

## The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 21 September 2017

Present:-

### LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

### COUNCILLORS

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

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

# 1 **Edinburgh Tram – York Place to Newhaven – Updated Outline Business Case – referral from the Transport and Environment Committee**

---

## a) **Deputation from Leith Central Community Council**

The deputation expressed concern at the impact of works to extend the tram line would have on local residents including increased noise, pollution, delays, inaccessible shops, constantly changing bus stops and quality of life.

They listed measures which they asked the Council to put in place before work on the Tram extension started.

## b) **Referral from the Transport and Environment Committee**

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report on the updated Outline Business Case for the Edinburgh Tram York Place to Newhaven project to Council for approval to commence Stage 2 activities of the project.

Details were provided on the updated Outline Business Case which had built on the work done for the Outline Business Case reported to Council in November 2015. The work to update the Outline Business Case had been overseen by the cross-party Transport Projects Working Group, in conjunction with an officer led Project Board to monitor progress and the approved project budget for Stage 1.

### **Motion**

To approve the commencement of Stage 2 activities of the project.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment**

- 1) To note the contents of the report.
- 2) To note with regret that the Updated Outline Business Case had not changed fundamentally from proposals considered by Council at several junctures in 2015.
- 3) To agree to take no action due to the fact that the proposals continued to:
  - Expose the Council to a high degree of financial and reputational risk.

- Present poor value and failed to constitute prudent use of taxpayers' money, particularly at a time of continued public sector funding pressures.
- Rely too heavily on a wide variety of assumptions.
- Proceed prior to publication of the full findings of the Hardie Inquiry into what went so badly awry with the previous project; considered the proposals presented in respect of the Inquiry findings to be presumptive and wholly inadequate to ensure lessons were learned meaningfully and comprehensively.
- Impact negatively upon Lothian Buses and remained likely to lead to higher fares for passengers.

- moved by Councillor Cook, seconded by Councillor Douglas

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	45 votes
For the amendment	-	18 votes

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

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

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee 4 September 2017 (item 1); referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

### **Declaration of Interests**

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

## **2 Edinburgh Youth Council - Motion by Councillor Graczyk**

---

### **a) Deputation from Glasgow Youth Council**

The deputation outlined the success of Glasgow Youth Council in involving young people with the decision making process within Glasgow City Council. They indicated that the Youth Council had undertaken a number of reforms aimed at making it more accessible and friendlier.

The deputation detailed the work they were involved with and the support they received from local Councillors and MSPs. They felt that although they aimed to make it fun based, it prepared young people for a future role in politics and assisted in building up their confidence.

### **b) Motion by Councillor Graczyk**

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

“Council:

- 1) Calls for a report in two cycles on the potential for establishing an Edinburgh Youth Council body to give Young People who live, work or study within the City of Edinburgh a stronger voice, and the power to be involved in democracy; to inspire Young People about the immense and positive change they can make to their local communities and the wider city environment; and to improve communication between the Council and the Youth sector.
- 2) Requests that said report includes, but is not limited to:
  - (a) consideration of how Young People can become members of the Edinburgh Youth Council;
  - (b) how often elections should be held and once elected, the geographical representation by the member;
  - (c) recognition that the Edinburgh Youth Council must be led and run by Young People themselves;
  - (d) the level of civic and options for budgetary support required by the Council;
  - (e) consideration of the operation of Youth Councils elsewhere and relationship with the Scottish Youth Parliament and other external bodies representative of young people.”

## **Motion**

To approve the motion.

- moved by Councillor Graczyk, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

## **Amendment**

To note the issues raised in Councillor Graczyk's motion and confirm that a report had already been requested to the next Education, Children and Families Committee on 10 October 2017 on Participation and Engagement in Communities and Families. This would consider and review the participation and engagement of children and young people, parents, carers and staff and look at appropriate ways for them to better inform committee decisions and shape policy.

The report would include details of the engagement with young people since the Edinburgh Youth Council was introduced in 2003 and would cover:

- a) Options on how to increase young people's participation;
- b) How young people could be encouraged to take a leading role in influencing Council policy;
- c) Ways in which the Council could support young people's activities;
- d) How young people were represented in other Councils throughout the UK.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted in place of the terms of the motion.

## **Decision**

To approve the following amended motion by Councillor Graczyk:

To note the issues raised in the motion, and that a report had already been requested to the next Education, Children and Families Committee on 10 October 2017 on Participation and Engagement in Communities and Families. This would consider and review the participation and engagement of children and young people, parents, carers and staff and look at appropriate ways for them to better inform committee decisions and shape policy.

The report would include details of the engagement with young people since the Edinburgh Youth Council was introduced in 2003 and would cover:

- a) Options on how to increase young people's participation;
- b) How young people could be encouraged to take a leading role in influencing Council policy;
- c) Ways in which the Council could support young people's activities;
- d) How young people were represented in other Councils throughout the UK.

### 3 Minutes

---

#### Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 24 August 2017 as a correct record.

### 4. Questions

---

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

### 5 Leader's Report

---

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

- Update on Coalition Programme Progress
- Future of South Queensferry High School
- Health and Social Care Services

The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor Whyte	- Health and Social Care Services
Councillor Burgess	- House prices in Edinburgh - development of derelict sites and areas of vacant land
Councillor Aldridge	- Health and Social Care Services
Councillor Day	- Expansion of nursery /early years provision
Councillor Howie	- Disability/equality services – bins causing an obstruction on public footpaths
Councillor Mary Campbell	- Children with additional support needs – Kindred services

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Councillor Gardiner  | - Mark Beaumont – circumnavigation of the globe by bicycle - congratulations                                    |
| Councillor Booth     | - Thanks to “Leithers Don’t Litter” and Council officers – community clean up                                   |
| Councillor Rust      | - Transport minister’s refusal to meet with disabled campaigners pressing for better access to Waverley Station |
| Councillor Brown     | - Dispute over recycling uplifts – missed bin collections   |
| Councillor Hutchison | - Record breaking festivals - congratulations<br>- Queensferry Crossing – disruption of traffic during opening  |
| Councillor Lang      | - Queensferry High School – amendments to plans   |
| Councillor Cameron   | - Housing and Homelessness – level of support from the Scottish Government                                      |
| Councillor Webber    | - Numeracy Champion   |
| Councillor Cook      | - Public utility works – performance monitoring   |
| Councillor Arthur    | - Council Tax arrears and abandoned properties - recovery   |
| Councillor Doggart   | - Care Inspectorate Report – Crisis within the Integrated Joint Board   |

## **6 Appointment of Parent Representative to the Education, Children and Families Committee**

---

The Council had agreed its political management arrangements and made appointments to a range of Committees, Boards and Joint Boards. Details were provided on the proposed appointment of a parent representative to the Education, Children and Families Committee.

### **Decision**

- 1) To confirm the appointment of Alexander Ramage as the parent representative to the Education, Children and Families Committee with the term of office to run from 21 September 2017 to 30 April 2022.

- 2) To note that the appointment was conditional upon confirmation that the appointee would comply with the Councillors' Code of Conduct and membership of the Protection of Vulnerable Groups (PVG) Scheme.

(References – Act of Council No 3 of 22 June 2017; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

## **7. Appointment of Chief Social Work Officer**

---

Details were provided on a decision taken by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Lord Provost, following the appointment of Michelle Miller as Interim Chief Officer to the Integration Joint Board, to appoint Alistair Gaw, Executive Director for Children and Families, to fulfil the role of Chief Social Work Officer

### **Decision**

To note the appointment of Alistair Gaw, Executive Director for Children and Families, as Chief Social Work Officer.

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

## **8 Edinburgh Festivals 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Legacy**

---

The Council had agreed a motion on the Edinburgh Festivals 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Legacy asking for a report to be provided on the details of funding proposals for the PlaCE programme.

Details were provided on the funding proposals which included how the impact on other Council activities could be mitigated given the Council's existing funding for festivals and how inclusive opportunities, including community-based arts and skills development could be realised.

### **Decision**

- 1) To note the PlaCE programme as detailed in the report by the Executive Director of Place, to be delivered in partnership with the Scottish Government and the 11 major Edinburgh Festivals.
- 2) To note that the Council's contribution to this programme would be subject to the full budget process 2018-2023.

(References – Act of Council No 9 of 24 August 2017; report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## **Declaration of Interests**

Councillors Ian Campbell, McNeese-Mechan, Whyte and Wilson declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Directors of Edinburgh International Festival.

### **9. Report of Pre-determination Hearing – Old Dalkeith Road, Edinburgh (South East Wedge Development Site) – referral from the Development Management Sub Committee**

---

#### **Decision**

To note that the application had been withdrawn.

(References – Development Management Sub- Committee 30 August 2017 (item 3); referral from the Development Management Sub-Committee, submitted.)

### **10. Revenue Monitoring 2016-17 – Outturn Report – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee**

---

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the provisional 2016/17 revenue outturn position for the Council based on the unaudited financial statements to the Council for ratification for use of funds to and from the General Fund.

#### **Decision**

- 1) To approve the use of funds to and from the General Fund.
- 2) To note that any reference in the report by the Executive Director of Resources to the “Strategic Acquisition Fund” (para 3.8 of the report) should have referred to the “City Strategic Investment Fund”.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee 5 September 2017 (item 6); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted)

### **11. Treasury Management – Annual Report 2016-17 – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee**

---

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on Treasury Management Activity in 2016/17.

#### **Decision**

- 1) To approve the Treasury Management Annual Report 2016/17.

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

(References – Finance and Resources Committee 5 September 2017 (item 13); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

## **12. Inverleith Park – Motion by Councillor Osler**

---

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

“Council notes;

- (1) the importance of Inverleith Park as one of Scotland's largest urban parks,
- (2) that, for almost 130 years, the park has provided residents across north Edinburgh with 54 acres of open green space and iconic views of the city centre,
- (3) the adverse impact of flooding within the park through damaged drainage at vehicle and pedestrian access points to areas rented out for events, both this year and in previous summers,
- (4) the impact this flooding has had on the ability of local people to make use of and enjoy the park.

