

Supplementary Council Questions and Answers

City of Edinburgh Council

10.00 am Thursday, 19th November, 2020

Virtual Meeting - via Microsoft Teams

Supplementary Questions and Answers V2

Contacts

Email: gavin.king@edinburgh.gov.uk

Tel: 0131 529 4239

Andrew Kerr

Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Annex

Item no 5.1

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question

Can the Convener list the road safety projects in which the design, tendering or implementation has been delayed as a result of officer resource being diverted to Spaces for People projects?

Answer

The Council has prioritised resources towards the delivery of the Spaces for People programme, to ensure that people can walk, wheel and cycle safely during the global COVID-19 pandemic. This includes improvements to road safety to the city's 140 or so schools.

A report is being prepared for the Transport & Environment Committee on 28 January 2021 on the prioritisation and delivery of the road safety programme. This report will include further information on planned projects.

Supplementary Question

The Convener did not answer my question. I asked for a list of road safety projects that have been delayed. Can the Convener provide this factual information or explain why it cannot be provided now?

Supplementary Answer

As was noted in the written answer a full report will be forthcoming at the next Transport and Environment Committee. The analysis has not been carried out as this would require a review of several programmes and would need to be cross referenced with projects carried out or underway in the Spaces for People programme. Some projects all or in part have been taken forward in advance of timescales, some are on track and others have been delayed which means they need to be amended. This process would require data collection, analysis, review and management oversight and consultation with members. Officers are undertaking a full review and the report will be open to detailed scrutiny in January, when Councillors will be able to ask for specific explanations.

Item no 5.2

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Further to the answer provided in response to question 5.5 at the 15 October 2020 meeting of the Council:

- Question** (1) Has the Convener been able to obtain an installation date for the speed table?
- Answer** (1) The final design and delivery of this feature will now be included and budgeted in the Queensferry High Street Town Centre project. Installation will be programmed with proposed early enabling works expected to commence Spring/Summer 2021.
- Question** (2) Has the Convener been able to obtain an explanation for the delays to the installation timetable?
- Answer** (2) Following the Transport Service restructure many staff have been deployed on a temporary basis to other critical teams or the Spaces for People pandemic recovery programme. Unfortunately, this situation has created the recent delay.
- Supplementary Question** Given officials initially agreed to carry out this work “in the first weeks of the 2019” school summer holidays, can the Convener clarify if she considers this latest delay to spring 2021 to be acceptable?
- Supplementary Answer** This is a topic that has been raised and responded to before at council questions. I have expressed my considerable concern to the service about the delay in implementing the speed table. I fully recognise the frustrations for the local community. However, acknowledging the fundamental impact of COVID-19 on all Council services, I recognise the the reasons why this has not been completed this year. I will expect officers to take a proactive approach to informing local ward councillors of the different stages towards the expected start dates of spring/summer 2021.

Item no 5.3

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question (1) Can the Convener confirm the criteria currently being used to determine whether a repair in a Council tenant property is considered an emergency?

Answer (1) Emergency repairs include un-containable leaks, blocked toilets, loss of heating and or hot water, loss of electricity, smashed window or property unsecure and smoke alarm repairs. The service aims to carry out emergency repairs within 4 hours of them being reported.

Question (2) In light of the ongoing COVID-19 restrictions, what is the current position with respect to addressing non-emergency repairs which have been reported by Council housing tenants?

Answer (2) From 5 October 2020 the service has been taking appointments for non-emergency repairs.

This includes all repairs with the exception of two person visits to avoid close contact with our operatives whilst carrying out repairs within our tenant's home. The Council's website will be updated when the service is able to offer this appointment.

Questions (3) How many non-emergency Council housing repairs are currently outstanding and how does this compare to pre-COVID levels?

Answer (3) There are a number of non-emergency repairs that are scheduled to take place in the coming days/weeks. Each of these have an agreed booked appointment slot with the tenant. Our current schedule does not exceed 4 weeks as per our recovery+ plan. This does exceed pre COVID timescales as non-emergency appointments were generally achieved within 10 days.

**Supplementary
Question**

My third question has not been answered. I asked how many non-emergency repairs are outstanding and the response provided said “a number of repairs are to be carried out”. I ask again; how many such repairs are outstanding and what was the relevant number before COVID-19?

**Supplementary
Answer**

There are currently 2547 appointments scheduled to be carried out over the next five-week period. All tenants receive a text reminder the day before the appointment.

