

Council Supplementary Questions and Answers

City of Edinburgh Council

10.00 am Thursday, 24th June, 2021

Virtual Meeting - via Microsoft Teams

Supplementary Questions and Answers

Contacts

Email: gavin.king@edinburgh.gov.uk

Tel: 0131 529 4239

Andrew Kerr

Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

MEETING 2

24 June 2021

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

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
Replace Residual Ind Grey Requests	3,550	705	4,255

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-Craighentiny/Duddingston	31	3	34
15-Southside/Newington	39	3	42
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	125	24	149
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	75	8	83
Replace Garden Bin Requests	853	127	980

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-Craigentiny/Duddingston	123	15	138
15-Southside/Newington	72	15	87
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	249	68	317
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	181	32	213
Replace Recycling Bin Requests	1,830	273	2,103

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.

Supplementary Question

The Council has a published target of getting new or replacement wheelie bins to households within 10 days of a request being made. However, her answers show this target is not being met in a third of grey bin requests; a quarter of garden waste bin requests and a fifth of recycling bin requests. Can the Convener clarify what factors are currently contributing to this?

**Supplementary
Answer**

There are a number of factors which have contributed to the delay in fulfilling bin requests including:

- In the past few months there has been a delay in ordering new bins and in the requested fulfilment date provided to the supplier;
- There is a shortage of the materials to manufacture bins which is impacting on supply and cost; and
- Over the past 12 months there has been a significant number of bin requests placed. When requests were submitted online, the confirmation email was confirming that the new/replacement would be received within 10 working days. When this was not the case, repeat requests were being submitted, further increasing the number of requests.

The service is monitoring both availability and cost and is placing orders when it is appropriate to do so. A mini-procurement competition is also currently underway to improve supply.

The web form has now been updated to indicate that there may be a delay in fulfilling requests and the Waste and Cleansing team are working with ICT colleagues to further update the website and to improve the information available to customers.

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.

Supplementary Question Which Ministers has the Leader met in his capacity as Council Leader and what extra funding has resulted from those meetings ?

Supplementary Answer Since the budget meeting I've taken part in meetings as Council Leader with the Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Economy, Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Housing and Local Government and Cabinet Secretary for Constitution, External Affairs and Culture many meetings have taken place pre-budget also to make Edinburgh's case on a number of points and consistently through COSLA to make a collective and unified case for local Government.

There are several ongoing discussions related to local government finance post-budget however already since the

budget there have been announcements of additional funding benefiting Edinburgh:

- £96.8m of extra support for bus operators which helped support Lothian Buses and other operators across Scotland bringing total support to over £210m
- £5.3m of extra support for light rail, which was split between Edinburgh Tram and Glasgow Subway, bringing total support to £15m
- An allocation of £0.846m from the Scottish Government's *Summer of Activities for Children and Young People* programme to deliver enhanced holiday activities and experiences for those in the city, including food and wider family support where needed, and targeted at low income families, children and young people particularly adversely affected by the impacts of the pandemic;
- Funding of £0.346m to increase the level of school clothing grant from £100 to £120 for primary school pupils and to £150 for secondary school pupils from the beginning of the August term;
- Additional in-year funding of around £0.350m to support the much-valued instrumental music service in the city's schools;
- Over £1.2m of continuing free school meal support to eligible children and young people during the summer, October, Christmas, February and Easter holidays;
- Over £2.3m to support the roll-out of free school meals to all P4 pupils from August 2021, extending this to all P5 pupils from January 2022.

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.

**Supplementary
Question**

Will representations be made to the Finance Secretary to allocate the same amount of funding found for the Council Tax freeze to make a one-off payment of the Scottish Child Payment?

**Supplementary
Answer (by
Councillor Day)**

This is not a local authority administered fund and is therefore a matter for National Government. I will write to the finance secretary to raise this issue.

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 14th January this year. I wrote to the Housing Minister on the 17th 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 25th March 2021, on the 21st 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.

**Supplementary
Question**

The increase indicated in the answer is nowhere near the 63% increase in funding identified by the SHIP and will this amount be requested in any meetings held with Government Ministers?

**Supplementary
Answer**

At the start of this administrative term the council's resource planning assumption (RPA) was £29.12m. This year our RPA was £52.42m, an increase of 80% over the last five years.

I met the Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Housing and Local Government on Monday 28th June and set out the challenges we face in Edinburgh including the low level of social housing compared to other local authority areas, and the need for increased grant funding to help redress this imbalance.

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>

Supplementary Question

What action will be taken to free the 55 workers identified from desk bound work to work that will make them active for the communities they serve?

Supplementary Answer

All the workers being referred to have been actively involved and key to the delivery of a wide range of supports and opportunities for the communities that they serve as highlighted in the annual Lifelong Learning Service report. That report provides a great deal of detail of the very positive and impactful work that these staff had led with a great deal of positive evaluation from the service users. The workers will be asked to continue to work from home if possible although many have already been working in face to face settings in schools , libraries ,outdoor settings .

The plans are that as restrictions hopefully ease over the summer months then staff will be able to return to a place of work if that is appropriate and desirable.

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

Supplementary Question

Will there be a drop in the number of workers in Libraries with the cuts made to the Libraries Budget for this year ?

Supplementary Answer

Any budget savings have been clearly targeted at efficiency savings and not at staff reductions. This Administration has made it quite clear that there must be no reductions in Library staff as a result of these or any other budget reductions.

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.

