

# Council Questions and Answers

## City of Edinburgh Council

10.00 am Thursday, 24th June, 2021

Virtual Meeting - via Microsoft Teams

### Questions and Answers

---

#### Contacts

Email: [gavin.king@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:gavin.king@edinburgh.gov.uk)

Tel: 0131 529 4239

#### Andrew Kerr

Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Annex

## Item no 10.1

### QUESTION NO 1

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

#### Question

What discussions have the Council had with the Scottish Government, with COSLA or other partners about how to finance and deliver low-carbon retrofit of council buildings including schools?

#### Answer

The Council leads on the Scottish Cities Alliance's Energy Efficiency in public buildings workstream. This group provides collective focus across Scotland's cities on how to improve the energy efficiency of public buildings including how best to accommodate low carbon heat/power generation and support zero carbon buildings. In this role, the Council is in regular contact with key Scottish Government Civil Servants to set the workstream programme and capture the challenges facing cities, including approaches to financing the low carbon agenda. Through this workstream, there is a workshop scheduled for the summer that will include discussions on how to fund the low-carbon retrofit of Council buildings as well as engaging on key topics, such as how to approach the PFI estate (with a view to developing PFI pilot projects).

In support of this agenda, the Council is currently developing an EnerPHit based approach to the future retrofitting of buildings. EnerPHit based feasibility studies are currently underway across a selection of representative Council buildings. As part of the early pilot feasibility works, projected pilot costs will be interpolated across the Councils estate to provide an outline cost for estate wide low carbon retrofit. Once available, this will help inform discussions with both the Scottish Government and the Scottish Cities Alliance.

## Item no 10.2

### QUESTION NO 1-2

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

At the 12 March 2020 meeting of the Council and in answer to question 9, the Convener advised that the planned pedestrian crossing at Bo'ness Road in Queensferry would be installed over the summer school holidays in 2020.

- Question** (1) Has the detailed design work for the crossing been completed?
- Answer** (1) The Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic has significantly impacted on the planned design and delivery programme. However, the detailed design is now almost complete, and the Road Safety Audit has been arranged. On conclusion, and subject to any appropriate revisions, the construction package will be prepared for our Transport Infrastructure team to deliver.
- Question** (2) What is the current expected installation date for the crossing?
- Answer** (2) Assuming this is completed by the end of September, installation should be completed by the end of this financial year, subject to the installation of an appropriate power supply by Scottish Power.

## Item no 10.3

### QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021

**Question** (1) How many requests for new or replacement grey household wheelie bins have been requested since 1 January 2021, broken down by ward?

**Answer** (1) Replace Grey Non Recycl Bin Service Requests from Jan 2021 to 15 Jun 2021

Wards	Closed	Open	Total
01-Almond	342	46	388
02-Pentland Hills	303	46	349
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	227	39	266
04-Forth	258	36	294
05-Inverleith	203	26	229
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	145	29	174
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	339	74	413
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	243	64	307
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhar	130	23	153
10-Meadows/Morningside	72	21	93
11-City Centre	32	6	38
12-Leith Walk	39	1	40
13-Leith	57	15	72
14-Craigentinny/Duddingston	196	52	248
15-Southside/Newington	140	32	172
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	482	110	592
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	342	85	427
<b>Replace Residual Ind Grey Requests</b>	<b>3,550</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>4,255</b>

**Question** (2) Of these grey household wheelie bin requests, what percentage have had new or replacement bins delivered

- a) within 10 working days,
- b) within 14 working days?

**Answer** (2) The fulfilment of grey household wheelie bin requests is:

- a) within 10 working days - 65%
- b) within 14 working days - 75%

**Question** (3) How many requests for new or replacement grey household wheelie bins are currently outstanding?

**Answer** (3) On the day this answer was prepared, there were 705 outstanding. This is update on a rolling basis as requests are fulfilled and new requests received.

**Question** (4) How many requests for new or replacement garden waste wheelie bins have been requested since 1 January 2021, broken down by ward?

**Answer** (4) Replacement Garden Bin Service Requests from Jan 2021 to 15 Jun 2021

Wards	Closed	Open	Total
01-Almond	70	13	83
02-Pentland Hills	59	7	66
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	50	5	55
04-Forth	44	8	52
05-Inverleith	65	6	71
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	53	11	64
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	46	9	55
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	64	11	75
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhar	36	10	46
10-Meadows/Morningside	45	4	49
11-City Centre	19	1	20
12-Leith Walk	22	3	25
13-Leith	10	1	11
14-Craigtinny/Duddingston	31	3	34
15-Southside/Newington	39	3	42
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	125	24	149
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	75	8	83
<b>Replace Garden Bin Requests</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>980</b>

**Question** (5) Of these garden waste wheelie bin requests, what percentage have had new or replacement bins delivered

a) within 10 working days,

b) within 14 working days?

**Answer** (5) The fulfilment of garden waste wheelie bin requests is:

a) within 10 working days - 72%

b) within 14 working days - 76%

**Question** (6) How many requests for new or replacement garden waste household wheelie bins are currently outstanding?

**Answer** (6) On the day this answer was prepared, there were 127 outstanding. This is update on a rolling basis as requests are fulfilled and new requests received.

**Question** (7) How many requests for new or replacement recycling wheelie bins have been requested since 1 January 2021, broken down by ward?

