

Council Supplementary Questions and Answers

City of Edinburgh Council

10.00 am Thursday, 26th August, 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

Agenda Annex

Item no 10.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) What is the current status of the review of the city's bus network, as set out on page 26 of the approved City Mobility Plan?

Answer (1) The review of the city's bus network is currently at a very early stage and will need to take account of some key priorities including understanding the scale of patronage recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic; the introduction of the Bus Partnership Fund; and planned growth across the city region. This is also a key priority of the proposals for transport arms length organisation reform.

Question (2) What is the timetable for the completion of the review and subsequent report to committee?

Answer (2) There is no fixed timetable for completion of the review and reporting to Committee. This is because it is currently uncertain, particularly because it is not possible to predict how long it will be before the scale of patronage recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic is known.

Question (3) What opportunities exist for bus users, community councils and other stakeholders to contribute to the review?

Answer (3) Stakeholder engagement will be a key part of the review and, once an engagement plan has been developed, this will be shared with stakeholders.

Supplementary Question In her answer to question 1, the Convener stated the review was "at a very early stage". Can the convener clarify if any work has yet been undertaken and, if so, what?

**Supplementary
Answer**

The commitment to review the city's bus network is embedded in all of the public transport team's work activities.

Current activities include engagement with a variety of stakeholders on the Bus Partnership Fund and Edinburgh City Centre Transformation workstreams, where methodology of determining road use and space hierarchies are being developed.

As part of this, officers have been studying other cities and lessons are being learned from Amsterdam's Plusnet and Ghent's Circulation Plan. Officers have also met with counterparts from Dublin who are working on their BusConnects network review.

QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

'The 2021-31 Sustainable Capital Budget Strategy – Outturn 2021/21 and Revised Budget 2011/22 report, which was presented to the Finance and Resources Committee on 12th of August, states that as regards Trams to Newhaven there has been out-turn slippage of £6.577m. This slippage is partially attributed to 'utilities diversions being more onerous than forecasted'.

Question

Can the Convener advise

- Which utility diversions are proving more onerous than forecasted?
- What problems have been encountered?
- Whether she remains confident that the Trams to Newhaven project will complete, on budget, by May 2023?

Answer

The report to Finance and Resources committee reported a £6.577m underspend in year 2020/21 for the Trams to Newhaven project. This was the result of programme slippage, partially as a result of utility diversions taking longer than programmed. The most significant additional work was required to the following utilities:

- Diversion of a gas main at Jane Street, which had been diverted by the previous tram project but, when uncovered, was found to be insufficiently deep and therefore further work was required; and
- Discovery of a Victorian sewer at Constitution Street, which required a complete replacement.

From the previous tram construction project, a key lesson learned was the risk of utilities taking longer than programmed and that the potential for associated cost increases. Therefore, a significant risk allowance has been made in the current Trams to Newhaven project to ensure

that any additional costs from utilities can be accommodated within the project budget. In addition, the construction strategy, which utilises large worksites so that work can continue in different locations while difficult utility diversions are completed, has proved effective in these instances.

The project remains within budget and is working towards 'Open for Revenue' service in Spring 2023.

**Supplementary
Question**

Can you please clarify what "working towards 'Open for Revenue' service in Spring 2023" means? Does this mean the Tram Extension will be fully operational, the project concluded on time and on budget by Spring 2023?

**Supplementary
Answer**

It is currently anticipated that the line to Newhaven will be complete and open for operation by Spring 2023. As with any project, there are pressures on programme which have to be mitigated, along with opportunities which can mean that work completes more quickly than anticipated. This means that the exact date of opening will become clearer as the project progresses. The project is currently forecast to be delivered within budget.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Where there are proposals for interventions in relation to pedestrians (such as the subsequently refused pedestrian crossing on Lanark Road) data is gathered. In relation to the installation, adjustment and retention of cycle lanes what data gathering on cycling is planned and please can you provide details of

- (a) location and
- (b) dates of this data gathering and
- (c) which organisation(s) is/are undertaking this?

Answer

The report to the Council in June 2021 on the potential retention of Spaces for People measures indicated that the monitoring of measures will be reported to Transport and Environment Committee prior to the implementation of the associated Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs).