Supplementary Question I thank the Council Leader for his answer, and I'm delighted to hear the Chief Executive will be one of the first to take the training. Can the council leader please clarify whether he has signed up to the current round of carbon literacy training for elected members, and if not, will he do so?

Supplementary Answer I will be attending one of the sessions, there are limited spaces and we'll make sure that key Councillors, including myself, are able to attend the future spaces provided for elected members through the programme.

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.

Supplementary Question I thank the Convener for his answer. He says that the "established practice" is that placement requests from GME parents outside the city boundaries are always granted. Will he agree to make that into a formal policy, to give more certainty to GME parents?

**Supplementary
Answer**

If a statutory consultation is to proceed then engagement with surrounding local authorities on developing this as a formal policy could take place as part of the process. Key elements in the discussion will be ensuring enough capacity exists for future demand and whether the other local authorities have any of their own plans to establish GME in their areas.

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 31st March 2021.

Supplementary Question To clarify, is it your position that you were unable to lodge the Company Accounts on time 2 years running because you were unable to access paper-based files for a 16 month period? Where were the paper based files being kept that rendered them inaccessible?

Supplementary Answer It was one of a number of challenges. The current board were only in place from November 2019, and the two key staff members who had been responsible for the company's finances, including the accountant, are no longer with the company. Many records were not kept electronically, including contracts for subvention. All the paperwork was initially at the offices shared with the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce. These had been moved to council storage facilities at the Murrayburn depot.

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.

Supplementary Question In relation to answer 4, what steps are the council and agencies taking to rule out any other possible spam in the rest of the data set?

Supplementary Answer The online research panel companies used to distribute the market research survey have a series of defined processes in place to ensure the high quality of their participants. This includes checking for duplicate participants by evaluating variables such as email address, matches across several demographic data, and device-related data through use of digital fingerprint technology. Additionally, the different panel companies work together to remove duplicate participants when more than one panel company is used on a project.

In this survey, respondents were screened to make sure they lived in City of Edinburgh before accessing the full

survey, and the topic was not revealed in advance. Each respondent received a unique invitation, their panel ID was recorded and a cookie dropped upon completion of the survey to prevent anyone responding more than once.

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

Supplementary Question Noting that BEST was not invited to respond as a stakeholder in terms of answer 1, but are listed as a stakeholder having provided a response, what are the objective criteria that a new group has to fulfil to become recognised by the council as a stakeholder?

Supplementary Answer The Council does not have specific criteria for recognition of a group as a Stakeholder. The list of Stakeholders given in answer 1 relates to those who were invited to respond to the stakeholder consultation.

However, submissions from groups or organisations received via email, and clearly identified as a response to the consultation, were included in the summary of responses from Stakeholders included in the report to Transport and Environment Committee in June 2021.

Each of the responses are [published in full on the website](#) (after gaining permission from each stakeholder to do so). The following stakeholders were thus considered alongside

those who were invited to make a submission:

- Better Edinburgh for Sustainable Travel
- Car Free Holyrood
- Corstorphine Primary School Travel Action Group
- Edinburgh Bus Users Group
- Low Traffic Corstorphine
- Preston Street School Parent Teacher Association

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 11th 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.

Supplementary Question In relation to answer 2, these costs seem to have increased by nearly £2,000 from £10,000 since the costs were provided in answers to questions previously. Why is this?

Supplementary Answer The cost of the market research increased from the original cost expected due to changes in the complexity and length of the survey which were requested by Council officers. [In particular, this related to the introduction of opportunities for participants to provide free text answers and the requirement to then analyse these responses.]

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 administrated 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.

Supplementary Question

What was the cost of the design work covered by the grant?

Supplementary Answer

There was no charge to the City of Edinburgh Council Spaces for People grant for design works which were carried out by Sustrans in-house.

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 28th of May, where the Convenor will clarify the Government's position in advance of that consultation being launched.

Supplementary Question I thank the Council Leader for his answer. Can I ask for some clarity on one point? He says that meeting parents' aspirations for the future of Gaelic Medium Education is one of his overriding concerns. If that's the case, will he agree to meet with Gaelic parents before the Education Committee in August to hear their concerns first hand?

Supplementary Answer Of course I'm happy to meet parents to hear their views but it's important that views are given through the consultation to ensure a full and arcuate picture.

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)

Location	Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pàirce	JGHS	Darroch Annexe (6 Gillespie Street)
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

Location	Bun-sgoil Taobh na Páirce Pupils	Bun-sgoil Taobh na Páirce Pupils (%)
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.

**Supplementary
Question**

I thank the Convener for his answer. Many Gaelic parents will be disappointed to hear that none of these options has been discussed with the Scottish Government. Will the Convener clarify whether that discussion will take place before the Education Committee meeting in August, and whether the report will reflect those discussions?

**Supplementary
Answer**

As agreed at the Education, Children and Families Committee on the 28 May, I have written to the Cabinet Secretary and requested a meeting to discuss GME. If a meeting is forthcoming then this issue of the Scottish Government making a site available for development of a GME secondary school will be raised.

The Executive Director has met with the parents group to review their concerns and to focus on their ambitions. This engagement will continue and be an opportunity for feeding back any further information to parents.

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.

Supplementary Question

If the survey was, as claimed, statistically representative of the Edinburgh population, why is the figure of car access not in agreement with the 45% figure (+/- the 4% survey margin of error)?

Supplementary Answer

As stated above, the market research survey was only weighted by age and gender of respondents to be broadly representative of the Edinburgh population. There was no weighting applied for car ownership.

This page is intentionally left blank