

Item 5.1 - Business Bulletin

Petitions Committee

2.00pm, Thursday, 8 September 2016

Dean of Guild Court Room, City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh

This is a public meeting and members of the public are welcome to attend

Contact

Stuart McLean

E-mail: stuart.mclean@edinburgh.gov.uk

Tel: 0131 529 4106

Petitions Committee

Convener	Members	Contact
<p>Councillor Booth</p> 	<p>Councillor Balfour Councillor Dixon Councillor Donaldson Councillor Edie Councillor Gardner Councillor Keil Councillor Key Councillor Lunn Councillor Paterson</p>	<p>Stuart McLean Committee Clerk Tel: 529 4106</p> <p>Samuel Ho Committee Support Officer Tel: 529 4210</p>

Recent news	Background
<p>Call on the Council to invest in improved facilities and to increase the number of inspections to tackle dog dirt</p> <p>On 3 February 2016, the Petitions Committee considered a petition entitled ‘Call on the Council to invest in improved facilities and to increase the number of inspections to tackle dog dirt’ the Petition asked for the Council’s support and investment to improve facilities, tackle problem dog fouling, and ensure that the Friends and Residents can enjoy a park that is safe clean, well used facility now and in the future.</p> <p>Environmental Wardens continue to regularly patrol and monitor levels of dog fouling at Westfield Park. The park currently shows a significant reduction in dog fouling.</p> <p>The park is currently within the Council’s archived area of the Dog Fouling Tracking System (DFTS) which allows officers to assess the impact of dog fouling on an area and implement a suite of actions to resolve the issue. The DFTS allows residents to contact the Council with specific reports of fouling and where possible identify/describe the owner or description of the dog. There have been no complaints in regard to dog fouling for Westfield Park for the months of March, April or May 2016.</p>	<p>Petitions Committee – 3 February 2016</p> <p>Transport and Environment Committee - 15 March 2016</p> <p>Watch the webcast here - LINK</p>

Recent news	Background
<p>The Council has installed a new piece of play equipment (cat springer) on 21 March 2016 which has been welcomed by the residents. Officers have developed a draft proposal for the play area which will be used for consultation purposes amongst local residents and funding applications to determine the future facilities in the park.</p>	
<p>Lothian Buses to continue to accept Adult City Single Tickets</p> <p>On 14 April 2016, the Petitions Committee considered a petition entitled 'Lothian Buses to continue to accept Adult City Single Tickets' the Petition asked that the City of Edinburgh Council do everything within its powers and remit to persuade Lothian Buses to continue to accept Adult City Single Tickets.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To thank the Principal Petitioner for raising the issues contained within the petition. 2) To note that there is ongoing dialogue between the Principal Petition, Transport for Edinburgh and Lothian Buses regarding the issues contained within the petition. 3) To note that Transport for Edinburgh Board would discuss the issues raised by the petition on 26 May 2016. 4) To refer the petition to the Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee to highlight the impact that the issues raised within the petition may have on some charities. 5) To note that an update regarding subsequent actions regarding this petition would be included in a future Petitions Committee Business Bulletin. <p>On 10 May 2016, the Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee considered a referral from the Petitions Committee. The Committee agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To request Lothian Buses to meet with the petitioner and relevant Council officers to explore all options towards identifying an alternative resolution to the decision by Lothian Buses not to continue to accept adult city single tickets. 2) That a report on the outcome of these discussions be submitted to a future meeting of the Transport and 	<p>Petitions Committee - 14 April 2016</p> <p>Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee - 10 May 2016</p> <p>Watch the webcast here - LINK</p>

Recent news	Background
<p>Environment Committee for consideration.</p> <p>3) To agree that a record of the discussions on this item be circulated at the next Transport for Edinburgh Board.</p> <p>Lothian Buses attended the Communities and Neighbourhood Committee and reported that they had had ongoing dialogue with a number of organisations and as a result of this put in place a heavily discounted ticket that can be used by these groups. Lothian Buses has now provided an alternative ticketing solution to this issue and will not be re-instating the Adult City Single Ticket.</p> <p>Lothian Buses will continue to engage with the petitioner as they have been doing regularly to date, along with other vulnerable user groups to inform and educate about bus usage in line with their activities</p> <p>Lothian Buses will continue to review and adjust their Commercial ticketing strategy in line with their plan to refine the products on offer to ensure ease of understanding and use by the customer.</p>	
<p>Re-Union Canal Boats location at Fountainbridge</p> <p>On 3 February 2016, the Petitions Committee considered the petition 'Re-Union Canal Boats location at Fountainbridge'. The Committee agreed to refer the petition to the Economy Committee and that the Convener would write to Scottish Canals to encourage dialogue with representatives of Re-union.</p> <p>On 26 April 2016, the Economy Committee considered a referral from the Petitions Committee and a related report by the Executive Director of Place.</p> <p>The Committee agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To note the activity which was on-going with Re-Union to secure a canalside location at Fountainbridge. 2) To note that the Executive Director of Place would facilitate a cross party meeting, including Re-Union, to focus on finding a solution to the issues raised by the petitioner. <p>The response from Steve Dunlop (Chief Executive - Scottish Canals) is attached at appendix 1.</p>	<p>Petitions Committee – 3 February 2016</p> <p>Economy Committee – 26 April 2016</p> <p>Watch the webcast here - LINK</p>