**Answer** (7) **Replacement Recycling Bin Service Requests from Jan 2021 to 15 Jun 2021**

Wards	Closed	Open	Total
01-Almond	224	21	245
02-Pentland Hills	98	11	109
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	114	12	126
04-Forth	152	20	172
05-Inverleith	97	12	109
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	71	8	79
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	146	17	163
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	89	11	100
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhar	66	12	78
10-Meadows/Morningside	53	7	60
11-City Centre	18	3	21
12-Leith Walk	33	2	35
13-Leith	44	7	51
14-Craigtinny/Duddingston	123	15	138
15-Southside/Newington	72	15	87
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	249	68	317
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	181	32	213
<b>Replace Recycling Bin Requests</b>	<b>1,830</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>2,103</b>

**Question** (8) Of these recycling wheelie bin requests, what percentage have had new or replacement bins delivered

- a) within 10 working days,
- b) within 14 working days?

**Answer** (8) The fulfilment of recycling wheelie bin requests is:

- a) within 10 working days - 81%
- b) within 14 working days - 82%

**Question** (9) How many requests for new or replacement recycling wheelie bins are currently outstanding?

**Answer** (9) On the day this answer was prepared, there were 273 outstanding. This is update on a rolling basis as requests are fulfilled and new requests received.

## Item no 10.4

### QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Munro for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question** (1) Following approval of the Budget for 2021/22 what meetings has the Council Leader held with Scottish Government Ministers and whom to improve Edinburgh's funding for 2021/22?

**Answer** (1) A number of meetings have taken place involving me directly where aspects of funding matters relevant to the Council or Edinburgh more widely have been part of the discussion. There have been continuing meetings also through COSLA on common issues, like staff pay, where Edinburgh continues to play an active part through the COSLA channels of communication.

**Question** (2) Have any meetings included the Deputy Leader?

**Answer** (2) These have taken place through forums or 1:1 with me representing the Council and City's interests as Council Leader.



## Item no 10.5

### QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Munro for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question** (1) The Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017 placed a duty on Local Authorities and Health Boards to annually produce a local child poverty action report. How many has Edinburgh produced?

**Answer** (1) Edinburgh has produced 2 Local Child Poverty Action Report (LCPAR) as required.

**Question** (2) What action has been taken

**Answer** (2) Actions reported in the last LCPAR (which covered 2019/20 and was extended to cover the pandemic to end of 2020) included a range of action across the city. These included:

- significant investments in affordable house building with a record 1,443 affordable homes built in 2019/20 - 25% more than in 2018/19.
- employability support programmes engaged with 3,145 people during 2019/20 to help people into work or learning.
- 3,400 pupils attended breakfast clubs during 2019/20, while over 4000 children attend out of school care, enabling parents to work and study.
- advice service providers generated £18.75m for families on low incomes in 2019 – 20
- Changeworks' energy advice service supported 2,100 tenants with 168 young families between 2018 and 2020, generating a total of £423,000 financial savings through support including energy advice, referral for grants and income maximisation, billing advocacy and tariff/ supplier switch.

## Item no 10.6

### QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor Munro for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question** (1) Following the approval of the Strategic Housing Investment Plan (SHIP) for 2021-26 what meetings has the Convener held with Scottish Government Ministers to improve funding for Housing in Edinburgh?

**Answer** (1) The SHIP was approved at committee on 14<sup>th</sup> January this year. I wrote to the Housing Minister on the 17<sup>th</sup> February 2021 to ask for a meeting to discuss Edinburgh receiving an uplift in grant funding from the central housing budget. Although a meeting was not arranged before the Scottish Parliament was (effectively) dissolved on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2021, on the 21<sup>st</sup> of April we received our resource planning assumption for the Affordable Housing supply Programme from Scottish Government for 2021/22. The full RPA for 2021/22 for Edinburgh was **£52.418m**. A rise of **£4.209m** from last year's allocation (£48.209m) with the additional funding coming from the central housing budget.

Since the announcement of a new Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Housing and Local Government I have written a further letter to ask for a meeting to discuss a number of issues relating to housing and homelessness, including the need for an increase to, alongside certainty over future years of, resource planning assumptions for the Affordable Housing Supply Programme for Edinburgh.

This meeting is in the process of being arranged.

**Question** (2) Have any meetings included the vice-convener?

**Answer** (2) Since the SHIP was approved, as set out above, there have not been any meetings.

## Item no 10.7

### QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Munro for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question** (1) How many Community Education workers are directly employed by City of Edinburgh Council?

**Answer** (1) This role no longer exists – it has been replaced and the functions this role did has been renamed and split between services eg

- Lifelong Learning Team Leader (Libraries)
- Lifelong Learning Development Officer (youth work/sport etc.)
- Lifelong Learning Strategic Development Officer (Adult learning)
- Lifelong Learning Service Manager (NW Locality)
- Lifelong Learning Strategic Manager (Creativity, Health and Wellbeing)

In addition to the discreet workforce that is the Lifelong Learning Libraries Service, there are 55 FTE Grade 7 Lifelong Learning Development Officers (LLDOs). The majority are located in the 4 Locality Lifelong Learning teams, reporting to Lifelong Learning Service Managers (LLSMs) and operationally managed by Locality Managers in Place.

A smaller number of strategic LLDOs have citywide responsibilities and report to Lifelong Learning Strategic Development Officers, who in turn report to one of the 3 (currently 2) Lifelong Learning Strategic Managers. The citywide Lifelong Learning line management sits under the Head of Schools and Lifelong Learning in Communities and Families.