The Council therefore seeks a report to the Transport & Environment Committee within one cycle to;

- (a) confirm that drainage infrastructure will be fully repaired and steps taken to ensure ongoing protection,
- (b) ensure revenue receipts from events held in Inverleith Park are applied to meet the full costs of such works.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Osler.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

### **Amendment**

Council notes;

- (1) the importance of Inverleith Park as one of Scotland's largest urban parks,

- (2) that, for almost 130 years, the park has provided residents across north Edinburgh with 54 acres of open green space and iconic views of the city centre,
- (3) the adverse impact of flooding within the park through damaged drainage at vehicle and pedestrian access points to areas rented out for events, both this year and in previous summers,
- (4) the impact this flooding has had on the ability of local people to make use of and enjoy the park.

The Council therefore seeks a report to the Transport & Environment Committee on the issues.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted in place of the terms of the motion.

### **Decision**

To approve the amended motion by Councillor Osler.

## **13 Locality Improvement and Service Delivery - Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell**

---

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

“Council:

- 1) Welcomes the remarks made by the Council Leader to full Council on 22 June setting out the importance of Localities.
- 2) Thanks officers for compiling Locality Improvement Plans ready for submission to the Scottish Government in October 2017.
- 3) Recognises that though there is much interdependence between Locality Improvement Plans and the desire of the Council to set up Localities Committees, these are separate issues and both need to be considered and evaluated with care.
- 4) Further thanks officers for compiling lists of organisations in receipt of Council funds by locality for the last Council meeting, and notes the additional work that was required to do this.

- 5) Further recognises that the key to improving Localities, both in terms of the Localities Improvement Plans and any future Localities Committees, will be robust performance measures at both the level of (a) the four Council Localities (North East, North West, South East and South West), and (b) identified Smaller Areas within each of these Localities.
- 6) Accordingly instructs officers to implement the tagging of all relevant data, or the structuring of data in such a way, so that performance reporting is possible at the level of (a) each Locality and (b) each Smaller Area within a Locality, in addition to Community Council, Ward and City aggregations where these are already available, and within existing resources.
- 7) Where performance reporting, as set out in clause 6, is not possible within existing resources, the Chief Executive is asked to report back to Council in three cycles how systems can be configured to enable reporting at (a) Locality, (b) Smaller Area within a Locality, in addition to Community Council, Ward and City aggregations where these are already available, identifying what the resource implications of providing this are.
- 8) In addition, the Chief Executive is tasked with developing specifications for future systems and system upgrades, so that data can easily be aggregated to report at (a) Locality, (b) Smaller Area within a Locality, in addition to Community Council, Ward and City levels, or any other level Council requires, and these aggregations can be changed without the need to call on any additional resources on future or substantially upgraded Council systems.
- 9) Requires councillors and officers to ask all partners involved with Localities to review their data arrangements so they too can contribute to the objective set out in clause 6.
- 10) Instructs the Chief Executive to report on the progress towards Localities Committees in three cycles. This report will cover competence, delegations and governance, detailing what options are still under consideration, what options have been dismissed.

Council requires the report instructed in clause 10 will have an appendix from each Senior Councillor leading the four Localities working groups setting out the progress made in each working group in the six months since their appointment.”

## **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

- moved by Councilor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Mowat

## **Amendment**

To note the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell and accept the need to ensure data is most useful to the localisation process.

To recognise that the Culture and Communities Committee had recently agreed to consider Locality Improvement Plans (LIPs) in one cycle and that recommendations on governance would be considered at the October Council meeting.

To note that the Council and its community planning partners already had some data sets which could be broken down by locality, postcode and datazone levels. This had been used to inform the contents of LIPs. Some of this data and analysis was published on the Edinburgh by Numbers website ([http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20247/edinburgh\\_by\\_numbers](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20247/edinburgh_by_numbers) ).

To instruct that a report detailing how data issues raised in the motion could be enacted, was presented to the next Culture and Communities Committee along with the draft LIPs.

- moved by Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor Ian Campbell

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted in place of the terms of the motion.

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jim Campbell:

- 1) To accept the need to ensure data is most useful to the localisation process.
- 2) To recognise that the Culture and Communities Committee had recently agreed to consider Locality Improvement Plans (LIPs) in one cycle and that recommendations on governance would be considered at the October Council meeting.
- 3) To note that the Council and its community planning partners already had some data sets which could be broken down by locality, postcode and datazone levels. This had been used to inform the contents of LIPs. Some of this data and analysis was published on the Edinburgh by Numbers website ([http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20247/edinburgh\\_by\\_numbers](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20247/edinburgh_by_numbers) ).
- 4) To instruct that a report detailing how data issues raised in the motion could be enacted, was presented to the next Culture and Communities Committee along with the draft LIPs.

## 14 Colinton Amenity Association 90<sup>th</sup> Anniversary - Motion by Councillor Rust

---

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that Colinton Amenity Association (CAA), a voluntary association comprising working and retired local residents, was established in 1927 to preserve and enhance the amenity of Colinton district in so far as the sustainable development of the City of Edinburgh permits.
- 2) Recognises the significant input by CAA on planning, roads and environmental matters affecting the Colinton area and its engagement with local elected members and City of Edinburgh Council.
- 3) Thanks the current Executive Committee and members for continuing the work of their predecessors over the decades in partnering with other local organisations on a broad range of local matters.
- 4) Congratulates CAA on its 90<sup>th</sup> anniversary and asks the Lord Provost to mark this anniversary in an appropriate manner.”

### Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Rust.

## 15 Graffiti Task Force - Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

---

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

“Council:

To recognise that graffiti has become a serious problem across our city with multiple surfaces being vandalised with low-grade tags.

To address the many instances of damage to council property, in particular litter and communal waste bins; lamp post and street furniture including bus stops, benches and bollards.

To instruct the Executive Director of Place to set-up a graffiti task-force to work with Police Scotland to address the problem and report back in two cycles to the Transport and Environment Committee detailing progress.

To enable the public to direct complaints of vandalised property through provision of a dedicated reporting function on the website and use of #graffiti on the Twitter handle @EdinHelp.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Johnston

### **Amendment 1**

To delete paragraphs 3 and 4 of the motion and agree to receive a report to the Culture and Communities Committee reviewing the current procedures for dealing with graffiti and examining options for spreading best practice in the city to deal with the issue.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment 2**

To approve the motion with the following adjustment:

Insert at the end of paragraph 3:

“and to ensure that this task-force does not divert resources from other vital environmental services such as waste collection, street cleaning and weeds removal”

- moved by Councillor Young, seconded by Councillor Gloyer

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	24 votes
For Amendment 1	-	39 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted) - Councillors Aldridge, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Daggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Webber, Whyte and Young.

For Amendment 1 - The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child,

Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Donaldson, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Ritchie, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work

## **Decision**

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Macinnes as follows:

- 1) To recognise that graffiti has become a serious problem across our city with multiple surfaces being vandalised with low-grade tags.
- 2) To address the many instances of damage to council property, in particular litter and communal waste bins; lamp post and street furniture including bus stops, benches and bollards.
- 3) To agree to receive a report to the Culture and Communities Committee reviewing the current procedures for dealing with graffiti and examining options for spreading best practice in the city to deal with the issue.

## **16 Public Water Bottle Refill - Motion by Councillor Burgess**

---

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

“The Council:

- 1) Recognises the high environmental and financial cost in dealing with plastic bottle waste in the city;
- 2) Welcomes steps to introduce a deposit return scheme for such bottles and other forms of recyclable or re-usable materials;
- 3) Recognises also that Edinburgh’s high quality public water supply represents an opportunity to reduce demand for bottled water and the associated plastic waste;
- 4) Recognises the health benefits from greater consumption of water, reducing risks of obesity and dental decay from high sugar drinks;
- 5) Therefore agrees to investigate a pilot scheme to provide public water bottle refill facilities in a number of high footfall locations in the city, taking account of experience elsewhere in the UK and other countries; and submitting a report within 3 cycles.”

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

## **17 Cricket Scotland - Motion by Councillor Doggart**

---

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

“Council:

Congratulates Cricket Scotland on being awarded a One Day International against England at the Grange Club, Edinburgh on June 10 2018 and two T20 Internationals at the same venue in the same week against Pakistan.

Council welcomes this further opportunity to showcase Edinburgh as an increasingly popular venue for the highest level of all sports.”

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Doggart.

## **18 Barclay Review - Motion by Councillor McLellan**

---

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

“Council:

- 1) Welcomes the recommendations contained in the Barclay Review of non-domestic rates to support economic growth, in particular the reduction in the large business supplement
- 2) Requests a report in the next cycle re-examining the provisions and implementation of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015, to see what reliefs can be provided for businesses beyond the City centre in Edinburgh’s local centres.
- 3) Believes the operations of arms-length organisations such as Edinburgh Leisure should continue to receive reliefs as at present.
- 4) Believes its schools should be exempt from non-domestic rates.
- 5) Believes university properties in Edinburgh should not be liable for non-domestic rates because of the potential negative impact on the Edinburgh Festivals and the wider city economy.

- 6) Recognises that the Finance and Resources Committee has called for a report and instructs that it includes an assessment of the Barclay Review recommendations on the Edinburgh economy.
- 7) Instructs the Council Leader to ensure the report is submitted to the Cabinet Secretary for Finance as part of the Scottish Government's ongoing consultation.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor McLellan.

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Hutchison

### **Amendment 1**

- a) To delete points 1 to 7 of the motion and note that the Scottish Government had responded in part to the Barclay Review with a full response expected by the end of the year.
- b) To note that the Finance & Resources Committee agreed at its meeting on 5 September that a report be brought back following the response by the Scottish Government. The points raised by Councillor McLellan would be addressed in this report.

- moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by councillor Donaldson

### **Amendment 2**

To delete Paragraphs 1-6 of the motion and insert the following:

- 1) To note that the Finance and Resources Committee on 5 September 2017 had already instructed officers to prepare a report into the implications of the Barclay Review.
- 2) To note that the Barclay Review had been constrained by its remit and so had not proposed more radical approaches to taxation, including the scope to bring derelict and vacant land back into productive use.
- 3) To welcome, nonetheless, some of the recommendations, including ending rates relief given to private schools and out-of-term commercial letting of university accommodation and look forward to their implementation in line with the timeline set out in the Barclay Review.

- 4) To acknowledge concerns about the impact of the review recommendations on the financial position of ALEOs such as Edinburgh Leisure, and the need to ensure that there was no additional burden on Edinburgh Leisure's finances.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Miller

### **Amendment 3**

To replace Paragraph 1) of the motion with;

Council notes the publication of the Barclay Review of Non-Domestic Rates, the decision by the Scottish Government to implement the majority of the report's recommendations and to consult further on other elements of the review report.

To add 8)

Council believes the review and subsequent response has presented a missed opportunity for radical changes that would benefit Scottish business such as a system of land value taxation which would avoid the big rate increases that Scottish businesses face when improving their property and provide a further incentive to redevelop brown-field sites.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Neil Ross

### **Voting**

#### **First Vote**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	18 votes
For Amendment 1	-	31 votes
For Amendment 2	-	8 votes
For Amendment 3		6 votes

(For the Motion - Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte

For Amendment 1 : The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Donaldson, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Ritchie, Watt, Wilson and Work.

For Amendment 2 – Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.

For Amendment 3 – Councillors Aldridge, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young.)

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

### **Second Vote**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	18 votes
For Amendment 1	-	31 votes
For Amendment 2	-	8 votes

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

For Amendment 1 : The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Donaldson, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Ritchie, Watt, Wilson and Work.

For Amendment 2 – Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.

Abstentions – Councillors Aldridge, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young)

### **Decision**

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Rankin.

### **Declaration of Interests**

Councillors Bruce, Ian Campbell, Staniforth and Wilson declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Directors of Edinburgh Leisure.

Councillor Osler declared a non financial interest in the above item as a member of Edinburgh Leisure and the parent of a child who attends an independent school.

Councillors Doggart, Lang, McLellan and Mowat declared a non financial interest in the above item as parents of children who attend independent schools.

Councillor Barrie declared a non financial interest in the above item as a member of the board of Fettes College.

## 19 Period Poverty - Motion by Councillor Mary Campbell

---

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

“Council notes

- 1) The inclusion of provision free sanitary products for schools, colleges and universities in the Scottish Government’s Programme For Government announced on the 5<sup>th</sup> of September, and that they have not yet attached a timetable for implementation.
- 2) That period poverty is an urgent issue, and the evidence from Barnardo’s [Scotland](#), Scottish Women’s Aid and the Trussell Trust that some young people are using unsuitable items such as socks and toilet paper instead of proper hygiene products simply because they cannot afford to buy them.
- 3) Their concern that some young people are avoiding school during their monthly cycle to avoid embarrassment.
- 4) That menstruation should never be a barrier to education.

Therefore Council agrees

- 5) That the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee will write to Scottish Ministers to ask them to urgently bring forward a timetable for the implementation of free sanitary products for schools, colleges and universities.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Mary Campbell

- moved by councillor Mary Campbell, seconded by Councillor Rae

### **Amendment**

Council agrees that the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee would write to Scottish Ministers stating Edinburgh's willingness to adopt the policy and offers any required information or assistance to secure a quick implementation of free sanitary products for schools in the city and in cooperation in colleges and universities.

- moved by Councillor Bird, seconded by Councillor Dickie

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Mary Campbell:

Council notes

- 1) The inclusion of provision free sanitary products for schools, colleges and universities in the Scottish Government's Programme For Government announced on the 5th of September, and that they have not yet attached a timetable for implementation.
- 2) That period poverty is an urgent issue, and the evidence from Barnardo's Scotland, Scottish Women's Aid and the Trussell Trust that some young people are using unsuitable items such as socks and toilet paper instead of proper hygiene products simply because they cannot afford to buy them.
- 3) Their concern that some young people are avoiding school during their monthly cycle to avoid embarrassment.
- 4) That menstruation should never be a barrier to education.

Therefore Council agrees

- 5) That the Convener of Education, Children and Families would write to Scottish Ministers stating Edinburgh's willingness to adopt the policy and offers any required information or assistance to secure a quick implementation of free sanitary products for schools in the city and in cooperation in colleges and universities.

## **20 Potential Closure of Leith Registrars Office - Motion by Councillor Booth**

---

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

"The Council:

- 1) Notes with concern reports that Leith Registrar's Office may be due to close;
- 2) Notes there has been a registrar in Leith for many years prior to the merger of Leith and Edinburgh in 1920, and since that date;

- 3) Agrees that Leithers should be able to continue to register births, marriages and deaths in Leith;
- 4) Agrees that any proposals for closure or rationalisation of Leith Registrar's Office should be subject to public consultation;
- 5) Agrees to receive a report to the first meeting of the North East Locality committee, or to the next meeting of the Culture and Communities Committee if that occurs earlier, setting out options for the future of Leith Registrar's Office and outlining plans for public consultation on these options."

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Booth.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Rae

### **Amendment**

To approve the motion subject to amending paragraphs 4 and 5 as follows:

- 4) Agrees that any proposals for closure or relocation of Leith Registrar's Office should be subject to public consultation.
- 5) Agrees to receive a report at the Finance and Resources Committee within one cycle and referred to the North East Locality Committee (when formed) setting out options for the future of Leith Registrar's Office and outlining plans for any necessary public consultation on these options.

- moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Donaldson

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Booth:

The Council:

- 1) Notes with concern reports that Leith Registrar's Office may be due to close;
- 2) Notes there has been a registrar in Leith for many years prior to the merger of Leith and Edinburgh in 1920, and since that date;
- 3) Agrees that Leithers should be able to continue to register births, marriages and deaths in Leith;

- 4) Agrees that any proposals for closure or relocation of Leith Registrar's Office should be subject to public consultation.
- 5) Agrees to receive a report at the Finance and Resources Committee within one cycle and referred to the North East Locality Committee (when formed) setting out options for the future of Leith Registrar's Office and outlining plans for any necessary public consultation on these options.

## **Appendix 1**

**(As referred to in Act of Council No 3 of 21 September 2017)**

### **QUESTION NO 1**

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

#### **Question**

Under point 18 in the Waste and Cleansing Improvement Plan, the Technical Team investigated the use of QR codes to allow residents to easily report missed or overflowing communal bins but this was abandoned after it was found to require a high level of administration to maintain. Until such time when QR code technology becomes simpler to administer, could the Council investigate the simpler alternative of setting up a new Waste telephone number and placing it, along with a unique identifying number, on each on-street communal bin so that members of the public could report a full or overflowing bin to the Waste Department, either by text or phone call?

#### **Answer**

Officers have investigated this suggestion. Applying a unique identifying number to the approximately 18,000 communal bins across Edinburgh comes with a number of practical issues, which ultimately may not provide a better service or outcome to citizens.

There would need to be a robust procedure in place, which would be resource intensive, to ensure bins and associated unique numbers were kept in the right location. Communal bins are not static.

Unique numbers would mean that a citizen would need to walk to the bin to find the number before they reported it therefore not an efficient, nor convenient service for the user. Currently, communal bin data is already on the online transaction, showing as blue dots on the map, so customers can select the exact bin they want to report on. The website is responsive (optimised for a variety of mobile device screen sizes which automatically resizes).

An additional phone line would require additional staffing in the Customer Service area. This resource implication would need to be agreed with the service area

The Waste and Cleansing Service is preparing to start a Communal Bin Review which will look at a range of ways to improve the efficiency of the service. This includes the possibility of increasing the frequency of servicing bins while reducing the number of bins on streets. It will also look at their location. Bearing this in mind it would not be appropriate to invest in unique identifying numbers now. However, it will be considered as part of the communal bin review.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you Convener for investigating my suggestion. Not everyone has an internet enabled mobile phone or has mastered the Council's online reporting system. So, by way of a supplementary question, I would ask the Convener if the communal bin review could take into account these factors when determining improvements in the reporting system.

**Supplementary Answer**

I think the very simple answer to that Councillor Ross is yes.

**QUESTION NO 2**

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**           (1) Under Section 130 of The New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, a utility company must ensure that the reinstatement of the road surface conforms to such performance standards as may be prescribed. In the case of permanent reinstatement, the road surface must conform for a prescribed period after the completion of the reinstatement. How long is the prescribed period for permanent reinstatements to the road surface carried out in the City of Edinburgh?

**Answer**           (1) The present Guarantee period for permanent reinstatements shall run for two years, or three years in the case of deep openings.

There are proposals by Scottish Government to increase this to six years and this is currently being consulted on.

**Question**           (2) The Council has a number of powers to ensure that the quality of a reinstatement of the road surface meets its performance standards.

On how many occasions in the past twelve months, and also in the past five years, has the Council:

- a) issued notices to utility companies to require them to carry out remedial works with respect to an inadequate reinstatement of the road surface?
- b) carried out the necessary remedial works?
- c) recovered the costs, which it reasonably incurred in carrying out remedial works, from these utility companies and how much was recovered?

**Answer**

**(2)** The Council currently inspects all reinstatements carried out by utilities in the city. We undertake a statutory 10% check of reinstatements within six months of completion and again within three months of the end of the guarantee period.

a) During 2016/17, 1,605 notices were issued to carry out remedial work. Between April and September 2017, 536 notices were issued.

