard from the Convener of Housing earlier that she was attempting slowly to bring the 1,200 voids back into circulation, has she noted that the numbers of homeless households in unsuitable accommodation is almost exactly that number and that that unsuitable accommodation is much much more expensive than other accommodation.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you, Councillor Whyte, for your supplementary question and of course, yes, I have, and am always glad when people raise issues in this Chamber to do with temporary accommodation, because to me it is a symptom, and I've said this many many times in this Chamber, of a very serious problem and malaise that we have in this city and to some extent in this country. This situation, isn't something, as Councillor Whyte will be aware, that has arisen overnight and it's something that the question of voids is being dealt with at the very highest level, not only politically but also in terms of officers, and I think that we're to be congratulated at what we are achieving rather than criticising for what we're not achieving, but we certainly have ambitious targets to make sure that the people who are in temporary accommodation are not subject to that, particularly those who are in unsuitable temporary accommodation, but, I apologise for it to the human beings who are forced to live in such temporary accommodation, but the reality is given all the constraints that exist, and we've gone over these issues many many times in this Chamber, all of the constraints that exist around the question of housing broadly in Edinburgh, then the only choice for such households would be literally the streets and none of us would want that, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 33**

**By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 8 February 2024**

**Question** (1) Please could the Convener confirm how many bin hubs with a 'nose in' arrangement have had a dropped kerb installed.

**Answer** (1) There are no bin hubs with a 'nose in' arrangement with a dropped kerb installed, I understand this is due to road safety concerns.

**Question** (2) Please also give a breakdown of the figures by Council ward.

**Answer** (2) None

**Supplementary Question** Thank you, Lord Provost, and I am grateful to the Convener for his answer. The answer 1 that clarity is obviously the impact assessment, acknowledges the safety risk, but it does not rule it out, so I wonder why, the clarity is, why they haven't been installed anywhere.

**Supplementary Answer** So Lord Provost, I think that the issue around the dropped kerbs is, if we were to drop kerbs for people to access the bin hubs, there is a danger with people with visual impairments might think they're a crossing point and that is the risk, but I think, if this is something you're concerned about I'm perfectly happy to meet with the Access Panel together and we can talk through the issues and there might be a way where we can improve this, I'm quite happy to hold that meeting.