For the same time period last year 3358 appointed jobs were completed. Our system only holds information on work completed looking back.

With our current resources there is still space in our diary's looking forward to programme in a similar level of work this year.

Item no 5.5

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Howie for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question (1) What is the current criteria for the allocation of sheltered housing?

Answer (1) The Council letting policy sets out that that preference is given to households over 55 or where a member of the household has a need for this type of accommodation such as a younger person who has a life-long or progressive medical condition or who needs more accessible housing due to restricted mobility.

Sheltered housing is therefore targeted towards people who have been awarded a Gold priority for bidding for homes through a Choice based letting system, who have mobility needs that can be met in this type of accommodation. Where no households meet the criteria and have made a bid for the property or the properties but do not meet the needs of people with gold priority the homes will be offered to older households or households where there is a current or future need for this accommodation.

Question (2) How many sheltered housing tenancies have been allocated to applicants who require partially or fully adapted accommodation in the last 5 years?

Answer

- (2) The terms “partially” or “fully adapted” housing are not used in the description and letting of Council homes. Prospective tenants are advised if a home has a wet floor shower or if the homes is fully wheelchair accessible.

In the last 5 years there have been 705 new lets in Council Sheltered Accommodation. Of these lets 314 went to households awarded a gold priority due to mobility reasons. This included 176 homes which were fully wheelchair accessible.

When a tenant is allocated a home an assessment of any requirement for adaptation is made and adaptations carried out in line with the tenants needs. Where a sitting tenants’ needs change and there is an assessed need for further adaptations those adaptations will be made. For example 28 major adaptations in sheltered housing were carried out in 2018/19.

Questions

- (3) How many sheltered housing tenancies have been allocated to applicants who do not require partially or fully adapted accommodation in the last 5 years?

Answer

- (3) The remaining 391 new lets in Council Sheltered Accommodation not allocated to households with a gold priority are as shown in the table below.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Silver Priority applicants – This priority is awarded based on housing need and includes homeless households and households downsizing to smaller accommodation | 210 |
| Waiting time – this will mainly be older households with long waiting time who have a need for this type of accommodation | 181 |

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you to the Convener for her answer.

Notes that the Convener confirms allocation of sheltered housing for those who need it and those who don't. Is there a plan to review the allocation of sheltered housing, taking into account demographic changes and pressure on hospital beds in relation to delayed discharges?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Sheltered housing is currently managed through the Council's existing Letting Policy, which means that any properties available for let are advertised and allocated in line with this policy. While sheltered properties are currently advertised with a preference for households aged 55 or over, they will also be offered to people who are younger, but are assessed as needing the adaptations.

While there are no plans to review the Letting Policy at the moment, we continue to monitor housing need, supply and demand. The Council has committed to letting 70% of its homes to homeless households and in 2019/20 13% of homes were allocated to people with gold priority.

Housing and Health and Social Care colleagues have been and continue to work together to identify shared priorities and outcomes for people with assessed housing need. We are keen to align suitable housing with appropriate care and support for a variety of client groups, to ensure that service users' needs are met in the right way.

The Home Accessibility Referral Team assesses people with mobility issues to ensure that they get priority when they bid for social housing. This includes sheltered housing.

In terms of delayed discharge, HART has a Housing Outreach Officer who works with colleagues from NHS Lothian to ensure that people delayed in hospital as the property from which they were admitted no longer meets their mobility needs are awarded urgent gold priority. While some of the people delayed in hospital choose to go in to sheltered housing (and they have the highest level of priority to do so), the majority choose mainstream housing that meets their needs (potentially with adaptations). Many patients are younger, so sheltered housing is not something they would consider.

Item no 5.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Spaces for People Proposals for Lanark Road/Inglis Green Road

Can the Convener confirm

Question (1) How many comments were received in total regarding the scheme?

Answer (1) During the notification period a total of 343 comments were received.

Question (2) How many comments were:

(a) from individuals and

(b) from organisations

Answer (2) a) 329 responses were received from individuals.

b) 14 responses were received from organisations (including those responses received from elected members).

Questions (3) How many were:

(a) for/supportive of the proposals;

(b) against/objections to the proposals;

(c) neutral

Answer (3) Of the responses from individuals, 19 were supportive, 300 were against the proposals, and 10 were neutral.