The Council reissues failure notices every 17 days for every reinstatement that has not been repaired correctly. These are entered on the Scottish Road Works Register and issued directly to the Utility company responsible.

Over the past 5 years 6,592 failure notices have been issued.

b) The Council has not carried out any permanent remedial work to Utility reinstatements. If the Council was to do so it would take on the responsibility for that reinstatement which would relieve the utility company of its responsibility.

c) There was no recovery of cost from the Council undertaking repairs. However, the cost of an inspection carried out is £36 for each failure and each failure reissue. Last year £365,468 was levied in inspection fees and paid by utility companies in Edinburgh. The inspection fee is fixed and set by Scottish Government.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you Convener. I'm sure the Convener can guess what prompted my question is the large number of inadequate road repairs carried out by utility companies that never seem to be fixed despite the issue of one or more failure notices. My supplementary question is what proportion of these inadequate repairs is eventually fixed by the utility company or would it be more effective for the Council to pay for an adequate reinstatement and to recover that cost from the utility company? Thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Ross for the supplementary question. I can't give you a specific answer on the proportion of those that are not repaired, although clearly we have an inspection programme that runs. But I would address the second part of your question which is that if the Council takes on the responsibility in any shape or form for undertaking those reinstatements, it absolves the utility companies of responsibility and I'm pretty sure that's not something that anybody in this Chamber would want to see happen.

**QUESTION NO 3**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the  
Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

What action is being taken to address the flooding issues in the Binks Car Park in Queensferry?

**Answer**

Gullies in the car park will be jetted and cleaned in the next - 3-4 weeks. If this fails to resolve the flooding problem a more extensive investigation will be carried out to establish if there are any breakages in the pipes.

**QUESTION NO 4**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

The Edinburgh and South East Scotland Region City Deal Heads of Term states that the Scottish Government will provide “£20m investment to support public transport infrastructure improvements identified by the Council’s West Edinburgh Transport Appraisal, alongside investment from partners and the private sector.”

Can the Convener explain which projects this funding to likely to finance and which partners are expected to contribute additional investment?

**Answer**

The total cost of the transport interventions identified in WETA is £108 million (see table below). The Scottish Government has agreed to contribute £20 million towards its delivery.

The Local Development Plan (LDP), Supplementary Guidance: [Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery](#) has already set contribution mechanisms for developers across the city, including how developers in West Edinburgh contribute to the WETA interventions that are now embedded in the [LDP Action Programme](#).

Further work is also being undertaken to determine other partner contributions; such as the Council’s own contribution.

**TABLE: WETA INFRASTRUCTURE PACKAGE COST**

Infrastructure measure	Potential cost excluding optimism bias	Potential cost including 44% optimism bias
<b>Cycling</b>		
A8 north side missing link	£537,500	£773,900
Improvements to Gravel path (old railway line) from A8/M9 interchange north to Kirkliston	£317,600	£457,300
Cycle Connection from A8 along Eastfield Road into Airport	£481,500	£693,300
New pedestrian / cycle bridge over railway between West Craigs and Edinburgh Gateway	£3,000,000	£4,320,000
Improved Crossings at Turnhouse Road and Maybury Road for designated cycle path	£110,000	£158,400
Improved access between Ratho Station and A8 along Station Road	£458,200	£659,800
Improved Station Road/A8 access for cyclists	£440,800	£634,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>£5,345,600</b>	<b>£7,697,500</b>
<b>Public transport</b>		
Broxburn to Newbridge Roundabout bus lane	£3,124,700	£4,499,600
Station Road to Newbridge Interchange bus lane	£1,112,700	£1,602,300
A8 Eastbound Bus Lane from Dumbbells to Maybury Junction	£2,567,700	£3,697,400
Bus Lane under Gogar Roundabout	£64,100	£92,300
Maybury Road Approach to Maybury Junction	£2,140,400	£3,082,200
Improved bus priority linking South West Edinburgh with the Gyle, IBG and airport (including pedestrian / cycle facilities where appropriate)	£4,480,200	£6,451,500
Upgraded Bus interchange facility at Ingliston P+R	£3,000,000	£4,320,000
Kilpult Park and Ride	£5,500,000	£7,920,000
New Tram Stop	£1,000,000	£1,440,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£22,989,800</b>	<b>£33,105,400</b>
<b>Road</b>		
Link Road Part 1 Dual Carriageway	£6,301,000	£9,073,400
Link Road Part 2 Single Carriageway	£2,813,900	£4,052,000
Segregated Link Road cycle route	£1,115,000	£1,605,600
Development Link Road Main Street Carriageway	£5,634,900	£8,114,300
Dualling of Eastfield Road Phase 1	£1,802,900	£2,596,100
Dualling of Eastfield Road Phase 2	£1,143,000	£1,645,900
Dumbbells Roundabout Improvement	£1,203,000	£1,732,400
Dumbbells westbound off-slip signals	£865,200	£1,245,900
MOVA improvements at Newbridge, Dumbbells, Gogar/Maybury	£1,510,000	£2,174,400
Newbridge additional lane from M9 onto A8	£581,300	£837,100
A8 Gogar Roundabout – 4 lane northern circulatory improvement	£1,699,200	£2,446,800
Gogar to Maybury additional eastbound traffic lane	£20,833,300	£30,000,000
CEC Maybury improvement scheme	£1,294,500	£1,864,100
<b>Total</b>	<b>£46,797,200</b>	<b>£67,388,000</b>
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>£75,132,600</b>	<b>£108,190,800</b>

**Supplementary Question**

Sorry to disappoint you Lord Provost! I thank the Convener for her answer. Whilst I very much welcome the investment that has been gained or secured by the City Deal, I am conscious that this is very much focused on the A8 corridor which exists between Newbridge and Gogar. One of the big concerns right now is the gridlock and the congestion further to the north at the Barnton junction and along the Queensferry Road, a problem which risks getting worse because of the terms of the Local Development Plan which the previous Council voted through. To my mind, there appears to be no real plan to address this problem (I'm conscious it's a big and complex one). So, could I simply ask her if she will write to me to outline what this Administration plans to do about it. Thank you.

**Supplementary Answer**

Councillor Lang, I will do more than that, I will write to you and invite you to meet with the officials with me to discuss some of the issues that are obviously emerging in your Ward. Thank you.

**QUESTION NO 5**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the  
Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

- Question** (1) On what date was the decision taken to commence the resurfacing and improvement works at the Silverknowes roundabout on 11 September?
- Answer** (1) The decision to commence works on or around 11 September was made at the time of contract award in May 2017.
- Question** (2) Why were local ward councillors not informed of the commencement date or provided with detailed project drawings until just a few days before the works?
- Answer** (2) Councillor notification usually runs in parallel with resident notification (and normally includes a copy of the resident notification letter which incorporates a location plan) so should be sent out 7-14 days prior to work starting on-site. This ensures residents are advised in good time but not too far in advance of the actual start date. It should be noted that the local ward councillors at the time, were originally provided with detailed scheme drawings in October 2016 during the development of the scheme.
- Question** (3) What assessment has been made of the effectiveness of the neighbour notification procedure for these works?
- Answer** (3) The form of neighbour notification used for the works at Silverknowes Roundabout is similar to that used for all capital improvement schemes of this nature. This aims to have the resident notifications issued 7-14 days in advance of works starting. In this instance, however, it is acknowledged that the notifications were distributed later than would normally would be the case. The performance of the distribution company in this regard will be investigated. In addition to notification letters, advance signage was erected two weeks prior to works commencing.

**Question** (4) What potential exists to complete the works within a shorter period than the expected 14 weeks?

**Answer** (4) The scheme duration is dictated primarily by the site constraints and traffic management required to maintain pedestrian and vehicular movements through the site. Providing the contractor with unhindered access to the site through closures of all arms of the roundabout could reduce the duration, however this would be at the expense of significant traffic disruption.

**Supplementary Question** Well, whilst I'm on a roll then, can I thank the Convener for the detailed answers which she has provided and, more importantly, thank her and Councillor Key for stepping in last week to try and deal with a whole series of issues around this project, issues which I completely understand and appreciate long pre-date her time as Convener. Nevertheless Lord Provost, I hope she will understand that there are many of us who have viewed this project as a complete and utter shambles involving an initial flawed design, botched and misleading communications with residents, local councillors kept completely in the dark and a wholly inadequate alternative pedestrian diversion arrangement. Will she agree that, as a new Convener, hopefully with a fresh approach, that she is well placed to review all of these issues to try and ensure that such a sorry state of affairs is not allowed to happen again?

**Supplementary Answer** I recognise some of the issues that Councillor Lang has brought forward here, although I would suggest that perhaps his characterisation of the processes around that is a little extreme. I would suggest, first of all, that there are lessons to be learnt from this particular instance and I would suggest that we pull together some form of meeting for some of the local residents, the community councils, etc with officials to actually learn from that and I would be happy to be there. Thank you.

**QUESTION NO 6**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

- Question** (1) What outstanding issues remain to be resolved to ensure Firrhill High School Hockey Club has an adequate pitch on which to train and play?
- Answer** (1) Pitches at both Firrhill and Oxgangs need to be lined.
- Question** (2) What is the anticipated timescale for resolving these issues?
- Answer** (2) The Firrhill pitch was lined over the weekend of 16 September. The Oxgangs pitch is due to be lined on Friday 22 September, weather permitting.
- Question** (3) Will the Convener give assurance that he and department officials will engage with Firrhill High School and Oxgangs Primary School to ensure a long term future for Firrhill High School Hockey Club with as minimal disruption as possible?
- Answer** (3) Yes. The Head Teacher continues to work closely with all stakeholders to find a long term solution.
- Question** (4) Why are new pitches which are being laid in Edinburgh schools such as Firrhill not suitable for competitive hockey beyond S2?
- Answer** (4) Because the pitches that are being laid are able to meet the secondary school PE curricular use. No surface exists that is compatible for competitive hockey and all purpose PE use.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer. Progress on this matter has been very slow and has caused a lot of concern locally but I am pleased to see we now have a timescale. In terms of the lining, is he able to confirm that the hockey club is being kept free of expense and that this is now being met by Amey?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Unsure about your last question here but in relation to the answer, if I can give you a guarantee that the lines will be drawn on 22 September. I will personally go up there to make sure they're drawn and if they're not drawn I will draw them myself, weather permitting !