Recent news	Background
<p>Charges relating to The Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 (Licensing of Skin Piercing and Tattooing) Order 2006</p> <p>On 3 February 2016, the Petitions Committee considered the petition 'Charges relating to The Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 (Licensing of Skin Piercing and Tattooing) Order 2006'. The Committee agreed to refer the petition to the Regulatory Committee and that the Convener would write to Scottish Government highlighting the issues raised by the petition.</p> <p>On 26 April 2016, the Regulatory Committee considered a referral from the Petitions Committee and a related report by the Executive Director of Place.</p> <p>The Committee agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To note the content of the report by the Executive Director of Place. 2) To agree to introduce an annual licence renewal in respect of Skin Piercing and Tattooing licences, setting the fee at £260. <p>The response from Shona Robinson MSP (Cabinet Secretary for Health, Wellbeing and Sport) is attached at appendix 2.</p>	<p>Petitions Committee – 3 February 2016</p> <p>Regulatory Committee – 26 April 2016</p> <p>Watch the webcast here - LINK</p>
<p>Fly the EU Flag over the City Chambers</p> <p>Following receipt of a petition entitled 'Fly the EU Flag over the City Chambers' on 30 June 2016 the Lord Provost agreed to fly the flag from the City Chambers. As the purpose of the petition had been met the Principal Petitioner requested that the petition be removed from the website and no further action should be taken.</p>	
<p>Pedestrian crossing near the foot of Yeaman Place</p> <p>Following receipt of a petition entitled 'Pedestrian crossing near the foot of Yeaman Place' on 2 January 2016 Council Officers agreed to undertake an assessment of the area regarding the possible introduction of a pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>The area meets the Council's criteria for the construction of a signalised pedestrian crossing. This will be reported to the Transport & Environment Committee for approval, as part of the annual pedestrian crossing update report,</p>	

Recent news	Background
early in the new year.	
<p>Redhall House and Lawn</p> <p>On 23 January 2014, the Petitions Committee considered the petition 'Save Redhall House and Lawn'. The Committee agreed to refer the petition to the Finance and Resources Committee, where the issues raised by the petition have been considered on several occasions.</p> <p>On 3 August 2016 the Development Management Sub Committee refused a planning application for the erection of eight mews buildings as an enabling development for the conversion and restoration of Redhall House.</p>	<p>Finance and Resources Committee - 20 March 2014</p> <p>Finance and Resources Committee - 7 May 2014</p> <p>Finance and Resources Committee - 5 June 2014</p> <p>Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee - 19 June 2014</p> <p>Finance and Resources Committee - 4 June 2015</p> <p>Finance and Resources Committee - 29 October 2015</p> <p>Development Management Sub Committee – 3 August 2016</p> <p>Watch the webcast here - LINK</p>
<p>Dalmahoy Traffic Lights Needed</p> <p>On 4 September 2014, the Petitions Committee considered the petition 'Dalmahoy Traffic Lights Needed'. The Committee agreed to refer the petition to the Transport and Environment Committee.</p> <p>On 30 August 2016 the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report by the Executive Director of Place and agreed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To note that sufficient detailed design work had been undertaken to produce a workable junction layout and a more detailed cost estimate. 2) To note that there was a projected funding shortfall of between £132,380 and £222,380 3) To agree that negotiations would be undertaken with affected landowners, seeking to acquire the land required for a signalisation scheme by agreement. 4) To agree that the detailed design would be completed, such that the scheme would be 'shovel ready' and that a further report would be submitted to Committee on possible funding options. 	<p>Petitions Committee - 4 September 2014</p> <p>Transport and Environment Committee - 28 October 2014</p> <p>Transport and Environment Committee - 17 March 2015</p> <p>Transport and Environment Committee – 30 August 2016</p> <p>Watch the webcast here - LINK</p>