Of the responses from organisations, four were supportive, seven were against and three were neutral.

**Supplementary
Question**

The feedback assessment provided to councillors on Lanark Road states: "Public. Over 300 emails received both in favour and against". We see from the answer that 300 (92%) were in fact against and 19 (<6%) were supportive. In light of the Convener's answer does she genuinely consider that the feedback to elected members by the department accurately and properly represented the position?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Notification was sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, RNIB, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 25 September 2020.

In response to the notification exercise over 300 emails were received from the public expressing both support for and opposition to the proposals.

An exact breakdown of public responses was not provided in the Assessment Feedback Form but all points and themes raised were addressed. In addition, it was noted that a public petition with over 1,000 signatures opposing the proposals had been submitted to Councillors.

Whilst the public are not part of the established notification process discussed and agreed by Policy and Sustainability Committee in May. It should be clear that on larger projects like this that we are listening to communities and their concerns. There have already been changes made to the design proposals based on feedback provided.

Recognising public input, considering all comments made and adapting proposals where possible is all part of an established process around the Spaces for People initiative, as has been exemplified on different proposals across the city.

Item no 5.7

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Can the Convener confirm

- Question** (1) Following the announcement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in respect of the extension of the scheme to end March what discussions have taken place regarding placing of CEC employees on furlough?
- Answer** (1) Council service areas that had previously furloughed employees/workers were asked to consider whether they had any categories of employees/workers who remained eligible to be furloughed under the extended Scheme. Meetings have been held between Finance, HR and officers from the respective service areas to discuss current service requirements and assess if any further furlough application should be considered.
- Question** (2) How many CEC employees are currently furloughed?
- Answer** (2) 36 Council employees are currently furloughed, all of whom work in the Council's Outdoor Education facilities.
- Questions** (3) What sum has been received from UK Treasury in furlough payments?
- Answer** (3) The Council has received £0.449m income in respect of claims to 31st August 2020 under the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme. It is anticipated that further payments totalling c. £0.160m will be received in respect of claims for the period 1st September to 31st October.
- Questions** (4) Is it CEC's intention to furlough further employees?
- Answer** (4) As stated in response to question 1, this is still under active consideration by service areas, Finance and HR. Any further furlough application will be reported to the Finance and Resources Committee as a part of the Revenue Budget Monitoring Report.

- Questions** (5) How many CEC staff are currently redeployed in areas of work, which is not their usual area of work and what teams are involved?
- Answer** (5) This information is not held corporately by the Council, because the redeployment of staff is managed at a local level in service areas.
- Supplementary Question** In relation to the answer to point 5, am I correct in saying the answer is that the Council does not know where its staff are redeployed and what they are doing?
- Supplementary Answer** Human Resources holds a central record of employees impacted by Covid-19 e.g. infected, self-isolating, or unable to work from home, etc. The repurposing or redeployment of staff in response to Covid-19 and service renewal requirements is managed dynamically by individual service areas. It is therefore a service responsibility to manage their staffing and to determine where staff need deployed to address resource gaps and ensure essential services are maintained. Therefore, at a Council level, Human Resources does not hold this information.

However, there are many examples where people are working flexibly to respond to Council priorities without being formally repurposed or redeployed. For example, some Customer Contact staff have been utilised to support increased demand for contact with vulnerable people and to process the Government's business support grants which would not normally be part of their day-to-day responsibilities. Other examples include Corporate Catering staff supporting school catering and our cleaners who are performing their important work, but are being deployed flexibly across our learning estate to ensure that all our schools can stay open. All of our Council staff have been flexible and supportive from the outset of the pandemic and continue to be so to help us manage our services and support the City.

Item no 5.12

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Rose for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Non-Disclosure Agreements

Question (1) Can the Convenor advise of the total number and spend on Non-disclosure or settlement agreements of any type, from May 2013 to the present?

Answer (1) The request relates to non-disclosure or settlement agreements of any kind, which includes a very wide scope of information across the Council.

Examples of non-disclosure or settlement agreements include: commercial settlements; employment-related settlements; settlements relating to allegations of abuse; personal injury settlements. The Council also settles some insured claims (primarily in relation to roads defects) which fall within its insurance excess cap.