**Question** (2) How many have redeployed during COVID?

- Answer** (2) None
- Question** (3) What tasks have those remaining in Community Education undertaken and how many worked directly with their community?
- Answer** (3) All staff have continued to work throughout the pandemic.
- For the most part, services have been adapted and offered online.
- This includes:
- Online **adult learning** provision including adult literacies, English for Speakers of Other Languages, adult learning programme, Syrian Refugee Programme, Adult Learning Achievement Awards, and Family Learning.
- Delivering online **parenting** programmes including Raising Children with Confidence, Raising Teens with Confidence, Teen Triple P, Incredible Years and SQA in Child Development.
- Developing online **youth work** including one to one support with vulnerable young people, development of online platforms and social media support, information on what to do for all ages. Preparing resumption of youth work services city wide. The forthcoming Scottish Youth Parliament elections have also been coordinated and publicised with 50+ young people expressing interest in standing so far.
- Staff have led in the preparation and drafting of a **Children's Rights** report setting out progress in relation to the UNCRC across the Children's Partnership.
- Provision of **community support** including support to neighbourhood networks meeting, supporting community groups to apply for funding opportunities, maintaining contact with community centre management committees.
- Support to **Discover** Facebook page activities for children living in poverty.
- In addition, where possible staff have worked directly with communities. This includes School Hub support at Easter and over summer 2020; provision of group and one to one support in schools, including youth work; detached and outdoor youth work; and assisting HSC teams and voluntary sector initiatives to

support vulnerable people in communities with food and medical deliveries.

Staff are currently planning **summer programmes**, including **Get into Summer**.

More information on the Lifelong Learning Service is available in the Lifelong Learning Service Plan Update committee report, May 2021:

<https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/documents/s33922/7.5%20Lifelong%20Learning%20Service%20Plan%20Update.pdf>

## Item no 10.8

### QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Munro for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

#### Question

Can the Convener provide details of the total number of Library workers, including the number of qualified librarians, in May 2007 and to date?

#### Answer

Year	Professional staff FTE	Other paid staff FTE
2006/7	78.4	241.1
2007/8	85.2	219
2008/9	65	188
2009/10	58	175.4
2010/11	50.1	215.1
2011/12	50.1	215.1
2012/13	46.1	206.1
2013/14	40.5	201.5
2014/15	40	175
2015/16	31	170
2016/17	No return	No return
2017/18	38.0	158.3
2018/19	38.0	141.7
2019/20	42.0	144.7
2020/21*	42.0	144.7

\* Estimate

## Item no 10.9

### QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

On 20 April 2021, Policy and Sustainability Committee approved carbon literacy training for council officers.

**Question** (1) Please can the council leader confirm which council officers and departments will be prioritised for this training?

**Answer** (1) Discussions are underway with potential Carbon Literacy Training providers to design and commission the delivery of a programme of training for the organisation during this financial year.

The training will target middle to senior managers in the key service areas that will have most impact on both the Council and City emissions. These include; planning, development, housing, transport, waste and cleansing, parks and green spaces and facilities management. It will also include wider corporate services which will support the necessary culture shift and carbon literacy across the organisation. The proposed Carbon Literacy Training Programme will also apply a “train the trainer” approach to ensure that the knowledge and skills gained from this targeted programme can be sustained by the Council.

Wider work is also underway to update the sustainability online learning available to employees to include the free UN accredited CC Learn content relating to climate change. This will enable even more employees, to gain a basic understanding and awareness about climate change and actions to mitigate against it.

The Chief Executive intends to be amongst the first senior managers undertaking the training and this will ensure that the Council becomes a bronze accredited carbon literate organisation by January 2022.

- Question** (2) Specifically, what proportion of those officers to receive the training will be:
- a) senior managers,
  - b) front-line officers in the divisions which will be at the forefront of cutting council and city-wide climate emissions, such as transport, planning, housing and waste?
- Answer** (2) The exact numbers that will undergo training and undergo the train the trainer module will be dependent upon the final contractual arrangements agreed with the selected delivery partner.
- Question** (3) Can the council leader also confirm when this training will take place?
- Answer** (3) The training is being planned to commence from October 2021, depending upon the successful procurement of an appropriate delivery partner. This process is currently underway.



## Item no 10.10

### QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question** (1) The papers for Education, Children and Families Committee on 28 May 2021 seemed to imply that the catchment area for Gaelic Medium Education (GME) will in future be the City of Edinburgh Council boundary only, where previously the catchment has included the whole of the Lothians.

Is it the council's intention to reduce the GME catchment to the CEC boundary only?

**Answer** (1) There has never been any official catchment area for GME which covers the Lothians. Pupils from other local authorities make placement requests for the GME primary school in Edinburgh and the established practice is that they are always granted. The draft statutory consultation paper presented to Education, Children and Families Committee on 28 May 2021 suggests this arrangement continues.

**Question** (2) If so, what engagement has happened with neighbouring councils on this issue?

**Answer** (2) Based on the information provided in answer 1, if a statutory consultation is approved to progress, neighbouring local authorities will be contacted to make them aware that the consultation process is proceeding. Other local authorities will be asked to make all parents aware of the consultation so they can contribute if they choose to do so.

**QUESTION NO 11**

**By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question**

Can the Convener confirm:

- a) How many complaints the Council has received regarding slurry sealing works on footways in the last five years?
- b) How long these preventative measures are expected to last before repaving is required?
- c) Whether the Council would consider a full reconstruction of a footway should local residents request one following dissatisfaction with slurry works?

