

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Godzik
answered by the Executive
Member for Health, Social
Care and Housing**

Question (1) What action is being taken to counter rising crime in and around the Meadows?

Answer (1) The police advise that crime levels have remained largely static in and around the Meadows. This area has lower crime than many parts of the policing area. There has, however, been a small increase over the summer months. The high number of persons attracted to this area during the Festival Fringe period is clearly a contributory factor for opportunist thieves.

The police have looked analytically at how best to reduce crime in and around the Meadows. A comprehensive series of measures have been introduced in the locality, including: increased patrols by Community Police Officers, Youth Action Team and Safer Communities Unit as well as CEC Environmental Wardens and Community Safety Officers; increased use of mobile CCTV; and greater patrols by the Mounted Section. Consideration is also being given to having extended police coverage on a Friday/Saturday night.

Question (2) Will the City of Edinburgh Council consider installing CCTV in the area?

Answer (2) Full Council considered the priorities for CCTV expansion in January 2007 at which time the Meadows was not agreed as a priority area.

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

A technical survey of the area has shown that:

1. Any CCTV will have limited coverage because trees and other obstacles restrict the potential view.
2. Large areas of the Meadows would also require to be lit.
3. CCTV works best where it can monitor access and exit points. The Meadows are a wide open space and would require extensive CCTV installation to properly cover the area.

Local residents, at a meeting with Elected Members, expressed concern that the significant work necessary would alter the character of the area.

The Council maintains a number of portable CCTV units which are being deployed in support of police operations in the area. The Mobile CCTV Unit which provides an overt presence is also being deployed routinely at this location. The Council will continue to work with the local community and the police to reduce crime in and around the Meadows.

**Supplementary
Question**

I see from the answer that the Executive Member has met with residents' groups but can I ask if he has met with Edinburgh University Students' Association on the matter and will he consider doing so in the near future?

**Supplementary
Answer**

That would have been the previous Executive Member who met with residents' groups but I would be happy to meet with the elected member and residents' groups in the future.

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Johnstone
answered by the Convener of
Planning**

Question

Following the approval of the Edinburgh Standards for Sustainable Building as supplementary planning guidance to be met by all 'major' planning applications submitted after 1 May 2007:

1. How many developers have submitted self-assessed Sustainability Statements since this date?
2. What proportion of these self-assessed Sustainability Statements have been audited?

Answer

1. To the end of July 2007
 - 6 basic scale major applications (2 strictly pre-policy introduction)
 - 7 large scale major applications (strictly pre-policy introduction)
 - 24 other pre-application schemes subject to meetings and correspondence
 - 10 other schemes subject of detailed enquiries
2. To the end July 2007
 - 6 basic scale all assessed and further supporting information awaited
 - 7 large scale all assessed and further supporting information awaited

Notes:

1. 'Basic' scale is more than 10 residential units, over 1000 sq. m. or sites of 0.5 hectare and less than large scale. 'Large' scale is more than 250 units or non residential of 5000 sq.m. or sites of 1 hectare and individual developments included within a master plan exercise.

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

2. Majority of assessments will be positive, if supporting information provided.
3. The process is still at an early stage reflecting the number of schemes requiring a more extended pre-application or assessment process.
4. As all are 'major' applications there may be a range of substantive issues over and above sustainability also needing resolution.

**Supplementary
Question**

Does the Convener of Planning know if the Executive intends to extend the requirement for Sustainability Statements to developments of less than 10 residential units?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I can provide a written reply to that question. We have a team looking into this and most developers have been very receptive. I will ask the Director to advise you of the Council's plans on this matter.

QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Whyte
answered by the Executive
Member for Transport and
Infrastructure**

Question (1) How much of the Council's contribution of £45m to the tram project is expected to come from developer contributions?