Supplementary Question

I fear my question has not been answered. I asked what is planned, not about what is to be reported? Please can I have an answer to the question.

Supplementary Answer

Before implementation of the original scheme, the following monitoring was commissioned by Sustrans and carried out during October 2020 by Streetwise and TSP Data:

- Volume of vehicle and cycle traffic across five working days at two locations on Lanark Road (adjacent to Redhall Bank Road, and adjacent to Hailes Gardens) and one location on Longstone Road (adjacent to Longstone Avenue); and
- Speed of vehicle traffic at the same locations.

Following the decision of Council in June 2021, monitoring was commissioned by the Council and carried out by Tracsis during Summer 2021 including:

In July 2021 (within School Holiday period):

- Volume of vehicle and cycle traffic monitoring was undertaken across five working days at two locations on Lanark Road (adjacent to Redhall Bank Road, and adjacent to Hailes Gardens) and one location on Longstone Road (adjacent to Longstone Avenue);
- Speed of vehicle and cycle traffic was monitored across the same period at the same locations; and
- A survey of parking occupancy was undertaken on full length of Lanark Road (from Inglis Green Road junction to Gillespie Road junction), along the full length of Inglis Green Road and on Longstone Road (from Lanark Road Junction to Murrayburn Road junction) on one full working day (05:00 – 20:00) during July 2021.

Monitoring was also carried out in August (outwith School Holiday period) on the volume of vehicle and cycle traffic across five working days at two locations on Lanark Road (adjacent to Redhall Bank Road, and adjacent to Hailes Gardens) and one location on Longstone Road (adjacent to Longstone Avenue).

No further monitoring is planned at this point.

QUESTION NO 14

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

- Question** (1) Can the Convener please arrange for this table from November 2020 to be updated, including any new schemes since then, showing the breakdown of Spaces for People expenditure (incurred and scheduled), broken down by project.
- Answer** (1) The table below is currently being updated and will be shared with Councillors as soon as possible.
- Question** (2) Now all the Spaces for People schemes have been completed, please also add the estimate for removing each of the schemes and carrying out any extra road repairs for any damage caused by burning the road surface and attaching bollards etc.
- Answer** (2) A breakdown of the cost for removing each scheme has not been prepared. However, a budget of £450,000 has been set aside for the removal of measures, if required.
- Question** (3) Please confirm that funding is still ringfenced and available for this as required.
- Answer** (3) As stated in the answer to Question 2, a budget has been set aside for the removal of measures.
- Supplementary Question** Does the failure to provide a complete answer for Full Council demonstrate the audit report findings of an over reliance on key officers?
- Supplementary Answer** Officers have confirmed that the delay in providing this updated table has been due to officer annual leave and that a cost reconciliation is currently underway on the individual schemes and the updated table will be provided when this reconciliation is complete.