**Answer**

- a) The Council has not recorded specific complaints raised about the footway slurry sealing process going back five years.
- b) Slurry sealing is expected to last 7-10 years before further treatment is required.
- c) Slurry sealing is a preventative maintenance technique. It is used to treat footways in order to stop deterioration that would lead to a more expensive resurfacing treatment being required.

The suitability for any footway treatment is determined by a condition assessment, with a further follow-up inspection carried out by the slurry sealing contractor.

If a footway requires a full reconstruction, this would be prioritised with other footways requiring full reconstruction. Given that full reconstruction is approximately ten times the cost of slurry sealing it would be many years before a new footway would merit inclusion in a capital works programme. Therefore, the Council would not consider full

reconstruction of a footway that was suitable to be included in a programme of slurry sealing works.

I understand that slurry sealing is not always the preferred choice of residents, due to it being aesthetically different from traditional asphalt surfaces. However, it is a very effective and cost-effective method in preventing deterioration and maintaining a safe surface for residents.

## Item no 10.12

### QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

#### Question

Irrespective of the source of funding, can the Convener please confirm how much was spent advertising the recent city-wide consultation on Street Schemes. This consultation had an unprecedented response and extremely high level of engagement with nearly 18,000 participants

- a) Radio
- b) Twitter
- c) Facebook
- d) Other Social Media, please specify
- e) Local Press
- f) Lamp post Wraps
- g) Other physical Signage, please specify.

#### Answer

The table below shows the breakdown of spend for advertising:

<b>Channel</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Provider</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Social media	1	Spirit Media	£1,263.75
Google ads - EEN	1	Spirit Media	£606.60
Google ads - other sites	1	Spirit Media	£1,263.75
Lamp post wraps	30	Out of Hand	£1,480
6 sheets (incl digital screens)	18	JC Decaux	£1,800
Radio advert	2	Spirit Media	£3,499.12
Scotsman	1	Spirit Media	£484.37
Edinburgh Evening News	1	Spirit Media	£346.82
Edinburgh Reporter digital	4	Direct	£150
Edinburgh Reporter print	1	Direct	£150

I would note, however, that the levels of response to the Spaces for People are not unprecedented as noted in the question. The response to the proposal for extending bus hours was of a similar level and indeed the consultation on 20mph streets received 20,000 responses.

## Item no 10.13

### QUESTION NO 13

**By Councillor Johnston for answer  
by the Convener of the Housing,  
Homelessness and Fair Work  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 24 June 2021**

For the second year in a row, the Company Accounts for Marketing Edinburgh Ltd have not been submitted on time, incurring fines in excess of £1,000. At time of writing the Accounts to March 2020 have still not been lodged and are verging upon being 3 months late.

**Question** (1) Why were the Accounts to March 2020 not lodged on time?

**Answer** (1) There have been a number of covid related challenges including access to non-electronic records during lockdown. The focus of the board has been an orderly transition of assets into the council and safeguarding those assets. The transition is now complete. The audit is in the final stages and will be signed off imminently.

**Question** (2) Are the assets of Marketing Edinburgh at risk if the company is struck off for non-submission of Accounts to Companies House?

**Answer** (2) No. Marketing Edinburgh no longer has assets, these were transferred to the council on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021.

### QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question** (1) Does the Convener agree that last year the downgrading of pupil's assessment results by the SQA, based on historical attainment of the schools and the catchments, was unfair and should not be repeated this year?

**Answer** (1) The Deputy First Minister said in his statement to Scottish Parliament on 11 August 2020, referring to the SQA 2020 Results, "We set out to ensure that the system was fair [...] But we did not get it right for all young people." We agree with the DFM that the algorithm used by SQA in 2020 was indeed not fair and note that no such algorithm will be used this year.

**Question** (2) If so can the Convener explain why the CEC Guidance on SQA Alternative Certification Model states on Page 4: "*We will work with schools to develop effective support for moderation at the centre, which will include sharing data on prior attainment and looking at provisional patterns of attainment for this session.*"

*And on Page 8: "The Curriculum Leader and the DHT attainment/HT meet to review the provisional results compared to historical data. Implications are considered, and adjustments made as appropriate. Justification for any change is recorded."*

**Answer** (2) The SQA expect Head Teachers to complete and sign a "statement of assurance" when submitting provisional results as part of the ACM. This statement is available here: [nq2021-head-of-centre-statement-of-assurance.pdf](https://www.sqa.org.uk/nq2021-head-of-centre-statement-of-assurance.pdf) ([sqa.org.uk](https://www.sqa.org.uk))

Note the bullet points "Provisional results have been quality assured, including rationales for any variances, and confirmed by our centre" and "Provisional results have been quality assured, including rationales for any variances, and

confirmed by our local authority (for local authority schools only)." Consideration of historical attainment patterns has always been a part of the ACM process for this session. Our advice to schools is designed to meet these requirements.

Note that the Education Scotland report "National review of local authority approaches to quality assurance as part of the [ACM]" (available at [National Review Of Local Authorities Role In ACM \(education.gov.scot\)](https://www.education.gov.scot/national-review-of-local-authorities-role-in-acm)) makes it clear that "most" local authorities have developed approaches similar to those mentioned above, "to support school-level quality assurance."

We are happy to clarify that decisions regarding grades are ultimately based on teacher professional judgement, and that no teacher would be instructed to change a provisional result (nor come under pressure to do so) where there is clear demonstrated attainment evidence in support of the grades.