There is no single source for officers to interrogate and therefore unfortunately we are unable to provide the detailed information requested. To answer the question would require a solicitor to assess not less than 6,300 files in Legal Services alone in the period between May 2013 and present day, November 2020, which may, or may not, contain information relevant to the question raised. The cost to the Council of officers locating, retrieving and providing the information would be substantial, involving hundreds of hours of work to collate. The request is also likely to extend to Insurance Services and to all other Directorates who may directly hold contract engagement details on behalf of their own service.

Non-disclosure or settlement agreements are generally entered into by the Council in the interests of protecting the public purse. Given the breadth and nature of its services, the Council is litigated against on a regular basis. It is often

in the Council's best financial interest that a matter is settled out of court and that such settlements would also be subject to the agreement of the individual who may raise such a claim, where they will often have the benefit of independent legal advice, prior to agreeing any such resolution.

Any non-disclosure or settlement agreements of a sensitive or high value nature are subject to appropriate professional legal advice in relation to the terms of settlement, including the appropriate level of financial settlement. Advice is also taken in relation to related non-disclosure agreements, which might form part of certain types of settlement agreement and are often confidential both ways to protect both the Council and any claimant. Settlement agreements in the context of employment matters require the employee to take independent legal advice and such agreements cannot prevent employees from making protected disclosures regardless of any confidentiality provisions

**Supplementary
Question**

Thanks for the answer. Of course I understand the volume of work indicated in the answer would be unreasonable. On 2.5.19 I asked a question about NDAs in relation to staff, and received a helpful answer. Will the Convener agree to have it updated to the present, and to include numbers and costs for personal abuse (or personal detriment), as referred to in the Answer, over the same period as the original question (now extended)? This narrows the scope enormously.

**Supplementary
Answer**

The updated clarification helpfully narrows the scope of the information sought and relevant officers will now assimilate such information available for the purpose of a response.

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Spaces for People Expenditure to date

Question (1) Can a full breakdown of Spaces for People expenditure (incurred and scheduled) be provided please, broken down by project.

Answer (1) See table below

The current forecast programme expenditure sits at £5.5M, including contingency and a substantial allowance for scheme maintenance and removal. The project team have successfully gained additional 'Spaces for People' and 'Places for Everyone' funding from Sustrans to increase the overall project budget by £1.95m, taking the total budget to £6.95m. This increased budget will fully fund the proposed scheme list, allow us to make enhancements to schemes where possible, broaden the scope of surfacing improvements and further increase the removal of street clutter.

If changes to the budget or programme are required, then this would be reverted to the Transport and Environment Committee in January for approval.

Question (2) Can a breakdown of expenditure (incurred and scheduled) be provided, showing the expenditure with a view to making improvements to benefit:

- (a) Pedestrians
- (b) Cyclists
- (c) Safe Travel to Schools

- Answer** (2) (a) (b) It is not possible to give a clear breakdown of these costs as all interventions have been designed to make it easier and safer for people to move around our streets, These changes to our pavements, pathways and roads create space for everyone, whether they are
- walking
 - cycling
 - using a wheelchair or other mobility equipment
 - using a pram.
- (c) £150,000 has been allocated to interventions specifically relating to schools. £20,625.49 has been spent up to this point.
- Question** (3) How much has been spent implementing floating bus stops and implementing disabled parking bays?
- Answer** (3) Floating bus stops - £16k.
Disabled bays - £74.80 which includes removal.
- Question** (4) Given the supply line for the Cycle Lane Defenders meant they could not be installed initially at Comiston Road for example, as the supplier ran out, and more had to be produced to meet demand, what additional costs were incurred in material and time by the temporary cones and other measures prior to the further “temporary” measures?

Answer

- (4) The Creating Safe Spaces for Walking and Cycling report that was approved by the Policy and Sustainability Committee in May refers to the implementation of SfP measures that were dependent on funding and/or availability of materials and contractors. Due to the current circumstances there has been a high demand for the materials being used to create spaces nationwide. This includes the segregation units and as a result of the urgent nature of the measures, when required, a three-phase approach was taken. The three phases were 1) traffic cones then 2) traffic cylinders and finally 3) segregation units. There were no additional costs as these were planned costs to mitigate supply issues. The majority of the measures will have some form of adaptation through their existence to take on board feedback received, reviews and government guidance.

Supplementary Question

It strikes me from the answer that approximately £20,000 has been spent on safe travel to schools (or interventions relating to school as it is phrased) and yet in a previous answer to my colleague Councillor Jim Campbell, about £32,000 had been spent on installing and removing orange cylinders and batons as part of Spaces for People schemes. If accurate, is the Convener concerned by that limited level of expenditure on school travel measures at this time as stated in her answer and the contrast with spend on “temporary” orange batons which are now removed?