Answer (1) The current working assumption is that £24.4 million in cash and contributions of land valued at £2.2 million will be obtained. This was set out in the report to Council on the Tram draft Final Business Case on 20 December 2006. This will be reviewed and will be reported back to Council with the Tram Final Business Case report. This is anticipated later this year and the working assumptions are that the amount attributable to developer contributions will be similar. The remainder comes from the value of the land in Council ownership underneath and alongside the tram route.

Question (2) What is the total value of contributions which have been secured from developers to date?

Answer (2) **PHASE 1A – Airport to Ocean Terminal**

The land contributions have been secured through agreement and are valued at £1.2 million.

The cash contributions are currently as follows:-

The amount where contributions have been secured and have been paid to the Council is £1,328,000.

The amount where contributions are secured through agreement but not paid (yet where development has commenced and payment is relatively certain) is £1,667,000.

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

The amount that has been secured through agreement but not paid (development has not yet commenced) is £1,868,000.

This gives a total of £4,863,000 that has been secured through agreement.

A further £3,452,000 is potentially available but relates to agreements that the Council is currently trying to conclude.

PHASE 1B – Russell Road to Granton Square

The land contributions have been secured through agreement and are valued at £1 million.

The cash contributions are currently as follows:-

There have been no payments made in relation to this section of the route. This is largely due to the fact that a number of consents for large areas of development were granted prior to the introduction of the Tram Developer Contribution Guideline.

The amount where contributions are secured through agreement but not paid (yet where development has commenced and payment is relatively certain) is £300,000.

The amount that has been secured through agreement but not paid (development has not yet commenced) is £80,000.

This gives a total of £380,000 that has been secured through agreement.

A further £2,509,000 is potentially available but relates to agreements that the Council is currently trying to conclude.

Question

- (3) What amount does the Council expect to secure from developer contributions between now and the commencement of tram operations?

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

- Answer** (3) This will depend on the rate of development over the next 4 years. The likely range of contribution will be between £4 – 6 million. The approach being developed is explained in answer 4.
- Question** (4) What mechanisms are to be used to secure any remaining contributions from identified development sites that will not have obtained planning consent prior to commencement of tram operations?
- Answer** (4) The Council has made policy provision in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan to continue applying the contribution policy beyond the commencement of tram operation. Legal advice has been sought and this approach is acceptable, providing the Council is repaying borrowing and states up-front the borrowing to be repaid by developer contributions. This will be the subject of reports to both the Planning Committee and Council in due course.

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

QUESTION NO 11

**By Councillor Burgess
answered by the Executive
Member for Environment**

- Question** (1) Whether the Council Executive plans to contribute to building a new incinerator to burn large volumes of Edinburgh's household waste or alternatively whether it will take steps to reduce the overall amount of waste and to increase recycling as promised in both Liberal Democrat and SNP manifestos.
- Answer** (1) The Administration is committed to reducing waste, promoting re-use, increasing recycling and diverting waste from landfill. There are a number of technologies available to treat residual waste. The Area Waste Project Team will not specify a particular technology, but will invite bidders to come forward with proposals, which will be assessed against the Best Economic and Environmental Option by the group of 5 councils working together on this issue.
- Question** (2) Whether the Council Executive is committed to the household waste stabilisation target as set out in the 2003 National Waste Plan and re-iterated in the 2007 Scottish Executive Household Waste Prevention Action Plan and if so whether this will be reflected in decisions it is taking relating to incineration.
- Answer** (2) Yes.
- Question** (3) Whether the Council Executive is committed to achieving the target of '75% recycling by 2020 towards Zero Waste' as promised in 'Winning a Bright New Future for Edinburgh' the Liberal Democrat manifesto.
- Answer** (3) Yes.