We are also happy to clarify that no ceiling has been put on the attainment of our young people this year within the ACM



### QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

On the Spaces for People: Moving Forward section on the council website the Council makes the following statement: *"There is a notable difference in the general level of support and opposition between the market research and survey responses from residents. The market research is more representative of the views of residents as participants are a statistically representative sample of opinions based on Edinburgh's population demographic. The online survey were 'self-selecting' responses so are not statistically representative."*

On point 4.17 in the report to the Transport and Environment Committee: *"Potential retention of Spaces for People measures"* it is stated: *"It is worth noting that in previous cases where consultation and market research has been carried out on the same topic, for example 20mph speed limits, a similar pattern was observed, with much higher levels of opposition in consultation results compared with answers to market research."*

- Question** (1) It is a concerning trend that there are a number of examples where consultation and market research finding differ so significantly. However, it is always known that consultations are 'self-selecting' responses, therefore why was the consultation launched at a cost of £50,000 if it was felt that the 'self-selecting' responses would not be appropriate for gathering public opinion?
- Answer** (1) As set out in the Committee report, the consultation and market research are different in nature and both help inform the decision-making process. To ensure that as many people, businesses and organisations as wished to could provide feedback, it was considered appropriate to carry out consultation as well as market research, which is a recognised way of seeking to ascertain the views of a cross section of the population.
- Question** (2) Has it been considered that market research respondents 'self-select' when they apply to join panels in the first place, and then they also 'self-select' as when invited to participate, they make a choice whether to participate or not?

**Answer** (2) While people do choose to participate in market research panels, people agreeing to respond to this survey were not advised of its subject matter beforehand. In this case, the only screening undertaken was for participants to confirm that they live in Edinburgh.

**Question** (3) Are people paid to give their opinion now more valued than individual residents giving their time to share their opinion on a matter that directly impacts them?

**Answer** (3) No.

**Question** (4) Has the Council considered that it could be the market research being flawed in some way that is leading to the significant mismatch in findings alongside the consultations?

**Answer** (4) The market research was carried out by two external agencies, working together. Ensuring the quality of the data is of the utmost importance to both of the companies and also to the Panel Providers they used. They adhere to the Market Research Society Code of Conduct, and only work with partners who also adhere to these standards.

Questions have been asked about a small number of responses to the market research (13 out of 583 (2% of the sample)). These questions are being investigated. However, even if all 13 were to be discounted, there is no material impact on the outcome of the research.

## Item no 10.16

### QUESTION NO 16

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

The Convener has highlighted an issue that the public consultation was spammed but this was identified early on, and impacted responses were removed prior to analysis. No such statement has been made about the market research used to inform the report on the potential retention of Spaces People measures.

**Question** (1) Would the Convener consider that the following comments in the market research appear to be anomalies that need further investigation on the basis that the comments are essentially meaningless, but very similar, and while scattered, they include two sets of consecutive pairs in terms of timing of submission (respondent 321 & 322, and 370 & 371)?

**Answer** (1) These have been investigated by the Panel Providers for the market research. In surveys where free text boxes are provided, it is the case that spurious comments may be added. The entries identified have been investigated by the Market Research companies.

**Question** (2) Would the Convener agree that these comments are not identical enough (e.g. the misspelling of 'modificatiions' in row 371) to suggest that some sort of 'autofill' has been to blame, so these must have been manually and separately input somehow?

2	If you wish to make a comment about measures you would li...
321	ested modification
322	ing suggested modificatio
365	ding suggested modifications
370	ing suggested modifications
371	suggested modificatiions

**Answer** (2) These comments are not identical and therefore are unlikely to have been completed using any sort of 'autofill'.

**Question**

**(3)** Would the Convener agree that the other responses provided by the person providing those comments are essentially very similar, so this would justify investigation?

2	Area	And finally, how many cars or vans are owned, or available for private use, by members of your household? Include any company cars or vans available for private use.	Age	Gender	Question Weight
321	Central		1 25 – 44	Male	1.08698
322	Central		1 25 – 44	Male	1.08698
365	Central		1 25 – 44	Male	1.08698
370	Central		1 25 – 44	Male	1.08698
371	Central		1 25 – 44	Male	1.08698

2	Measures to provide more space and improve road safety for parents and children near schools	Measures to provide more space and improve road safety for parents and children near schools	New protected cycle lanes on main roads (e.g. Comiston Road, Ferry Road, Crewe Road, Old Dalkeith Road)	New protected cycle lanes on main roads (e.g. Comiston Road, Ferry Road, Crewe Road, Old Dalkeith Road)	Additional space for walking and/or cycling in shopping streets (e.g. Morningside, Corstorphine, Stockbridge, Gorgie)	Additional space for walking and/or cycling in shopping streets (e.g. Morningside, Corstorphine, Stockbridge, Gorgie)	Additional space for walking and/or cycling in the city centre, (e.g. Waverley Bridge closure, Mound cycle lane)	Additional space for walking and/or cycling in the city centre, (e.g. Waverley Bridge closure, Mound cycle lane)	Measures to provide more space for people to exercise. (e.g. closures to motor traffic of Silverknoes Road, Links Gardens, Braid Road, Cammo Walk)	Measures to provide more space for people to exercise. (e.g. closures to motor traffic of Silverknoes Road, Links Gardens, Braid Road, Cammo Walk)	New signed 'quiet connections' for cycling, with road closures to reduce traffic (e.g. Greenbank to Meadows, Hope Lane and Stanley St)	New signed 'quiet connections' for cycling, with road closures to reduce traffic (e.g. Greenbank to Meadows, Hope Lane and Stanley St)	Can you select the schools with Spaces for People that you are most familiar with?	Can you select the schools with Spaces for People that you are most familiar with?	Can you select the schools with Spaces for People that you are most familiar with?	Can you select the schools with Spaces for People that you are most familiar with?
321	I often use a road with tl	Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I am aware Not used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I often use ; Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used			Boroughmuir High School			
322	I often use a road with tl	Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I am aware Not used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I often use ; Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used			Boroughmuir High School			
365	I often use a road with tl	Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I often use ; Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I often use ; Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used			Boroughmuir High School			
370	I often use a road with tl	Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I often use ; Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I often use ; Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used			Boroughmuir High School			
371	I often use a road with tl	Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I often use ; Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used	I often use ; Used	I occasionally Used	I occasionally Used			Boroughmuir High School			