**QUESTION NO 7**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the  
Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question** (1) In relation to the Council owned properties at 5 Ratho Park, Ratho Station occupied by Cheque Centres Limited please advise of any outstanding sums due to the Council?

**Answer** (1) All rent and service charge due under the terms of the lease are paid in full to 27 August 2017. There are no outstanding sums.

**Question** (2) What steps are being taken to recover said sums?

**Answer** (2) No action is required at present.

**Question** (3) What was the Council's total contribution during the term of occupation of Council owned premises at Ratho Station or elsewhere by Cheque Centres Limited, in terms of

- (a) agreed rental reduction,
- (b) fitting out of premises and
- (c) any other net benefit to the company?

**Answer** (3) (a) A 30-month rent free period was granted on entry. This was spread over the initial 5-year period, which equated to a rental reduction of £106,745.50 p.a.

(b) In addition to the above, a capital contribution was made in the sum of £166,750.

(c) These reductions reflect a combination of normal market incentives and costs of fitting out the property from a shell condition and were approved by the Finance and Resources Committee on [1<sup>st</sup> November 2012](#).

All other sums due during the term of this lease have been paid, in full, by Cheque Centre Ltd. Up to 27 August 2017, this equates to £505,663.75 in rent and £430,000 service charge.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer. The poor return on investment aside, I'm sure the Convener will appreciate that subsidising a now former pay day loan lender with hundreds of thousands of pounds of Council taxpayers' money remains a matter of public concern. Can he confirm that no similar arrangements will be made with other such companies during this Council term?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank Councillor Rust for his supplementary. I don't think there is any serious prospect that we would be doing something similar to this. If you think back to the time when we decided that we would lease this property to this particular company it was because there was no other interest from any other quarter in taking out a lease in the property and it remained simply a liability in the Council's books. What we managed to do was to gain an income stream from letting the Cheque Centre take this place over. Now, as you know, they are moving into liquidation but we will still be able to receive the full amount of rent that was due. I think on the whole it has been a prudent thing for the Council to do although I can well understand the political sensitivities of coming to a similar arrangement with a similar company.

**QUESTION NO 8**

**By Councillor Rose for answer by the  
Convener of the Housing and  
Economy Committee at a meeting of  
the Council on 21 September 2017**

The current update to housing statistics for Scotland published by the Scottish Government include the following qualification to the figures:

"Figures for the private sector new build completions for the City of Edinburgh have been estimated from 2015 Quarter 4 onwards due to quality concerns of data derived from building completion certificates. Estimates for Edinburgh have instead been based on private new build house sales data from Registers of Scotland, with further assumptions on self-builds and private sector led Section 75 completions which are not captured in this data source. The estimates for Edinburgh are being investigated further and are subject to change in future publications."

**Question**

- (1)** What is the extent of delays in issuing building completion certificates over the last five years?

**Answer** (1) The figures show that the percentages for time taken to issue completion certificates within 5 working days following final site inspections were as follows:

Q1 2015/16	82.0%
Q2 2015/16	93.3%
Q3 2015/16	80.9%
Q4 2015/16	71.5%
Q1 2016/17	71.8%
Q2 2016/17	67.8%
Q3 2016/17	87.3%
Q4 2016/17	83.1%
Q1 2017/18	91.2%

These figures do not include temporary occupation certificates. These are required when an amendment of warrant is required (for example when there have been design changes during construction). Temporary occupation certificates are also required where partial works have been completed – e.g. some flats in a larger block of flats.

**Question** (2) When will this be resolved?

**Answer** (2) Performance in issuing completion certificates is in line with performance in other authorities. However there are other aspect of the process that require attention. The Building Standards Improvement Plan was reported to Planning Committee on 17 August 2017 in the [Planning and Building Standards Customer Engagement Strategy and Building Standards Improvement Plan report](#) .

**Question** (3) What measures are being taken to resolve this failure of service

**Answer** (3) The above report sets out the measures that are being undertaken to address performance. Progress will be reported to the Planning Committee.

**Question** (4) Please give the information requested above in relation to the timely issue building warrants

**Answer** (4) A building warrant is ready to grant once all satisfactory information has been received. The percentage of warrants granted within 10 days following receipt of final plans is as follows:

Q1 2015/16 43.4%

Q2 2015/16 35.2%

Q3 2015/16 34.5%

Q4 2015/16 35.8%

Q1 2016/17 35.9%

Q2 2016/17 32.5%

Q3 2016/17 27.4%

Q4 2016/17 27.2%

Q1 2017/18 23.4%

This aspect is a measure of part of overall performance. The action to improve this is set out in report to the Planning Committee as indicated above.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost. I thank the Convener for his answer in which I note that the performance in granting building warrants within the standard timescale has steadily fallen from 43% to 23% from June 2015 to June this year. Now, I learn from the accompanying report, and indeed from constituents, that a proportion of this work has been outsourced to other local authorities, namely Argyll and Bute and Aberdeen. A couple of small questions for the Convener. First of all how long has this outsourcing been taking place? And, secondly, will he be willing to supply me with a full copy of the poor Performance Inspection Report initiated by the Minister for Local Government and Housing delivered to the Council in April this year?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you for the questions. How long has it been in place? Right now I can't answer that. I suspect that the decision to outsource was made prior to my position in this post. I will certainly get that information to you. If there is no reason why the Inspection Report can't be released, it will be released and I'll make sure you have a copy of it.

**QUESTION NO 9**

**By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question** (1) To ask the Convener for an update on a feasibility study into the possible amalgamation of services provided by the Northfield Community Centre, Gilmerton Community Centre and Piershill Library, conducted by Edinburgh University on behalf of CEC, and for which Northfield Community Centre continues to provide data.

**Answer** (1) There has been no feasibility work undertaken by Edinburgh University.

**Question** (2) To ask the Convener to confirm that amalgamation of community centre and library services in Northfield and Gilmerton will not take place

**Answer** (2) The Council has approved a city wide review of assets with a view to reducing the size of the Council estate. This review includes Libraries and Community Centres and a range of options will be developed that might include, where appropriate, opportunities to co-locate services. Service user engagement will be important and every effort will be made to work in partnership with key stakeholders.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much. It's fair to say that the situation with libraries and community centres in this part of the City is causing some confusion. At the last meeting of the Northfield Community Centre, the Management Committee were told unequivocally that an amalgamation with Piershill library was not on the agenda. So I wonder if I could ask the Convener, and I'm grateful for his answer, if he could provide the community centres with some further clarity about exactly what the situation is with amalgamations with the library services? Thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

The answer is contained in Answer (2) that there is a review ongoing and all the libraries and all the community centres will be part of that review. When the review is complete it will come to Committee and we as Councillors will see that and we can make our judgements against it. I will say there has been some confusion and I accept that particularly with Edinburgh University there being this notion that they were coming in to do a feasibility study. That wasn't exactly true. Edinburgh University offered their services to help us with the consultation process. So I think that's where part of the confusion came in.

**QUESTION NO 10**

**By Councillor Johnston for answer  
by the Convener of the Corporate  
Policy and Strategy Committee at a  
meeting of the Council on 21  
September 2017**

**Question**

What procedures are in place to deal with potential conflicts of interest in terms of an elected member's role and their role as a champion, and what additional powers or budgets do champions have access to?

**Answer**

Council on 24 August 2017 appointed champions to act as ambassadors for specified areas. These appointments are compatible with the role of elected members. Duties that councillors undertake must comply with the Councillors' Code of Conduct and standing orders in relation to committee business. Should any conflict of interests arise, these will be dealt with, in the regular manner, in compliance with the Code. Council also decided that champions should consult with, and be accountable to, the relevant committee and their Convener. This should minimise potential conflicts. There are no additional powers or budget provided to champions and decision making remains in the hands of the relevant committee.

**QUESTION NO 11**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

The Scottish Government announced on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2017 that it will support the introduction of a Low Emission Zone in Edinburgh by 2020 and the Administration has made a commitment to introduce one in the Council's business plan. It appears from the press reports and Government Consultation that this is likely to be fines for vehicles entering the zone. There have been reports that Edinburgh would like to be one of the first LEZ in Scotland. Could the Convener indicate:

- Question** (1) When will the Council publish their plans showing where the LEZ will be?
- Answer** (1) The Scottish Government has issued a public consultation document (Building Scotland's Low Emission Zones). The Council is engaging in this consultation and a response will be considered by the Transport and Environment Committee in December.
- Question** (2) Which vehicles will be affected?
- Answer** (2) This will be considered in future reports to the Transport and Environment Committee.
- Question** (3) Whether there will be exemptions for residents who live within the zone?
- Answer** (3) This will be considered in future reports to the Transport and Environment Committee.
- Question** (4) What is the timescale for introduction so that people can begin to plan for any introduction of a Low Emission Zone given the extremely short timescales being proposed for the introduction of said zones by the Scottish Government?
- Answer** (4) This will be considered in future reports to the Transport and Environment Committee.

**Question** (5) How are the decisions regarding the above matters to be taken and what empirical evidence will be used as the basis for taking these decisions?

**Answer** (5) This will be considered in future reports to the Transport and Environment Committee

**Supplementary Question** Thank you. I would thank the Convener for her answer but there isn't really an answer because there is no information that we were seeking except that this will be considered in future reports to the Transport and Environment Committee. So, what I would ask the Convener is, given that this is obviously a substantive piece of work that's been undertaken, given the commitment that Edinburgh has said that the various members of the Administration, supported by their cheerleaders, agreed they would like to be early adopters of low emission zones and the lack of progress we seem to have made on this matter, can you confirm that all other projects recently agreed to, such as the implementation of the Parking Action Plan, will go ahead and will not be superseded and fall off the agenda as they have done previously?