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
South Bridge	Awaiting decision	£117,683.55	£12,033.17	£1,369.75	Underway
Waverley Bridge	On	£13,305.46	£371.80	£7,585.46	Underway
Forest Road	On	£52,695.78	£3,839.33	£33,863.78	Underway
George IV Bridge	On	£138,179.63	£5,687.06	£118,389.63	Installed
The Mound	On	£148,331.72	£2,669.17	£148,088.37	Installed
Princes Street East End	On	£100,375.96	£2,469.90	£95,282.23	Underway
Victoria Street	On	£18,501.01	£371.80	£16,781.01	Installed
Cockburn Street	On	£13,638.45	£371.80	£12,716.00	Installed
Chamber St / George IV	On	£136,000.00	£5,032.00	£1,493.45	Underway
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£6,729.45	£0.00	£6,402.17	
City Centre Phase 1		£745,441.01	£32,846.03	£441,971.85	
Queensferry High St	On	£30,000.00	£1,024.55	£0.00	
Great Junction St	On	£14,957.64	£307.51	£2,840.50	Underway
Stockbridge	On	£48,494.40	£3,784.70	£3,126.50	Underway
Portobello High Street	On	£30,132.72	£1,965.44	£2,598.50	Underway
Newington	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Gorgie / Dalry Road	On	£43,812.35	£3,433.65	£42,721.29	Installed
Corstorphine	On	£43,060.40	£2,953.17	£3,243.50	Underway
Bruntsfield	On	£31,983.48	£2,389.81	£29,998.69	Installed
Tolcross	On	£31,761.69	£1,652.80	£29,898.08	Installed
Morningside	On	£63,081.17	£4,229.95	£56,188.81	Installed
Haymarket Terrace	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Easter Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Shopping Streets		£337,283.85	£21,741.58	£170,615.87	
Telford Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Carrington Road	On	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Fountainbridge Dundee	On	£61,858.64	£4,980.14	£0.00	
Ferry Road	On	£106,284.88	£8,168.73	£100,146.32	Installed
Melville Drive	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Teviot Pl / Potterrow	On	£6,952.32	£257.24	£0.00	
Buccleuch St / Causewayside	On	£46,185.52	£3,537.28	£37,378.44	Underway
Crewe Toll Roundabout	On	£28,995.00	£1,880.20	£0.00	
Meadowplace Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Duddingston Road	On	£48,320.48	£3,805.36	£0.00	
Wester Hailes Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Craigmillar Park / Liberton	On	£110,058.80	£7,851.87	£0.00	
Gilmerton Road	On	£42,695.68	£3,717.04	£0.00	

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
Crewe Road South	On	£88,222.63	£5,116.01	£85,216.63	Installed
Old Dalkeith Road	On	£78,008.98	£3,056.52	£75,002.98	Installed
Comiston Road	On	£139,839.05	£10,466.80	£113,207.61	Underway
Ingils Green Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Pennywell Road	On	£119,757.32	£8,785.73	£111,788.32	Installed
Mayfield Road	On	£29,715.11	£2,380.00	£0.00	
QC - Meadows / Greenbank	On	£43,680.00	£2,751.46	£0.00	
Queensferry Road 1a	Awaiting decision	£75,261.00	£4,965.51	£0.00	
A1 Corridor	Awaiting decision	£93,692.00	£6,662.40	£0.00	
Slateford Road (A70), Lanark Rd, Longstone Rd & Murrayburn Rd	On	£252,774.00	£19,092.74	£0.00	
Orchard Brae	On	£13,330.00	£851.91	£0.00	
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£5,992.61	£0.00	£0.00	
Phase 1b Bus Lanes	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
West Coates	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Arterial Routes		£1,391,624.02	£98,326.94	£522,740.30	
East Craigs	Awaiting decision	£55,598.00	£4,878.09	£0.00	
Drum Brae North	On	£36,419.00	£2,896.50	£0.00	
Leith Connections	On	£42,880.00	£4,087.20	£0.00	
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£2,536.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Low Traffic Neighbourhoods		£137,433.00	£11,861.79	£0.00	
Braid Road	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Links Garden	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Cammo Walk	On	£1,700.00	£0.00	£1,700.00	Installed
Warriston Road	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Stanley Street/Hope Street	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Braidburn Terrace	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Silverknowes Road (South)	On	£33,318.00	£2,464.65	£0.00	
Silverknowes Road (North)	On	£27,900.00	£2,306.09	£0.00	
Granton Sq / Gypsy Brae	On	£77,463.92	£5,981.42	£0.00	
Braid Hills Drive	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Seafield Street	On	£2,174.00	£78.10	£1,467.00	Installed
Kings Place	On	£17,177.00	£929.50	£877.00	Underway