**Answer**

**(3)** This has been investigated by the Panel Providers and Market Research companies.

**Question**

**(4)** Would it concern the Convener to learn that other consecutive respondents in the market research have shown almost identical but fractionally different responses which on initial examination impacts a minimum of 13 responses?

**Answer**

**(4)** These have been investigated by the fraud departments of the Panel Providers for the market research. Four have been identified for further investigation. However even if all 13 responses (approximately 2% of the total) were discounted, there would be no material impact on the outcome of the research.

## Item no 10.17

### QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question** (1) Please provide a full list of stakeholders who were invited to submit responses to the recent Stakeholder consultation for retaining Spaces for People measures.

**Answer** (1) The following Stakeholders were invited to submit responses to the Spaces for People Stakeholder survey.

- Cockburn Association
- Community Councils and Residents' Association
- Edinburgh Access Panel
- Edinburgh Bus Users Group
- Deaf Scotland
- Edinburgh Hotel Association
- Edinburgh World Heritage
- Edinburgh Taxi Association
- Essential Edinburgh
- Federation of Small Business
- First Bus
- Guide Dogs Scotland
- Living Streets
- Lothian Buses
- Police Scotland
- RNIB
- Scottish Ambulance Service
- Scottish Fire and Rescue
- Scottish Licensed Trade Association
- Spokes

**Question** (2) Please provide a full list of stakeholders who then responded.

**Answer** (2) The responses from Stakeholders are published on the Council's website - [stakeholder-submission-summaries \(edinburgh.gov.uk\)](https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/stakeholder-submission-summaries).

**Question** (3) Please provide a full list of any stakeholders who were not permitted to submit a response or whose response was not considered.

**Answer** (3) All stakeholders invited to take part in the survey were permitted to submit a response and their responses considered.

**Question** (4) Please provide the criteria for being considered as a stakeholder.

**Answer** (4) The Stakeholder Groups included in the consultation included representatives from the following areas:

- Accessibility advocacy
- Community Councils and residents' associations
- Emergency Services
- Business organisations
- Heritage groups
- Transport and mobility advocacy

# Item no 10.18

## QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021

### Question

In the market research commissioned in relation to Spaces for People, how was it technically possible for nearly 30 people (5% of the statistically representative sample) to provide the same answer for their most often, and third most often mode of transport when asked:

"During the pandemic, what forms of transport have you most often used when travelling around Edinburgh? (including for short trips to the local shop etc, and leisure trips, as well as longer journeys around town)"

and

"Thinking back before the pandemic, what forms of transport did you most often use when travelling around Edinburgh? (including for short trips to the local shop etc, and leisure trips, as well as longer journeys around town)"?

	During pandemic													Pre pandemic		
	Most often	2nd most often	3rd most often	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Most often	2nd most often	3rd most often
2																
5	Cycle	Walk	Bus			Bus		Walk		Cycle				Walk	Bus	Cycle
89	Cycle	Walk	Bus			Bus		Walk		Cycle				Bus	Cycle	Walk
130	Cycle	Walk	Car	Car				Walk		Cycle				Car	Cycle	Walk
144	Cycle	Walk	None					Walk		Cycle			None	Cycle	Bus	Walk
146	Cycle	Walk	Bus			Bus		Walk		Cycle				Cycle	Bus	Walk
148	Cycle	Walk	Bus			Bus		Walk		Cycle				Bus	Walk	Cycle
275	Cycle	Bus	Walk			Bus		Walk		Cycle				Bus	Cycle	Walk
292	Cycle	None								Cycle			None	Cycle	None	
296	Cycle	Car	Cycle	Car						Cycle				Walk	Cycle	Bus
321	Cycle	Bus	Cycle			Bus				Cycle				Bus	Cycle	Bus
333	Cycle	Car	Walk	Car				Walk		Cycle				Cycle	Car	Walk
340	Cycle	Walk	Car	Car				Walk		Cycle				Cycle	Walk	Car
346	Cycle	Walk	Bus			Bus		Walk		Cycle				Cycle	Walk	Bus
370	Cycle	Bus	Taxi/Private hire car	Taxi/Private	Bus					Cycle				Cycle	Bus	Cycle
371	Cycle	Bus	Cycle			Bus				Cycle				Bus	Taxi/Private	Cycle
372	Cycle	Bus	Cycle			Bus				Cycle				Taxi/Private	Cycle	Taxi/Private
377	Cycle	Bus	Taxi/Private hire car	Taxi/Private	Bus					Cycle				Cycle	Taxi/Private	Bus
379	Cycle	Bus	Cycle			Bus				Cycle				Taxi/Private	Bus	Cycle
448	Cycle	Car	None	Car						Cycle			None	Cycle	Car	Bus
565	Cycle	Taxi/Private	Bus			Taxi/Private	Bus			Cycle				Cycle	Bus	Taxi/Private
566	Cycle	Bus	Taxi/Private hire car	Taxi/Private	Bus					Cycle				Cycle	Taxi/Private	Bus
568	Cycle	Bus	Taxi/Private hire car	Taxi/Private	Bus					Cycle				Cycle	Bus	Taxi/Private
580	Cycle	Bus	Taxi/Private hire car	Taxi/Private	Bus					Cycle				Cycle	Taxi/Private	Cycle
581	Cycle	Bus	Taxi/Private hire car	Taxi/Private	Bus					Cycle				Cycle	Car	Bus