**Supplementary Answer** First of all I appreciate the frustrations attached to the answers given in the written answer but inevitably, at this stage, I would not, if you will excuse the vehicular allusion, want to be jump started into providing information that at this point still has to be pulled together. I think it is only right and proper that the development of the low emission zones work and the project is brought to the Transport and Environment Committee for a more detailed examination which certainly wouldn't be possible in this Chamber. In terms of, essentially, the diary management of the projects that have already been committed to, I can assure you that it is certainly my intention to bring forward all of the projects that have come under my jurisdiction as Convener. Thank you.

**QUESTION NO 12**

**By Councillor Johnston for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

Given the guidance regarding repairs in shared buildings has not been updated in some time, will the administration consider a fresh public awareness campaign, to further explain both the rights and responsibilities for owners and occupants?

**Answer**

The Edinburgh Shared Repairs Service (ESRS) constantly seeks to raise awareness with owners and occupants, supported by specific campaigns throughout the year. The Autumn campaign is due to start in mid-October and this includes multiple promotion and awareness raising methods, such as updated leaflets, factsheets, and guidance, both in print and online, and by the use of social media. In addition, officers from the ESRS will continue to attend events and deliver presentations to groups of owners throughout the city.

**Supplementary  
Comment**

I thank the Convener for that answer. I think that a new public awareness campaign is very timely and I look forward to engaging with it. Thank you.

**QUESTION NO 13**

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

The 'Overtime working and working time payments' section of the Orb states that 'No function should be routinely reliant on overtime working in order to deliver its service.'

**Question** (1) In light of the first quarter budget overspend and the projected overspend for the 2017/18 financial year, can the Convener please advise the total spend on overtime in the year to date and the projected budget for overtime for the remainder of the financial year.

**Answer** (1) The current expenditure on overtime working for the financial year to date is £2,715,618.

The total budget provision made for overtime for the financial year is £6,255,088. Although this allocation has been made, it may not be required to be fully utilised. Projections for overtime are challenging to provide with a high degree of accuracy, given the exceptional circumstances that this may be applied to address.

**Question** (2) Can the Convener please confirm the contributions of individual departments to the total overtime spend as given in the answer to Question 1 and provide details of the circumstances under which overtime working is authorised.

**Answer** (2) The breakdown of overtime expenditure by Directorate to date, is as follows:

<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Current expenditure</b>
Communities and Families	£614,266
Place	£1,286,266
Health and Social Care	£267,849
Resources	£391,588
Safer and Stronger Communities	£147,115
Chief Executive's	£8,534

Overtime working may only be approved in exceptional circumstances. Examples of such circumstances can include: annual billing activities for council tax and non-domestic rates; major events such as Edinburgh's Hogmanay or during the Edinburgh Festival; ICT system related changes being implemented during weekends; etc

**Question** (3) Are the reasons for overtime working as given in the answer to Question 2, deemed to be exceptional or is overtime working seen as a long-term solution?

**Answer** (3) Overtime working is not a long-term solution. The use of overtime working is one of several measures that may be applied to address demands upon services or to temporarily increase resource levels in exceptional circumstances, only where deemed necessary.

**Question** (4) Can the Convener please confirm what actions are currently in place or planned to be put in place to manage and reduce the overtime spend.

**Answer** (4) Executive Directors and their management teams are responsible for managing overtime within their Directorates. Monthly management information about overtime working is provided to senior managers to enable appropriate scrutiny and controls to be applied.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his response. A quick few follow up questions. Given the significant variance in the overtime spend across departments as shown in the answer to part (2), can the Convener please provide assurances that the Overtime Policy is being applied consistently across the Council? With a budget of over £6m for overtime for the financial year, does the Convener agree that stricter enforcement of the Overtime Policy could be a means of reducing the projected budget overspend for the financial year? And finally, following the recent Members' Bulletin noting a recruitment freeze, can the Convener please confirm that a cost benefit analysis of this Policy set against the projected £6m spend on overtime has been carried out? Thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I thank Councillor Hutchison for his three supplementary questions. First of all, on the variance across departments, as you will appreciate the demands for overtime across departments are going to vary according to the nature of what they do. Some will have more volume, festivals for example, than others and some will be more involved with things like the work peaks that are involved in putting out Council Tax notices. So, yes there is variance, and that's natural, but we do keep it under review and it's something that I've been keen to stress talking to the Head of Finance that we do keep all overtime under review and that managers only ever allow it where there is a compelling operational need.

In terms of stricter enforcement, I think I've just addressed that point. It's something which I think is, that is one aspect and the other thing in this area would be the number of agency staff that we take on. Everything to do with staffing levels in the Council is under review virtually week by week as you might imagine in the Council's financial situation.

I can't immediately answer your third question about the cost benefit analysis but I will be happy to get back to you about that.

**QUESTION NO 14**

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for  
answer by the Convener of the  
Housing and Economy Committee at  
a meeting of the Council on 21  
September 2017**

**Question**

What are the missing conditions that have resulted in large areas of undeveloped land remaining void of new housing in the Edinburgh Waterfront, in our otherwise economically successful City?

**Answer**

Prior to 2008, it was anticipated that land at the Waterfront would be developed by private developers for first time buyers and to a lesser extent families and larger households. The major landowners in the area sold development sites to private developers for speculative housebuilding. The banking crisis led to a reduction in availability of mortgages to first time buyers and a fall in land prices. In some cases, housebuilding came to a halt whilst, in other cases, land was traded or simply lay derelict awaiting development. Granton Hesperus is an example of a development where works stopped on site in 2008. It was only when the Council provided grant funding to Dunedin Canmore Housing Association that the development was completed. The downturn in the housing market had a greater impact on the Waterfront than other parts of the city due to a heavy reliance on the first time buyer housing market, fragmented land ownership and challenging infrastructure constraints.

Since 2009 there has been piecemeal development in the Waterfront, supported largely by Scottish Government grant funding administered by the Council. Housing associations have managed to secure land at Granton Harbour and the wider Waterfront area and have completed 465 homes, with an additional 545 homes either under construction or about to start on site.

The Waterfront has suffered from over 40 years of post-industrial decline, which has in many areas, resulted in particularly challenging infrastructure constraints. In an attempt to accelerate the delivery of new homes and wider

regeneration of this area, the Council is already working in partnership with the Scottish Government to identify ways in which investment in infrastructure can be made to overcome barriers to development. Through City Region Deal, the Scottish Government has committed to work with the Council on a site- by -site basis to support local authority borrowing and to share the financial risk of infrastructure delivery. It is anticipated that the development of a wider regeneration strategy for the area, consolidation of land ownership and public sector led investment will accelerate progress and help meet the shortfall of affordable homes for those on low to medium incomes.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer. Just building on his indication that he is in discussions with the Scottish Government about what can be done going forward, would that include looking at the mix of housing that might work in the Waterfront and also might it include a study of whether a growth accelerator model might provide a way of lowering the initial costs but spreading the costs of infrastructure into the future?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary. I'm not sure the growth accelerator model would be one that would be fitting for that area by all means that can be raised with the Scottish Government. We will do everything we can to accelerate development in that area. The answer suggests it's been blighted by and during the recession. I also take the opportunity to welcome you to come and have a chat with officials and myself and the Vice-Convener. Let's talk about how we can all work together to get that area moving.

**QUESTION NO 15**

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

The boundary fence between Baberton Mains Housing Estate and the A720 City Bypass is in a terrible state of repair. The bypass boundary fence has never had any maintenance work carried out since it was built to prevent trespass onto the A720 during its construction in the mid to late 1980s.

Can the Convener confirm that she will contact AMEY to request its engagement with residents to ensure the integrity of this boundary and repair and assist the 1,000s of residents of this area?

**Answer**

The legal position on the boundary fence between Baberton Mains Development and the A720 (City Bypass) is that this is owned and maintained by the proprietors of the houses. The fences between house plots being mutual with adjoining proprietors, with fences of open spaces in the estate being the joint responsibility of all the proprietors of the properties. This was placed in the title deeds relieving the original developer (Wimpey) of all responsibility for any future maintenance. The Council therefore is not responsible for the maintenance of these fences.

However, I have asked that the South West Locality approach AMEY on my behalf to establish if they will be willing to engage with local residents to effect repairs to the boundary fence in question in order to mitigate the risk of people gaining access to their network.

The South West Locality will report back to me once a response has been received from AMEY.

**Supplementary Comment**

Can I thank the Convener for her answer and I very much look forward to working with her while we look to resolve this matter. Thank you.



**QUESTION NO 16**

**By Councillor Daggart for answer by  
the Chair of the Edinburgh  
Integration Joint Board at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question** (1) Following the departure of Rob McCulloch-Graham as Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the EIJB, could the Chair provide a timetable to Council for the recruitment of a replacement CEO?

**Answer** (1) The Integration Joint Board will consider what action needs to be taken at its meeting on 22 September 2017. Robust interim arrangements have been put in place to ensure that financial, performance and quality issues for the service are dealt with quickly and efficiently.

**Question** (2) In light of the Care Inspectorate Report into health and social work for older people in Edinburgh, what steps has the Chair of the EIJB taken to ensure that the new CEO will address the quality indicators that the Care Inspectorate found to be less than adequate?

**Answer** (2) Work is already underway to address the recommendations in the Care Inspectorate's report. An improvement action plan has been developed and regular progress reports are considered by the IJB. A progress report will also be considered by the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee on 3 October 2017. Ensuring delivery of improvement actions will be a key focus for the interim Chief Officer and subsequent appointee to this role.