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
Arboretum Place	On	£12,431.46	£729.55	£1,766.10	Underway
Maybury Rd Temp. Crossing	On	£55,883.63	£1,950.00	£22,975.84	Underway
Spaces for Exercise		£238,048.01	£14,439.31	£28,785.94	
Broughton Street	Awaiting decision	£49,428.24	£4,939.08	£0.00	
Broughton St Roundabout	Awaiting decision	£50,624.20	£3,817.03	£0.00	
Restalrig Rd South - Opt. 2	On	£6,920.00	£416.20	£0.00	
West End of Princes Street	On	£3,763.00	£316.92	£0.00	
Musselburgh to Portobello Opt. 1 Edinburgh section	On	£55,399.20	£5,601.98	£0.00	
Duddingston Road West	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Fillyside Road - Crossing	On	£30,000.00	£1,950.00	£0.00	
Fillyside Road	On	£4,584.36	£411.93	£0.00	
Glenlockhart Drive	On	£2,798.00	£103.53	£0.00	
Starbank Road	On	£12,608.40	£1,128.81	£0.00	
Commonplace Interventions		£216,125.40	£18,685.48	£0.00	
Schools		£150,000.00		£20,625.49	
Sub-total			£3,413,856.42	£1,184,739.45	
Consultancy Support			£300,000.00	£118,478.78	
Internal Management Costs			£750,000.00	£504,759.07	
Segregation units for maintenance and schemes to be developed			£171,292.00	£0.00	
Monitoring & Evaluation			£175,000.00	£86,410.00	
Removal Allowance			£450,000.00	£0.00	
Street Cleaning Over Winter Period 20/21/22			£50,000.00	£0.00	
Removal of Street Clutter			£50,000.00	£0.00	
Uncertainty - installation, maintenance, removal			£196,005.10	£0.00	
TOTAL PROJECTION			£5,556,153.52	£1,894,387.30	

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

- Question** (1) Who created the brand name "Spaces for People"
- Answer** (1) In response to the outbreak of COVID-19, the Scottish Government announced funding to enable physical distancing and to improve conditions for walking, cycling and wheeling in April 2020. This funding was titled 'Spaces for People'.
- Question** (2) Who designed the adverts for the retaining Spaces for People consultation (used on lampposts and digital formats) for Council to approve and implement?
- Answer** (2) These were designed internally within the Council.
- Question** (3) Why is the programme, largely consisting of the same schemes, being rebranded as "Travelling Safely"?
- Answer** (3) As set out in Question 1, the Spaces for People initiative was specifically to enable physical distancing and to improve conditions for walking, cycling and wheeling in response to COVID-19. These measures were introduced using Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTRO).
In June 2021, the Council agreed to introduce Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETRO) in some areas where measures which are currently in place under TTRO have the potential support the Council's objectives in the longer term.
This is a new approach rather than a rebranding of the programme.
- Question** (4) When there have been so many accidents relating to existing Spaces for People schemes, with a number of personal injury claims, could the Council be accused of misrepresentation by rebranding the programme "Travelling Safely"?

- Answer** (4) The schemes which have been approved to progress to ETRO and those which are currently being reviewed are all designed to improve connectivity and to link into other schemes, therefore the new programme has been titled Travelling Safely.
- Question** (5) Why is the programme not more clearly being branded in relation to the main aim of supporting the Net Zero target?
- Answer** (5) The aim of supporting the Net Zero target was set out clearly in the consultation and in the reports to Transport and Environment Committee and the Council, alongside the other strategic priorities which the new programme will support moving forward.
- Question** (6) Please can you provide evidence of the exact dangers and number of incidents in the last 5 years in Edinburgh that the "Travelling Safely" programme is aiming to address broken down by each road user group?
- Answer** (6) The Travelling Safely programme is aiming to provide safer, more desirable routes around the city as an alternative to using motorised vehicles. The programme is designed to encourage cycling and walking around the city for people who do not feel safe with the current infrastructure or who do not have access to a motorised vehicle.
- Question** (7) Please can you provide the target of reduced accidents by category of road user group, that the "Travelling Safely" programme is aiming to address, in what timescale, and how that will be measured
- Answer** (7) The priority of the Council is to make travelling around the city as safe as possible, with the ultimate aim of there being no accidents on the city's roads. The Travelling Safely programme does not have specific targets attributed to it.
- Supplementary Question** In answer to questions (3) it is stated this a **new approach**. Why therefore, for clarity are we not starting again from scratch?

**Supplementary
Answer**

As discussed at Council in June and set out in answer (3) above, there are some measures which are currently in place under Spaces for People which have the potential to support the Council's objectives in the long term. The approach to this new programme was set out in a report to Transport and Environment Committee on [19 August 2021](#).

Item no 10.21

QUESTION NO 21

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

As the cost of providing the service has increased by 40% to £35, can the Convener please pinpoint and specify what is driving such a significant increase?