Supplementary Answer

Costs associated with interventions related to schools have been kept to a minimum because there is limited requirement for cycle segregation units or cylinders and more requirement for parking restrictions and road closures. As a result the materials used are more readily available and easier to install thus reducing the costs of the measures. It therefore seems inappropriate and unnecessary to compare levels of spending between projects of a different nature when successful outcomes are of primary concern.

Funding identified for the Schools workstream has recently increased to £200,000 all of which will be successfully allocated by the end of the programme with interventions introduced following assessments of over 130 schools throughout the city.

As shown in answer 1 it has been noted that we have received additional funding to make further progress across a number of different areas within the spaces for people initiative. This is a welcome indication that our work in this endeavour is moving in the right direction.

| Scheme | Status On / Off | Cost Projection | Maintenance Projection | Actual Cost to Date | Status |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| South Bridge | Awaiting decision | £117,683.55 | £12,033.17 | £1,369.75 | Underway |
| Waverley Bridge | On | £13,305.46 | £371.80 | £7,585.46 | Underway |
| Forest Road | On | £52,695.78 | £3,839.33 | £33,863.78 | Underway |
| George IV Bridge | On | £138,179.63 | £5,687.06 | £118,389.63 | Installed |
| The Mound | On | £148,331.72 | £2,669.17 | £148,088.37 | Installed |
| Princes Street East End | On | £100,375.96 | £2,469.90 | £95,282.23 | Underway |
| Victoria Street | On | £18,501.01 | £371.80 | £16,781.01 | Installed |
| Cockburn Street | On | £13,638.45 | £371.80 | £12,716.00 | Installed |
| Chamber St / George IV | On | £136,000.00 | £5,032.00 | £1,493.45 | Underway |
| Non-allocated Expenditure | On | £6,729.45 | £0.00 | £6,402.17 | |
| City Centre Phase 1 | | £745,441.01 | £32,846.03 | £441,971.85 | |
| Queensferry High St | On | £30,000.00 | £1,024.55 | £0.00 | |
| Great Junction St | On | £14,957.64 | £307.51 | £2,840.50 | Underway |
| Stockbridge | On | £48,494.40 | £3,784.70 | £3,126.50 | Underway |
| Portobello High Street | On | £30,132.72 | £1,965.44 | £2,598.50 | Underway |
| Newington | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |

| Scheme | Status On / Off | Cost Projection | Maintenance Projection | Actual Cost to Date | Status |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Gorgie / Dalry Road | On | £43,812.35 | £3,433.65 | £42,721.29 | Installed |
| Corstorphine | On | £43,060.40 | £2,953.17 | £3,243.50 | Underway |
| Bruntsfield | On | £31,983.48 | £2,389.81 | £29,998.69 | Installed |
| Tolcross | On | £31,761.69 | £1,652.80 | £29,898.08 | Installed |
| Morningside | On | £63,081.17 | £4,229.95 | £56,188.81 | Installed |
| Haymarket Terrace | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Easter Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Shopping Streets | | £337,283.85 | £21,741.58 | £170,615.87 | |
| Telford Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Carrington Road | On | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Fountainbridge Dundee | On | £61,858.64 | £4,980.14 | £0.00 | |
| Ferry Road | On | £106,284.88 | £8,168.73 | £100,146.32 | Installed |
| Melville Drive | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Teviot Pl / Potterrow | On | £6,952.32 | £257.24 | £0.00 | |
| Buccleuch St / Causewayside | On | £46,185.52 | £3,537.28 | £37,378.44 | Underway |
| Crewe Toll Roundabout | On | £28,995.00 | £1,880.20 | £0.00 | |
| Meadowplace Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Duddingston Road | On | £48,320.48 | £3,805.36 | £0.00 | |
| Wester Hailes Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Craigmillar Park / Liberton | On | £110,058.80 | £7,851.87 | £0.00 | |
| Gilmerton Road | On | £42,695.68 | £3,717.04 | £0.00 | |
| Crewe Road South | On | £88,222.63 | £5,116.01 | £85,216.63 | Installed |
| Old Dalkeith Road | On | £78,008.98 | £3,056.52 | £75,002.98 | Installed |
| Comiston Road | On | £139,839.05 | £10,466.80 | £113,207.61 | Underway |
| Ingils Green Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Pennywell Road | On | £119,757.32 | £8,785.73 | £111,788.32 | Installed |
| Mayfield Road | On | £29,715.11 | £2,380.00 | £0.00 | |
| QC - Meadows / Greenbank | On | £43,680.00 | £2,751.46 | £0.00 | |
| Queensferry Road 1a | Awaiting decision | £75,261.00 | £4,965.51 | £0.00 | |
| A1 Corridor | Awaiting decision | £93,692.00 | £6,662.40 | £0.00 | |
| Slateford Road (A70), Lanark Rd, Longstone Rd & Murrayburn Rd | On | £252,774.00 | £19,092.74 | £0.00 | |
| Orchard Brae | On | £13,330.00 | £851.91 | £0.00 | |
| Non-allocated Expenditure | On | £5,992.61 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Phase 1b Bus Lanes | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| West Coates | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Arterial Routes | | £1,391,624.02 | £98,326.94 | £522,740.30 | |
| East Craigs | Awaiting decision | £55,598.00 | £4,878.09 | £0.00 | |