**Question** (3) Following the Council Leader's verbal commitment at the last Council meeting to implement the 17 recommendations of the Care Inspectorate report, what representations has the Chair of the EIJB made to the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee for an increase in the 2018/19 Budget to meet the recommendations?

**Answer** (3) All adult care needs and any improvement measures will be considered as part of the normal budget process for the 18/19 financial year. The Convener of the Finance and Resources is fully aware of the pressures on the adult care budget.

**Supplementary Question** Lord Provost thank you and I thank the Chair of the Board for his response. I think it would be appreciated by members of Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee if the update to that Committee could include a summary of the actions agreed tomorrow in terms of the replacement of the Chief Officer.

In terms of the specific Directions of the Board, could the Chair of the Board please indicate whether Direction 1F – Publication of Locality Improvement Plans by October of this year will be met and could he give a specific date for publication?

**Supplementary Answer** Thanks Lord Provost and I thank Councillor Doggart for his supplementary question. Locality Improvement Plans in respect of the Neighbourhood Partnerships in the Council's localities, I know that's being taking place elsewhere. Health and social care and the Integration Joint Board will align with that and publish at the same time.

## QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

### Question

Given the successful community-led buy-out by Action Party of the former church on Bellfield Street in Portobello, the first exercise of right to buy powers in urban Scotland, what support does the Council plan to provide to other community groups considering using the right to buy provisions or considering transfer of ownership of a local asset?

### Answer

Community right to buy powers, which were extended under the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015, apply to all properties. The Act also introduced powers relating to Community Asset Transfer which are applicable to the purchase or lease of public sector property. This is the anticipated route for applications to purchase Council assets. Our policy on Community Asset Transfer was approved at Council in [March 2017](#) and this policy will also form the basis of the Council's approach under the right to buy powers.

A small team has been established within Property and Facilities Management which will advise groups seeking to submit proposals under the legislation.

### Supplementary Question

I thank the Convener for the answer. Lord Provost, I know the Convener will be aware of the level of anger in the community and the city more widely this week because one of Scotland's first major community right to buy projects, the Sick Kids Hospital in Edinburgh, has been derailed. The NHS sold the site to the Downing Group before even allowing the Marchmont/Sciennes Development Trust the chance to enter into the right to buy process. The Trust notified Government Ministers several times of their interest in purchasing the site and had fantastic plans which included truly affordable housing for a range of different occupiers.

But they were met with repeated knock backs due to technical issues with their applications. Not because their plans for the site were wrong, not because their vision was wrong and not because funding was absent, but because the process was wrong. Instead of the Government and NHS providing the community group with the help to get past these hurdles with a very very complicated sale, they simply refused the applications on technicalities

So, would the Convener please write to the Scottish Government requesting an urgent report into the failure to support the community bid so there can be transparency about what went wrong and so that lessons can be learned on how better to support future community bids? And will he also ask Council staff to be proactively engaging with the Trust to develop support for community groups who need help to navigate the process to ensure that future applications are given a fair hearing?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Lord Provost, I would like to thank Councillor Miller for her question and also for the supplementary. I'm certainly more than happy to do that but I think also in my reply I would say that the issue that you are getting at is one that very much occurred to me in the answering of this question but is not actually contained in the answer and that is how we proactively promote the structure and the process for taking up these powers in the future. I have now instructed the Communications Team to come up with a plan to do this proactively to get the message out to our communities about how they engage with these new powers.

That's one thing I would say and the other answer to the question would be that, certainly in answering this question I have amassed quite a bit of information on exactly how to engage with these powers and I will be circulating that to elected members so that they can enact their leadership role in their local communities and disseminate and promote engagement with these new powers with their own communities.

**QUESTION NO 18**

**By Councillor Main for answer by the  
Chair of the Edinburgh Integration  
Joint Board at a meeting of the  
Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

How many hours of required care at home per week, have the Council and its contracted partner providers each been unable to provide over the last year, broken down week by week?

**Answer**

The table below shows the number of hours of care which providers have been unable to offer over the last four months. Full year figures are unavailable because of changes to recording, which were introduced to support the new care at home contract in autumn 2016.

The table gives the following detail of people waiting for domiciliary care:

- The hours for which people aged 65 and over are waiting, split into: a) waiting to move on from the reablement service, effectively reducing the service's capacity for new clients; b) other people waiting in the community, most of whom will not be in receipt of support already; c) people in hospital
- The number of hours needed by people aged under 65 years
- The total number of hours needed

Time Series of Hours Waiting	Older People				People aged under 65	Total
	a) Receiving Reablement, awaiting Mainstream service	b) In the community, including people with Intermediate Care	c) In hospital	Total	Total	
27/03/2017	763	1,780	1,172	3,715	1,151	4,866
03/04/2017	752	1,835	1,263	3,850	1,188	5,038
10/04/2017	655	1,888	1,227	3,770	1,321	5,091
17/04/2017	587	1,914	1,176	3,677	1,285	4,962
24/04/2017	703	1,853	962	3,518	1,267	4,785
01/05/2017	670	1,956	748	3,374	1,452	4,826
08/05/2017	638	2,018	654	3,310	1,486	4,796
15/05/2017	717	1,993	618	3,328	1,503	4,831
22/05/2017	897	2,203	677	3,776	1,489	5,265
29/05/2017	947	2,370	650	3,966	1,568	5,534
05/06/2017	908	2,302	801	4,011	1,657	5,668
12/06/2017	929	2,238	1,119	4,286	1,526	5,812
19/06/2017	867	2,243	1,033	4,143	1,580	5,723
26/06/2017	886	2,238	1,011	4,135	1,359	5,495
03/07/2017	942	2,250	1,016	4,208	1,412	5,620
10/07/2017	904	2,365	1,186	4,455	1,464	5,919
17/07/2017	964	2,223	1,203	4,390	1,394	5,784
24/07/2017	1,048	2,297	1,199	4,544	1,565	6,109
31/07/2017	1,069	2,332	982	4,382	1,584	5,966
07/08/2017	1,101	2,471	1,225	4,796	1,431	6,228
14/08/2017	1,109	2,555	1,368	5,032	1,477	6,509
21/08/2017	1,100	2,646	1,272	5,018	1,524	6,542
28/08/2017	1,101	2,599	1,344	5,045	1,591	6,635
04/09/2017	1,118	2,552	1,266	4,936	1,605	6,541
11/09/2017	1,195	2,600	1,121	4,916	1,576	6,492

**QUESTION NO 19**

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

As a category one responder, expected to be among the first to deal with any incident, has the Council assessed the possible impact of a release of radioactive material from 1) military convoys carrying nuclear warheads and high explosives by road, and 2) radioactive waste transports by rail, that pass through or near to the City?

**Answer**

The City of Edinburgh Council works through Resilience Partnerships, in conjunction with other designated Category 1 Responder Organisations, including the Emergency and Health Services and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) to examine the potential impacts, outcomes, response arrangements and mitigation measures related to a range of risks that might impact on the local area. This work is led by multi agency groups, chaired by the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) and the information is published in Community Risk Registers available on the SFRS web site at: <http://www.firescotland.gov.uk/your-safety/community-risk-register.aspx>

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thanks very much and I thank the Convener for her written answer. My written question was about planning in the event of an incident involving radioactive material that is transported near or through Edinburgh on a regular basis such as military convoys and nuclear power station waste from Torness. The answer provided pointed me to the East of Scotland Community Risk Register. I'm not sure if the Convener has had a chance to look at the Register but I could find no mention of radioactive material on the Register at all which is surprising and perhaps confirms a report by NukeWatch and Green MSP Mark Ruskell that Edinburgh has not conducted risk assessments on weapons convoys and has not planned how the Council would respond to an incident nor inform the public about the risks.

I would be happy to provide that research report to the Convener if she would be prepared to investigate the matter further perhaps with a view to bringing a report to a future Transport and Environment Committee.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Burgess for the supplementary questions. I think that's a deal we can strike. You give me the report and we'll come back okay? Thank you very much.

**QUESTION NO 20**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

What plans does she have to reform the Council's Cycle Forum?

**Answer**

The Council has an Active Travel Forum whose remit includes cycling. There are no agreed plans to change this. Arrangements are currently being made for a programme of meetings over the next year.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost. I thank the Convener for her reply. She will be aware of discussions on social media and elsewhere about how well, or otherwise, the Active Travel Forum addresses the concerns of both pedestrian and cycle groups compared to having separate pedestrian and cycle forums as previously.

Now, I appreciate that she doesn't want to set up meetings for the sake of meetings but I hope she can reassure me that she will continue to discuss with pedestrian and cycle groups, as well as the Council's Cycling Champion and other relevant stakeholders, to ensure that the Council has the best mechanisms to take the active travel agenda forward.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Booth. As you know, I've been actively engaging where possible particularly on projects like Silverknowes roundabout as highlighted by Councillor Lang with the concerns raised by the groups you have referenced. The Active Travel Forum is currently being prepared for the early part of November and I hope that the cycling groups will find it an appropriate forum this time. We are looking at form and outcome at the moment. If at a later date there is a need for flexibility around that, then I would be very happy to entertain the possibility of a further specialist forum for cycling groups in particular. In the meantime, I am happy to have meetings, where appropriate and possible given diary commitments, with anybody who has concerns coming forward. Thank you.

**QUESTION NO 21**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

What conversations has the Council had with the Scottish Government regarding taking forward a low emission zone for Edinburgh?

**Answer**

On 6 September I, together with chief officers met with Humza Yousaf, Minister for Transport and the Isles to discuss a range of transport issues including implementation of LEZs.

Additionally, Council officers met with Transport Scotland officers on 12 September to discuss LEZs.

## QUESTION NO 22

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

### Question

What quality assessment does the Council undertake to ensure that cycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects adhere to the Council's own design guidelines, and to Scottish Government design guidelines?

