

THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

MEETING 5

22 OCTOBER 2015

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Item no 5.1

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Edie for answer by the Council Leader at a meeting of the Council on 22 October 2015

Question

Following questions and reassurances received about the Council's commitment to a Transient Visitor Levy, please list what communication there has been with the Scottish Government since April on this issue?

Answer

Further work on the development of the proposition has taken place since April and well as informal consultation of members of the industry. There have been two material meetings between Council Officers and Government Officials. These were on 24th September and 7th October 2015.

The dialogue and the development of the proposition continues as has been instructed by Council.

Item no 5.2

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Orr for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 October 2015

Question

Concerns have recently been expressed (for example by Living Streets Edinburgh and the Southside Association) about a number of oversized or badly placed new bus shelters, with advertising panels now at right angles to the road. Some of these have resulted in excessive restrictions on the space available for people walking along the footway.

Have the worst examples, such as Buccleuch Street in the Southside, been installed in line with the new contract?

What action is planned to review and remediate these worst examples?

Under the contract, what is the minimum width of space which must be left on the footway for wheelchair users or pedestrians to pass?

Answer

There are some locations that currently have advertising shelters that will have to be replaced with smaller non advertising shelters due to limited footway width. We will look to find suitable alternative locations for advertising shelters, install smaller types of bus shelters with advertising and consider footway widening works in order to assist.

A number of bus shelters are located on narrow footways and have restrictions of around 1 metre in width adjacent to end panels or glazing. This is an existing issue and common to Edinburgh's narrow streets. The replacement shelter programme should not be creating any unacceptable restrictions.

The shelter at Buccleuch Street actually complies with the minimum clear footway width of 1 metre, however, having reviewed the site, we have decided to replace the shelter with one that has a less obtrusive design.

The Council's Bus Friendly Design Guide notes that ideally a minimum circulating passage of 1.4m be provided.

However, as this can be difficult to achieve in some locations, the guidance does state that in exceptional circumstances the acceptable width can be reduced to 900mm. National guidance documents from the Department of Transport (Inclusive Mobility Guidance) and Transport for Scotland (Roads for All) is also referred to and they state that a 1 metre minimum width over the length of the shelter is deemed suitable.

JCDecaux has been instructed to speak to us before progressing with any site that may encounter this issue, or where there is any concern about shelter positioning, busy footways or adjacent properties that may be adversely affected.

Item no 5.3

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 October 2015

Question

What overspend (if any) has there been in Devolved School Management Budgets per High School in each of the past three financial years (a) in real terms and (b) as a percentage of budget?

Has any such overspend been written off? If yes, please advise (a) the name of school and (b) the amount of write off?

Answer

The budget position for each school is in the attached table.

Budgets are monitored closely through a quarterly budget return from each school. Each school has a nominated finance officer who provides support and training for Head Teachers and Business Managers.

For any school in an overspend situation an action plan is in place to reduce the overspend over an agreed period.

A Self Assurance Programme is being rolled out across schools. This includes assessment of financial controls.

School	2012/13		2013/14		2014/15		Notes on Overspend
	Actual Carry Forward Overspend	Percentage of Total Budget	Actual Carry Forward (Overspend)	Percentage of Total Budget	Actual Carry Forward (Overspend)	Percentage of Total Budget	
Balerno Comm High School	21,571	0.6%					
Boroughmuir High School					13,318	0.30%	
Broughton High School							
Castlebrae Comm High School	338,192	17.5%			34,927	1.99%	Overspend relating to 2012/13 written off.
Craigmount High School	79,033	1.6%	9,476	0.19%			
Craigroyston Comm High School	54,240	2.3%	96,875	4.32%	87,082	3.92%	
Currie Comm High School							
Drummond Comm High School							
Firrhill High School					1,252	0.03%	
Forrester High School			434	0.02%			
Gracemount High School							
Holy Rood RC High School							
James Gillespie's High School			158,059	3.57%	200,955	4.73%	
Leith Academy							
Liberton High School	77,279	2.6%	61,112	2.29%	13,089	0.51%	
Portobello High School							
Queensferry Comm High School	159,807	4.7%	103,679	3.31%	83,664	2.74%	
St. Augustine's RC High School							
St. Thomas of Aquin's RC High School			38,011	2.35%	150,725	4.63%	
The Royal High School					34,318	0.73%	
Trinity Academy	76,912	2.0%	156,491	4.49%	212,252	6.28%	
Tynecastle High School					969	0.04%	
Wester Hailes Education Centre	392,120	11.0%					This related to the Leisure centre not the school.

Item no 5.4

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Nick Cook for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 22 October 2015**

Question

To ask the Convener of Transport and Environment if, like Fife Council, CEC has any plans to pilot or introduce 4 weekly waste collections in Edinburgh? What discussions have taken place between coalition elected members and officials regarding the possibility of 4 weekly collections?

Answer

Waste Services currently has no plans to pilot or introduce 4 weekly residual waste collections and no discussions have taken place with elected members in this regard.

Item no 5.5

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Orr for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 October 2015

Question

In May 2011 the Council signed up to the Covenant of Mayors – a European initiative where towns, cities and regions commit to reducing carbon dioxide emissions through greater energy efficiency and renewable energy generation.

A requirement of this Covenant is that a SEAP (Sustainable Energy Action Plan) must be produced setting out how the reduction in emissions will be achieved. A SEAP report was commissioned from a third party contractor during the last administration but it was later shelved and never used. The process was restarted in 2013 by the current administration and a new (in-house prepared) draft SEAP was in existence from at least November 2013. After further delays the Sustainable Edinburgh Annual Report for 14/15 gave February 2015 as the new deadline for completion. However, as at November 2015, and four and a half years since signing the Covenant, the SEAP on the council website is still in draft form.

Can the Convener comment on whether or not she feels that this level of performance meets the standard that the people of Edinburgh expect of their council?

Assuming that a final version is published one day can the Convener confirm that she is confident that the council does have the ability and drive to fulfil its role in the implementation of the SEAP?

Answer

As Cllr Orr will be aware from his time as lead with the Sustainable Energy Action Plan, as well as securing commitments from the Council the SEAP also needs to involve key partners in the City.

A huge amount of work has been underway since the February Committee across the five SEAP programmes to get the commitment of these key partners. An updated report to November Committee will show that there has been an additional 216.8 kt of CO2 reductions included in the plan, this is an increase of 15.7% and has been identified from initiatives undertaken by service areas in the Council and through external stakeholders. This represents 81.3% of the reduction necessary to achieve the 2020 target. This is great progress and will continue.

In addition the Edinburgh SEAP received special praise from the Eurocities Secretary General following her recent visit to the Council for the fact that it identifies both mitigation and adaptation measures in the programme.