| Scheme | Status On / Off | Cost Projection | Maintenance Projection | Actual Cost to Date | Status |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Drum Brae North | On | £36,419.00 | £2,896.50 | £0.00 | |
| Leith Connections | On | £42,880.00 | £4,087.20 | £0.00 | |
| Non-allocated Expenditure | On | £2,536.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Low Traffic Neighbourhoods | | £137,433.00 | £11,861.79 | £0.00 | |
| Braid Road | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Links Garden | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Cammo Walk | On | £1,700.00 | £0.00 | £1,700.00 | Installed |
| Warriston Road | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Stanley Street/Hope Street | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Braidburn Terrace | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Silverknowes Road (South) | On | £33,318.00 | £2,464.65 | £0.00 | |
| Silverknowes Road (North) | On | £27,900.00 | £2,306.09 | £0.00 | |
| Granton Sq / Gypsy Brae | On | £77,463.92 | £5,981.42 | £0.00 | |
| Braid Hills Drive | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Seafield Street | On | £2,174.00 | £78.10 | £1,467.00 | Installed |
| Kings Place | On | £17,177.00 | £929.50 | £877.00 | Underway |
| Arboretum Place | On | £12,431.46 | £729.55 | £1,766.10 | Underway |
| Maybury Rd Temp. Crossing | On | £55,883.63 | £1,950.00 | £22,975.84 | Underway |
| Spaces for Exercise | | £238,048.01 | £14,439.31 | £28,785.94 | |
| Broughton Street | Awaiting decision | £49,428.24 | £4,939.08 | £0.00 | |
| Broughton St Roundabout | Awaiting decision | £50,624.20 | £3,817.03 | £0.00 | |
| Restalrig Rd South - Opt. 2 | On | £6,920.00 | £416.20 | £0.00 | |
| West End of Princes Street | On | £3,763.00 | £316.92 | £0.00 | |
| Musselburgh to Portobello Opt. 1 Edinburgh section | On | £55,399.20 | £5,601.98 | £0.00 | |
| Duddingston Road West | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Fillyside Road - Crossing | On | £30,000.00 | £1,950.00 | £0.00 | |
| Fillyside Road | On | £4,584.36 | £411.93 | £0.00 | |
| Glenlockhart Drive | On | £2,798.00 | £103.53 | £0.00 | |
| Starbank Road | On | £12,608.40 | £1,128.81 | £0.00 | |
| Commonplace Interventions | | £216,125.40 | £18,685.48 | £0.00 | |
| Schools | | £150,000.00 | | £20,625.49 | |
| Sub-total | | | £3,413,856.42 | £1,184,739.45 | |

| Scheme | Status On / Off | Cost Projection | Maintenance Projection | Actual Cost to Date | Status |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Consultancy Support | | | £300,000.00 | £118,478.78 | |
| Internal Management Costs | | | £750,000.00 | £504,759.07 | |
| Segregation units for maintenance and schemes to be developed | | | £171,292.00 | £0.00 | |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | | | £175,000.00 | £86,410.00 | |
| Removal Allowance | | | £450,000.00 | £0.00 | |
| Street Cleaning Over Winter Period 20/21/22 | | | £50,000.00 | £0.00 | |
| Removal of Street Clutter | | | £50,000.00 | £0.00 | |
| Uncertainty - installation, maintenance, removal | | | £196,005.10 | £0.00 | |
| TOTAL PROJECTION | | | £5,556,153.52 | £1,894,387.30 | |