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

- Question**
- (4) Whether the Executive is aware that building and operating a new incinerator to burn large volumes of household waste:
- (i) is likely to undermine current efforts to increase recycling;
 - (ii) may tie the Council into maintaining high waste volumes to satisfy contracts with incinerator operators;
 - (iii) is contrary to the proximity principle enshrined in the National Waste Plan;
 - (iv) does not eliminate waste but generates around 25-30% ash which still has to be disposed of;
 - (v) can produce as much Climate Change pollution as a gas-fired power station (per kilowatt of electricity generated);
 - (vi) is likely to pollute the environment, including with dioxins harmful to human health.
- Answer**
- (4) All technologies for the disposal of residual waste have advantages and disadvantages which will be weighed up in assessing the best economic and environmental option for residual waste management.
- Question**
- (5) Whether the Executive is aware that many of our European neighbours, including the Netherlands and Germany, are already meeting recycling and composting targets in excess of 60%, that Flanders recycles or composts about 70% of its waste and that 27 local authorities in England & Wales already recycle and compost in excess of 40% of their waste.

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

Answer (5) Across Europe, the range of materials which contribute to their recycling performance are often more extensive, which makes other countries appear to recycle more than the UK. For example it is our understanding that Construction and Demolition waste is included by some countries in calculating their recycling rate. The Council recycles construction waste but this is classified as industrial waste in the UK and is excluded from the recycling rate. However, the amount of residual waste that this project will divert from landfill will ensure the Lothian and Border Councils will be one of the top 4 performers in recycling in Europe by the year 2013.

Question (6) To give the locations of possible sites that may be considered for a new incinerator or residual waste treatment facility.

Answer (6) It will be up to bidders to identify potential sites for residual waste treatment facilities which will then be fully assessed by the 5 project partners, ie the City of Edinburgh, Midlothian, West Lothian, East Lothian and Borders Councils.

**Supplementary
Question**

I asked whether the Council was committed to achieving the target of 75% recycling by 2020 promised in the Liberal Democrat manifesto because, at its last meeting, the Council's Executive approved a response to a review of the Area Waste Plan. This stated that Edinburgh would only achieve 40% recycling and went on to support options in the paper that included between 45% and 56% residual waste treatment and that could mean incineration.

Can the Executive Member reassure us that officers are aware of the Executive's policy to achieve 75% recycling and that incineration of large volumes of Edinburgh's household waste will not be acceptable?

The City of Edinburgh Council
23 August 2007

**Supplementary
Answer**

I can give an assurance on the former and on the latter, as you will note in the answer to the last question, we are committed to working with the other four neighbouring authorities on an Area Waste Plan. That does not specify any particular technology for dealing with residual waste and we will rely on bidders putting forward their view on how that residual waste would best be met and we will judge that on what is the best environmental and economic option for our joint five Council areas.

Appendix 2
(As referred to in Act of Council No 18 of 23 August 2007)

Standing Order 62

Receiving Deputations

62. (1) The Council or any Committee or Sub-Committee can hear deputations on any matter that is included in its power and duties or delegation.
- (2) Every application for a deputation must be from an office bearer of an organisation or group or a person presenting a petition. It must be submitted in writing or by e-mail, set out the subject and be signed by a representative of the organisation or group wishing to be heard and delivered to the Council Secretary no later than one working day before the meeting concerned. However, the Lord Provost or Convener can choose to ignore this requirement.
- (3) The Council Secretary will submit the application to the relevant Committee. An application for a deputation to a Council meeting shall only be submitted to the Council if it relates to an item of business on the agenda for that meeting or if the Lord Provost decides that there is sufficient reason for the Council to consider it.
- (4) When the Council, Committee or Sub-Committee considers whether to hear a deputation, it must not discuss the merits of the case itself. Unless the meeting agrees unanimously to hear or to refuse to hear the deputation, a vote will be taken without discussion on whether to hear the deputation.
- (5) A deputation will have 10 minutes to present its case. If the meeting decides to hear more than one deputation on the same subject, they will be heard together. The Lord Provost or Convener will decide how much time to allow.
- (6) Any member can put a question to the deputation that is relevant to the subject but the merits of the case must not be discussed by members until the deputation has withdrawn.