### Answer

The Council's new street design guidance was approved by Transport and Environment Committee on [25 August 2015](#) and endorsed by Planning Committee on 3 October the same year. This document is intended as the first point of reference for all street design in Edinburgh, including, but not confined to, projects specifically aimed at improving conditions for walking and cycling.

The Edinburgh Street Design Guidance (ESDG) aligns closely with the Scottish Government's Designing Streets policy statement, with objectives that reflect the 'six qualities of successful places' set out in Designing Streets.

Work on the bulk of the technical guidance documentation accompanying the ESDG is nearing completion. Work is also underway on formally incorporating the use of the ESDG into internal management processes.

### Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost. I'm going to disappoint you again I'm afraid! I thank the Convener for her reply. I note that the reply talks about the development of the Council's Street Design Guidance but it doesn't mention the Scottish Government's Cycling by Design Guidance which I asked about in my question. And it doesn't actually answer my question about what quality assessment is carried out to ensure that the works the Council undertakes or procures does actually comply with the Guidance. Councillor Lang has already raised the issue about Silverknowes roundabout and she will be well aware of that.

The original proposals there did not, as far as I understand it, comply with the Cycling by Design Guidance. Now, the Convener may be aware of Living Streets' dossier listing a total of 14 instances where recent works did not, in their view, meet with the Council's own Design Guidelines which suggests that there may be a systematic problem. In light of the very welcome announcement this week of more than £12m of Community Links PLUS investment, I hope she agrees with me that the quality of delivery on the ground will be absolutely crucial and will she agree to meet with me and with representatives from cycling and pedestrian groups to develop an action plan for ensuring high quality delivery of walking and cycling infrastructure in future?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you very much Councillor Booth for that supplementary. I couldn't agree with you more about the importance of getting it right and I would be very happy to meet with you to discuss this subject in more detail.

**QUESTION NO 23**

**By Councillor Young for answer by  
the Convener of the Planning  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

The Council's Planning and Building Standards Customer Service Charter includes a commitment to "respond within 10 working days or tell you if we need longer." What percentage of correspondence to Planning and Building Standards have met this commitment in each of the last 5 years?

**Answer**

The casework management system which is used to manage applications and warrants does not record data relating to correspondence which would allow analysis to assess whether the target response time is met. The service is currently working with IT and Business Intelligence teams to retrieve the figures for general Planning and Building Standards enquiries raised through the Customer Contact centre. A briefing will be provided to members.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you very much and thank you very much Convener for your reply. I do have to say though I do find it a little surprising that we have Service Level Agreements set up and are actually able to monitor but not actually able to meet them. So, I was going to ask if you would be willing to commit to ensure that the briefing you mention in your reply does make reference to what action we can take to address the frequency of the 10 day deadline not being met because otherwise there's not really any point in having that standard set. Thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I thank Councillor Young very much for her supplementary question. I completely understand the frustration that she expresses in her supplementary question but I think it is important to note the fact that the Charter was established to set out exactly what our citizens have a right to expect from the planning service but also to serve as an important indication to highlight what staff expectations have in order to how they address the demands that citizens have from the planning service too.

Now, there is unfortunately huge administrative work that would have to go into providing the kind of statistics that Councillor Young is looking for and to provide that level of administrative work to do so would actually take us away from the objective that we actually want to try to achieve which is to bring down handling times to increase the service provision that we offer. However, if it is data that the Councillor wants I'm quite happy to give her some statistics which she might find useful from last year alone. We have 42,000 calls that have been received by the planning department, almost 4,500 planning applications heard, 16,000 building warrant inspections and only 170 complaints to the department. Now, of course, even one complaint is one complaint too many. However, I think that demonstrates that we have a planning department that handles an extremely huge caseload and is actually serving the public well. However, the Councillor does ask that we look into how we provide more assurance, how we streamline our service, how we provide a better level of service quality but also how we can report on that and I'm happy to investigate that. Thank you.

**QUESTION NO 24**

**By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question** (1) What income has been generated by the fees paid from Cruise Liners visiting the port at South Queensferry, in each of the last 5 years?

**Answer**

(1)

Year	Net Income
17/18	£268,300.00 projected
16/17	£254,375.03
15/16	£221,502.60
14/15	£277,240.47
13/14	£242,078.19
12/13	£207,227.59

**Question** (2) What budget area do these fees contribute to?

**Answer** (2) Income generated forms part of the Transport Services budget within Place.

**Question** (3) How much of this income, in each of the last 5 years, has been specifically used to fund projects or make improvements in South Queensferry, and what were these?

**Answer** (3) The income forms part of the overall revenue budget and is not spent on specific projects.

For your information, there is a piers maintenance budget and approximately £75,000 is spent per annum.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you very much and thank you indeed for the answers and the details provided. Whilst noting that the income is not being ringfenced for the local area in particular, and that there is a fund of £75,000 already allocated to maintaining the pier, there is still, in fairness, well over £100,000 of income being generated for the transport part of the base budget. Now, in the local community of Queensferry they do experience a lot of disruption from these visits but they don't feel they're getting any local benefit. And indeed the local amenities being used by those visitors from the cruise ships, and indeed the residents themselves, are often well below acceptable standard. So, I would like to ask the Convener if he would agree to look at utilising some of this income to make some essential improvements such as the public toilets in South Queensferry which, it has to be said, are currently an extremely embarrassing first impression to these visitors, and to generally consider the potential for a small fund for other similar amenity improvements on a more regular basis? Thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank Councillor Young for her question. You're quite right to say there's no ringfencing around this amount of money and it does go into the Transport Directorate's budget. What I usually say when people make suggestions like this is please show me the business case to support what you want to do and if you want some help from officers in getting that business case together then I'm sure they would be happy to provide it. It is worth saying, however, that although the answer, or indeed your question, covers the last five years that some, 2011 I think it was, major structural repair work costing the best part of £1.5m was at Hawes Pier. So the demands for financing the pier, not only that one but also the Longcraig Pier, can vary very much from year to year depending on the state of the weather and so on what that might do over a harsh winter. So, we do need to take all these factors into consideration in the round. But as I say if you do want to bring forward the case for some amenity, you mentioned public lavatories and so on, then that's obviously something that could be considered within the context of available budgets.

**QUESTION NO 25**

**By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question** (1) What consultation takes place between CEC, Event Organisers and the local community on the annual Pedal Scotland event which goes through Kirkliston every year?

**Answer** (1) A number of planning meetings are held with the organisers as well as the blue light services and adjacent affected authorities to discuss and plan the event every year. The organiser informs residents along the route between Glasgow and Edinburgh of the closures and restrictions via a targeted residents' letter and on-street pre-warning signage as well as notices, correx and the associated traffic management.

The organisers have been asked to make contact with any affected Community Councils well in advance of the event.

The organiser also has an informative website to share details with the participants as well as the many residents and businesses along the route that have to negotiate the road closures. Within the Edinburgh boundary the Legal Order detailing the closures and restrictions is also advertised in the local press in advance of the event

**Question** (2) How has this engagement influenced traffic management and residential access decisions over the years?

**Answer** (2) Engagement has led to changes to the route, the type and level of traffic management, and access and egress arrangements that will continue for as long as the event takes place in Edinburgh.

**Question** (3) What consideration has been given to variations in route, considering the growing size of Kirkliston's population?

**Answer** (3) Access and egress for residents and businesses is carefully considered to mitigate disruption. An example of this is that the bus gate between Kirklands Park Street and Eilston Road is rescinded on the day of the event to allow movement for vehicular traffic to the B800 which allows access to the north and east to enable free movement in and out of Kirkliston

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much and thank you very much Convener for your answer. Now, I note in your response reference to the organisers being asked to make contact with any affected community councils in advance of the event. Unfortunately this isn't actually happening on the ground and I've got confirmation from Kirkliston Community Council that, despite repeated attempts, they've not actually been actively engaged. So, I'd like to ask the Convener if she can commit to ensuring the local consultation that is documented does actually in reality take place for next year, ideally through that Community Council and that would just allow for discussions on how disruption can be minimised for residents and also just ensure that we don't just copy and paste what's happened this year into next year and take some lessons forward. Thank you.

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you Councillor Young for your supplementary. Clearly an event like this grows and evolves and certainly around this issue of communication we have to grow and evolve in order to answer the community's concerns. We will reinforce this with the event organisers about their role and responsibilities in all of this and, indeed, you and I can discuss further whether or not there are any measures the Council have to take. Thank you.

**QUESTION NO 26**

**By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 September 2017**

**Question**

Is the Council aware of the impending HW students traffic study of the Lanark Road area and does the Council have any plans to consider this in light of future developments in Balerno?

**Answer**

A transport appraisal of the new developments allocated in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (adopted November 2016) was carried out in 2014. This includes the allocated sites in Balerno. This appraisal considered the cumulative impact of the plan-led developments supported in principle by the Local Development Plan. It informed the LDP Action Programme, which sets out a number of transport actions in the area.

Officers would welcome the opportunity to review the Heriot-Watt Students' traffic survey of the Lanark Road area and consider its results.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and can I thank the Convener for her information within the Local Development Plan Action Plan. In the Action Plan it talks about a number of improvements such as a new MOVA system at Gillespie Crossroads, extra bus stops at Newmills no doubt to slow traffic down again, and improving cycle routes to Curriehill Station etc. That's all good and well but can I ask Councillor Macinnes that with around 140 homes being built at Ravelrig which will compound traffic issues at the lights at Balerno, can you confirm that a MOVA system will be installed at this location because I can't see it in the Action Plan and also with around 400 new homes under construction in Balerno and Currie which will no doubt equate to around an extra 650 cars on Lanark Road West. What other infrastructure plans do you have to support this amount of traffic? Thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Bruce for your supplementary question. You've raised some very detailed issues and I would hesitate to make any particular comment on them at this time but I would be happy to come back to you on them. Thank you.