Item no 5.16

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

- Question** (1) What assessments have been done of the likely average walking/cycling time for pupils at each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site?
- Answer** (1) Secondary GME has a city wide catchment area. In line with policy any pupil living more than 3 miles from any secondary GME school would receive transport support, usually in the form of a bus pass. As such it is only expected that those living within 3 miles of any option would walk or cycle to school. No further detailed assessment on walking and cycling has been carried out.
- Question** (2) How compatible are each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site, with the '15 minute city' agenda?
- Answer** (2) Secondary school catchment areas in the city are of a scale that they would not be considered as one of the services which should be available within a 15 min or 20 min city concept. In line with policy pupils are expected to walk or cycle up to 3 miles to reach their catchment secondary schools (which takes much longer than 15 mins to walk). Beyond 3 miles travel support is provided.
- Question** (3) What is the estimated average public transport travel time for the current P1-3 years at Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce to each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site?
- Answer** (3) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (4) What is the estimated average public transport travel time from a likely city-wide catchment of each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and to the temporary Darroch site?

Answer (4) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (5) What proportion of the current school role at Taobh na Pairce live within the following distances of each of the four options for GME secondary, James Gillespies High School, and the temporary Darroch site, broken down by school year:

(a) less than 1km

(b) between 1km and 3km

(c) greater than 3km

Answer (5) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (6) The current informal consultation on GME secondary states that, in the short term, "Darroch would be the Gaelic Secondary with curriculum support from the surrounding Secondary Schools" (p.17).

(a) Which surrounding schools are being considered for curriculum support?

(b) Would a statutory consultation be required to change the curriculum support away from James Gillespies High School?

(c) What is the anticipated pupil capacity of Darroch during this period?

(d) When does the council expect that Darroch will exceed the capacity outlined in answer to c) above?

Answer

- (6)** (a) Support from surrounding schools will depend on capacity available in different subject areas, if pupils are to join classes physically. Closest schools are Tynecastle, Boroughmuir and St. Thomas'. Boroughmuir already has capacity issues. Use of digital resource and Esgoil will enable ease of access to a wide range of subjects and levels.
- (b) No. Curriculum support means taking subjects in another school if they have availability. This practice already happens.
- (c) The overall capacity of James Gillespie's High School is estimated to be 1850 once the Darroch Annexe is operational although further work on timetabling and use of the facility requires to be completed with the school to finalise
- (d) The current school roll projections suggest this will be exceeded in 2025.

Supplementary Question

Please could I ask that the three questions which have not been answered (3, 4 and 5) are answered by email to all councillors before Wednesday 25th November, when the first parent consultation event on this subject takes place?

Supplementary Answer

All answers are approximate and based on the level of analysis it was able to carry out in the limited time available.

Answer to question 3.

What is the estimated average public transport travel time for the current P1-3 years at Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce to each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespie's High School and the temporary Darroch site?

James Gillespie's - 30 minutes
Darroch - 27 minutes
Castlebrae - 40 minutes
Granton - 26 minutes
Liberton - 39 minutes
WHEC - 45 minutes

Answer to question 4.

What is the estimated average public transport travel time from a likely city-wide catchment of each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespie's High School and to the temporary Darroch site?

James Gillespie's - 28 minutes

Darroch - 25 minutes

Castlebrae - 38 minutes

Granton - 27 minutes

Liberton - 37 minutes

WHEC - 43 minutes

Answer to question 5.

What proportion of the current school roll at Taobh na Pairce live within the following distances of each of the four options for GME secondary, James Gillespie's High School, and the temporary Darroch site, broken down by school year:

(a) less than 1km

(b) between 1km and 3km

(c) greater than 3km

| | 1k | 1-3k | Over 3k |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|
| James Gillespie's | 2.9% | 10.5% | 86.6% |
| Darroch | 3.3% | 13.9% | 82.8% |
| Castlebrae | 0.7% | 11.2% | 88.0% |
| Granton | 4.1% | 8.1% | 87.8% |
| Liberton | 3.3% | 3.1% | 93.5% |
| WHEC | 0.0% | 2.4% | 97.6% |