During pandemic

Pre pandemic

	Most often	2nd most often	3rd most often	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Transport used during pandemic	Most often	2nd most often	3rd most often
2																	
393	Car	Taxi/Private	Car	Car	Taxi/Private	hire car								Car	Taxi/Private	Car	
526	Car	Walk	Car	Car				Walk						Walk	None		
164	Bus	Car	Bus	Car		Bus								Bus	Car	Walk	
322	Bus	Cycle	Bus			Bus				Cycle				Cycle	Bus	Cycle	
344	Bus	Tram	Bus			Bus	Tram							Bus	Tram	None	
503	Bus	Walk	Bus			Bus		Walk						Walk	Bus	Walk	
60	Walk	Car	Walk	Car				Walk						Car	Tram	Other	
115	Walk	Bus	Walk			Bus		Walk						Walk	Bus	Walk	
216	Walk	Bus	Walk			Bus		Walk						Bus	Walk	Bus	
467	Walk	Bus	Walk			Bus		Walk						Walk	Bus	Walk	
468	Walk	Bus	Walk			Bus		Walk						Walk	Bus	Walk	
472	Walk	Bus	Walk			Bus		Walk						Walk	Bus	Car	
194	Bus	Car	Taxi/Private	Car	Taxi/Private	Bus								Taxi/Private	Bus	Taxi/Private	
372	Cycle	Bus	Cycle			Bus				Cycle				Taxi/Private	Cycle	Taxi/Private	
234	Car	Walk	Bus	Car		Bus		Walk						Car	Bus	Car	
393	Car	Taxi/Private	Car	Car	Taxi/Private	hire car								Car	Taxi/Private	Car	
521	Car	Walk	Taxi/Private	Car	Taxi/Private	hire car		Walk						Car	Walk	Car	
195	Tram	Car	Bus	Car		Bus	Tram							Bus	Car	Bus	
210	Car	Cycle	Walk	Car				Walk		Cycle				Bus	Cycle	Bus	
338	Car	Tram	Walk	Car			Tram	Walk						Bus	Tram	Bus	
365	Bus	Cycle	Taxi/Private	hire car	Taxi/Private	Bus				Cycle				Bus	Cycle	Bus	
512	Car	Taxi/Private	Bus	Car	Taxi/Private	Bus								Bus	Walk	Bus	

Answer

The Market Research company confirmed that, as the survey included the option to provide a 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> option for the modes of transport used, it is possible that some respondents only had two answers to give and so therefore may have repeated the mode of transport used in more than one answer.



### QUESTION NO 19

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

#### **A - Market research agency role and costs**

In the report to Transport and Environment Committee "*Potential retention of Spaces for People measures*" it refers to Social Marketing Gateway (SMG) and Jump carrying out the research.

**Question** (1) Please can you clarify the roles and responsibilities each of these agencies had.

**Answer** (1) The Council commissioned SMG and Jump Research jointly to carry out market research on the potential retention of Spaces for People measures. The two companies share the work and responsibilities for all partnership projects.

**Question** (2) Please can you clarify all costs associated with the work these agencies did on the market research including analysis and presentation.

**Answer** (2) The cost of the market research was £11,805.

**Question** (3) Please can you clarify if all costs were incurred directly by the council, or did third parties such as Sustrans or Transport Scotland pay any costs directly.

**Answer** (3) The costs associated with the Market Research will be paid by the Council, using the funding provided for Spaces for People through Sustrans.

#### **B - Consultation**

**Question** (4) In answers to my questions to Full Council on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2021 the total costs of the consultation were expected to be approximately £60,000. Those anticipated costs were before it was known that the consultation would attract such a significant level of responses (c.17,600) which must impact analysis time. Please can you confirm if there are any changes to costs and officer time involved in anything to do with managing the consultation.

**Answer**

- (4)** While it is expected that the overall cost of the analysis will be greater than originally anticipated, it is not possible to confirm the total cost at this stage. The overall cost increase will be contained within the funding available for this work, which is being paid for from the grant allocated by from Transport Scotland/Sustrans.

## Item no 10.20

### QUESTION NO 20

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

#### **Question**

In an answer to a supplementary question at a previous council meeting in April 2021 by the Finance and Resources Convener, it was stated that Transport Scotland had paid Sustrans directly to design the Lanark Road, Longstone, Murrayburn Road, Slateford Road and Braid schemes. Please can the Convener explain this rather unusual funding arrangement and why design of these schemes was not covered by the Council through Spaces for People funds.

#### **Answer**

Spaces for People funding was provided by Scottish Government through Transport Scotland and was administered by Sustrans.

The cost of the design resource for the schemes mentioned above is paid directly via the Transport Scotland grant to Sustrans and therefore this funding did not require to be claimed by the Council.