Recent news	Background
<p>5) To agree that a low cost safety scheme involving vehicle activated signs would be introduced as a interim measure to address the current collision profile at the junction</p> <p>6) To agree to receive a report within 3 cycles outlining proposals for meeting the funding shortfall referenced within the report.</p>	
<p>Petitions Live</p> <p>The most recent Petitions Committee on 14 April 2016 has been viewed by 88 people and is still available to view in the webcast archive.</p> <p>Our webcast facility allows you to watch the committee as it happens. You can also catch up on what you have missed by visiting our webcast pages, where previous meetings of the Petitions Committee and the full Council can be viewed. Other Committees are now being webcast and are available to view.</p> <p>There are options to pause, fast forward and rewind this recording and to view the reports and minutes at the same time.</p>	
<p>Petitions to the Council</p> <p>Since the Petitions Committee launched on 8 October 2012, the Council has received a total of 73 petitions. Of these, 44 were valid and the remaining 29 petitions were deemed invalid as they did not meet the Petitions Criteria.</p> <p>Of the 44 valid petitions, the Petitions Committee has, so far, considered 31 petitions. In each case, the Committee has agreed that the issues raised merit further action and have taken action as appropriate.</p>	<p>Current Petitions</p>
<p>Contact Us</p> <p>If you have any comments or suggestions, or if you would like information on how to submit a petition please contact us</p>	<p>Stuart McLean Tel: 529 4106</p> <p>Samuel Ho Tel: 529 4210</p>

Forthcoming activities:

The next meeting of the Petitions Committee will be at 2pm on 10 November 2016 in the Dean of Guild Court Room, City Chambers.

21st April 2016

Cllr Chas Booth
City Chambers
High Street
Edinburgh
EH1 1YJ

Canal House
1 Applecross Street
Glasgow
G4 9SP

Tel: 0141 354 7515

www.scottishcanals.co.uk

Dear Cllr Booth,

Re: ReUnion Canal Boats

Thank you for your letter dated 31st March 2016 in relation to the recent petition from Re-Union Canal Boats regarding their search for premises at Fountainbridge following their recent relocation. In your letter, you asked for clarification on what dialogue we have had on this subject with Re-Union and EDI and the potential for future dialogue.

Our team at Scottish Canals is in frequent dialogue with both parties. Firstly, EDI has been liaising with ourselves as adjoining landowners on their development aspirations for the council's landholding at Fountainbridge. This dialogue has taken place in a number of formats, including the regular Fountainbridge Sounding Board chaired by Cllr Andrew Burns. We have also had a number of more technical discussions with EDI on how their plans interface with the canal environment, which formed part of their planning proposals. These are regular ongoing discussions. Scottish Canals and EDI are yet to agree a Memorandum of Understanding for the development works to cover the interface with the canal. This is something we would like to progress with EDI and would welcome the Councils support with further dialogue.

Secondly, we have regular meetings with Re-Union on a number of fronts; predominantly as one of the core businesses operating on our canal network. Scottish Canals are a long term supporter of their business and have been a funder and partner since their inception in c2004. As a social enterprise, Re-Union also benefit from substantial discounts and extremely favourable rates from ourselves. Our collaboration with Re-Union is entirely supportive and we have recently jointly launched a lock-keeping and volunteer base on our canal network which has been received positively by all parties involved. We have worked in partnership over the years and recently supported Re-Union's successful application to the Heritage Lottery Fund and are working in collaboration to deliver this exciting engagement programme along the Union Canal.

When we became aware of Re-Union's notice on their former leased premises, we helped them look at other opportunities around the vicinity of Fountainbridge. One of the options suggested was a floating venue, however this was deemed unfeasible by Re-Union. We also suggested the possibility of sharing office space at our Operations base at Lochrin, however, as the space is restricted, this was also dismissed by Re-Union. We suggested a number of alternative canalside options that may be available within the Edinburgh area as temporary solutions, however these were unpalatable to Re-Union as they were not within the Fountainbridge area. In addition, we also provided a number of alternative contact details for other landowners so Re-Union could make their own commercial approaches separately.

Scottish Canals are aware that Re-Union wants to be located within the City of Edinburgh / EDI's landholding in the longer term, however we do not have any legal role to influence this matter. If EDI and Re-Union would like to meet up to discuss aspirations in this regard and how best to collaborate with ourselves we would, of course, be willing to do so. We do find it disappointing that the parties involved in the petition did not raise these issues directly with ourselves.

In terms of helping to facilitate a shorter term solution to house Re-Union in a canalside environment whilst development is undertaken in the Fountainbridge area, we would be happy to arrange a meeting with Pat Bowie and Jane Jones to discuss remaining possibilities more fully. We have offered assistance to date and will continue to do so.

As you may be aware, Scottish Canals own landownership in this vicinity is limited. We have appended a copy of our legal title for your ease of reference. In addition to this, we note that there are some landownerships under the governance of Edinburgh Quay Limited, a joint venture between ourselves and Miller Developments. This covers limited landholdings on Lower Gilmore Place and some strips of land along the towpath. Having discussed this with our partners at Miller Developments, we would be willing to arrange a discussion with the parties and Re-Union to discuss whether this presents a viable short term solution. There are technicalities regarding the habitable condition of the properties which would need addressed. This is best taken forward as a separate discussion between the relevant parties and we will contact Pat Bowie directly to arrange. We would also be keen to have discussion with the City Council on a longer term strategy for Lower Gilmore Place to ensure a shared partnership approach for the area.

Within the petitions committee hearing, I noted that frequent reference to our partnership arrangements with Glasgow City Council were made. We would like to note for the record, that we approached both City of Edinburgh Council, as well as EDI, to formalise a shared partnership approach. Various discussions were held with both Sue Bruce and with EDI proposing a collaborative partnership during 2013, however, despite our best endeavours, this was not viewed as a favourable option and EDI have since progressed other opportunities.

Subsequent to this, discussions were held with the Council on our concerns on achieving the aspirations outlined in our shared Edinburgh Canal Strategy, which included a number of formal letters between our organisations. I have attached a copy of these, not with the purpose of re-opening the developer contribution discussion which is clearly a closed matter, but to make the point that we have had longstanding concerns about achieving a high quality waterspace and public realm. The commentary in my own letter to John Bury back in 2011, copy attached, are still as relevant today as the day they were originally voiced. Over the years, we have seen the dissipation of canalside aspiration in the area – we do not wish this to diminish further.

We have discussed the opportunity of using the waterway as an alternative mechanism for water management – something we are achieving in Glasgow through our Metropolitan Glasgow Strategic Drainage Partnership. If the City Council are minded to take this potential seriously, we would be open to arranging discussion with Scottish Water and ourselves to explore this further. To date we have had little support.

We remain committed to supporting City of Edinburgh Council in the delivery of our shared Edinburgh Canal Strategy and our joint aspiration to create a vibrant canalside quarter at Fountainbridge and would welcome positive discussion with the parties to deliver this.

We have also received an invitation to attend the Economy Committee on 26th April regarding this matter. Unfortunately, we cannot send representation on that day, however, we are going to provide a copy of this letter to demonstrate our commitment to addressing the issues raised.

I would be happy to arrange a meeting with CEO Andrew Kerr to discuss this further if necessary.

Please do not hesitate to get in touch with me if you would like to discuss this matter further.

Yours sincerely,



Steve Dunlop
Chief Executive

cc. Rebecca Miller for Gavin Barrie, SNP Councillor for Inverleith
Caryn Elder – CEC
Cllr Gordon Munro – Canal Champion
Helena Huws – Scottish Canals

T: 0300 244 4000
E: scottish.ministers@gov.scot

Councillor Chas Booth
Convenor, Petitions Committee, City of Edinburgh Council
City Chambers
High Street
EDINBURGH
EH1 1YJ

RECEIVED
- 5 MAY 2016

Your ref: CB/AG
Our ref: 2016/0013368
3 May 2016

Dear Councillor Booth

Thank you for your letter of 31 March, in which you ask what consideration has been given by the Scottish Government to the issues raised in the British Acupuncture Council (BAC's) petition on the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 (Licensing of Skin Piercing and Tattooing) Order 2006.

Firstly, I can confirm that the Scottish Government has no plans to amend the Order.

This legislation requires that premises must be licensed for public safety and includes provisions to set an appropriate fee to cover associated costs. However, it does not make it mandatory for local authorities to recover the associated costs. It is therefore open to the City of Edinburgh Council to waive this charge or set a reduced fee for acupuncture practitioners. You may wish to approach the convenor of the City of Edinburgh Council's Regulatory Committee in respect of this matter.

In addition, the Scottish Parliament website contains supporting documents relating to Petition PE01590: Licences for Acupuncturists which you may find useful:

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/GettingInvolved/Petitions/PE01590>

I hope you find this information helpful.



SHONA ROBISON