## Item no 10.21

### QUESTION NO 21

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

- Question** (1) Further to his answer to my question on this subject on 27 May, please can the council leader outline:
- a) On what dates and times within the last two months has he discussed the issue of Gaelic Medium Education with any Scottish Government minister or Cabinet Secretary;
  - b) In each case, what was the conclusion of the discussion.
- Answer** (1) Position is as reported to Council on 27 May 2021, although I understand a date is now set for a meeting between the Cabinet Secretary and Education Convenor as agreed by Education, Children and Families on 28 May 2021.
- Question** (2) Can the council leader please also outline what future calls, meetings or discussions he has planned with any Scottish Government minister or Cabinet Secretary on the subject of GME over the next two months?
- Answer** (2) See answer 1. I won't rule out further meetings involving myself as Council Leader over that time period.
- Question** (3) Can the council leader also clarify whether he made clear to the Cabinet Secretary for Education, when he spoke to her in May, that the council's preferred option of Liberton is supported by only 15% of parents surveyed by Comann nam Pàrant?
- Answer** (3) See answer to follow up question on 27 May 2021.
- Question** (4) Can the council leader also clarify how the Liberton location is seen to be consistent with the SNP manifesto commitment for "the creation of a standalone GME secondary school in central Edinburgh."?

**Answer**

- (4)** Whether proposals meet parents' aspirations for the future of GME in the City and meet the requirements for the young people's attainment is a matter for the consultation. I won't second-guess the views of parents but I would highlight the recommendations of the Education Children and Families committee of 28<sup>th</sup> of May, where the Convenor will clarify the Government's position in advance of that consultation being launched.

**QUESTION NO 22**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

**Question**

**(1)** The following central locations have been suggested for a Gaelic Medium Education secondary school:

- a) the current Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion;
- b) the old Royal High School;
- c) the old Tynecastle High School;
- d) the Lothian Buses depot on Annandale Street;
- e) the former Royal Victoria Hospital site; and
- f) the council's former depot at Russell Road;

Please can the Convenor outline the distance of each of these from:

- i) Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pàirce
- ii) James Gillespie's High School and
- iii) Darroch annexe

**Answer**

**(1)** Please see the table below.

**Distances to GME HS Options (In Miles)**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pàirce</b>	<b>JGHS</b>	<b>Darroch Annexe (6 Gillespie Street)</b>
Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion	2.5	0.6	0.6
Old Royal High School	1.6	1.7	1.7
Old Tynecastle High School	3.4	1.5	1.1
Lothian Buses depot, Annandale Street	0.9	2.1	2.2
Former Royal Victoria Hospital Site	2.3	2.2	1.9
Russell Road Depot (Former)	3.4	1.5	1.2

**Question** (2) Please can the Convenor outline the proportion of the current TnP school roll who live within 3 miles of each potential site?

**Answer** (2) Please see the estimates below. Values are approximate due to equivalent buffers used in the sampling instead of individual routes for all pupils.

**Percentage of BS-TNP Pupils Within 3 Miles of Potential Sites**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pàirce Pupils</b>	<b>Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pàirce Pupils (%)</b>
Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion	263	62.9%
Old Royal High School	289	69.1%
Old Tynecastle High School	91	21.8%
Lothian Buses depot, Annandale Street	296	70.8%
Former Royal Victoria Hospital Site	222	53.1%
Russell Road Depot (Former)	101	24.2%

**Question** (3) Please can the Convenor also outline which, if any of these potential sites have been discussed with a) the current owner, if not the council; and b) the Scottish Government, with a view to assessing the feasibility of each of these sites for a central, standalone GME secondary school?

**Answer** (3) None of these sites have been discussed with the current owner or the Scottish Government in relation to assessing their feasibility for a central, standalone GME secondary school.

### QUESTION NO 23

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 June 2021**

#### Question

The Convener was quoted in the Edinburgh Evening News as stating *inter alia*: “45 per cent of the people in this city do not have access to a car”.

However, in the Council’s statistically representative market research sample, only 167 out of 583 people said they had no access to a car. That is only 29%.

Is the 45% quoted incorrect or this sample not statistically representative?

#### Answer

The 45% is based on the 2019 citywide travel behaviour survey of 5,172 residents undertaken across all wards. Results of the market research survey were weighted by the age and gender of respondents to give a result that was broadly representative of the Edinburgh population. It would have been possible to similarly weight the results of the Market Research Survey by car ownership of respondents. If weighting is applied, support for all types of measure increases – e.g. 1% up for protected cycle lanes, 3% up for extra space in the city centre.

However, in order to avoid any concerns that officers had attempted to manipulate the results of the survey, this weighting was not carried out.



### QUESTION NO 24

**By Councillor Johnston for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 24 June 2021**

#### **Question**

Can the Convener advise when an independent safety audit will be carried out on the Lanark Road and Longstone Spaces for People measures and what scope there is for local people to feed in to said audit?

#### **Answer**

A road safety audit (RSA) is undertaken when physical changes are proposed and/or implemented to the Council's road network. The purpose of an RSA is to review the safety implications that may result from these changes for all road users.

The Council requests that all RSAs are undertaken in accordance with GG119, the Road Safety Audit guidelines. In line with this guidance, the appointed RSA team must remain independent from the conception, design, construction and operation of the scheme being audited. Therefore, to ensure an RSA remains free of bias, it is not possible for residents or anyone outwith the appointed RSA team, to feed into the process.

A stage 3 post-construction RSA for the Lanark Road and Longstone Spaces for People scheme is currently underway. The necessary site visits were undertaken week beginning 14 June 2021 and the draft report is currently being reviewed by the audit team. Upon completion of this review, the audit report will be issued to the City of Edinburgh Council.

This page is intentionally left blank