Answer

The Council introduced a charge for the garden waste collection service to assist in recovering some of the costs associated with this non-statutory service.

Scottish Councils are limited by regulation to only recover costs related to collection, but not disposal. The increase from £25 to £35 enables the service to fully cover the current garden waste collection costs and takes into account overhead costs (e.g. fuel, labour, transportation) which have increased since the charge was first introduced and allows for investment to improve the registration process for customers.

Supplementary Question

I requested to “**pinpoint and specify**” yet I have been given general high level statement. I have submitted a reasonable request.. As local Cllrs we are all accountable for this and therefore can you please provide a detailed breakdown of the relative costs?

Supplementary Answer

The business case for the introduction of the charge in 2018 was based on a mix of known costs and predicted costs based on assumptions such as sign up levels, subscription management costs and system costs.

The table below outlines the forecasted (or actual for 2019/20) cost of the service, projected income and anticipated revenue budget allocation required between the

original business case to introduce the charge in 2018, 2019/20 collection year (used in the cost recovery business case as the last full collection year before the proposal was developed); and the cost recovery and increased mid-year window business case:

	Cost of Service	Income	Budget Requirement
Business case assumptions when charges were introduced	£1.8m	£1.5m	£0.256m
Actual 2019/20	£2.5m	£1.9m	£0.634m
Updated business case for 2021/22	£2.6m	£2.3 - 2.5m	£0.088m - £0.341m

It is important to note that the service can only recover costs related to the garden waste collection service and cannot generate a surplus.

The £35 charge has been calculated on this basis, with the forecast income based on both projected high and low levels of resident sign up.

The increase in service collection costs from the original business case, and therefore increase required to the charge, has been caused by factors such as:

- The cost of vehicles – the number of vehicles required increased following the move from 5-day double shifts to 4-day collections (a cost increase of £0.215m);
- The cost of frontline staffing – additional crew members were required and pay awards, pay steps and the pay changes from the move to 4-day week have led to an increase in the cost of frontline staffing (a cost increase of £0.294m);
- The cost of systems and administration – the original business case does not breakdown these costs in the same way as the cost recovery calculations so a direct comparison is not possible, however additional resources have been added to the subscription team and funding identified for the system developments to improve the process and increase the period when sign up can be processed (a cost increase of £0.207m);

- Communications – the ongoing need for a communication and marketing budget (including permit and mailing costs) has led to an annual budget being created for communications (the annual budget has increased by £0.065m);
- Provision of bins – particularly for customers signing up at new developments or at addresses that have not been receiving the service (the cost of this has increased by £0.064m);
- Bank charges – charges for transaction processing were not accounted for in the original business case. The charge is a percentage of the transaction cost and varies from bank to bank. This cost is met from the income received (this equates to a reduction in income of between £0.058m and £0.065m); and
- Achieving full cost recovery – as outlined above, the service can only recover costs related to the collection service and cannot generate a surplus. The £35 charge is based on the cost of service delivery; however, the associated income was forecast on the basis of both high and low sign up levels

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Has the City Council reported to Scottish Government as funder of Spaces for People through Sustrans about the red audit finding and if not, does it intend to do so?

Answer

No, the Council has not reported this to Sustrans as officers do not believe that there is reason to do so.

Supplementary Question

I note that officers do not believe there is a reason to do so. Given we have a councillor and administration led council and the question was of the Convener, what does the convener think?

Supplementary Answer

The provision of Scottish government funding for the Spaces for People pandemic response did not include any conditions of grant relating to how the programme was administered. There is therefore no specific reason to share the findings of an internal audit with the Scottish Government or with Sustrans. The internal audit is in the public domain and could, of course, be shared with them if they request it.

It should also be recognised, as it was in the internal audit report, that, in the interim period between the internal audit being undertaken and the report being published, there had been significant management actions to meet concerns expressed within the report.

‘Management had identified a number of areas where improvement was required, and had either addressed them (for example, retrospective publication of prioritisation outcomes) or were implementing improvements (for example, creating a programme risk register) during the audit or as at our audit completion date.’

The internal audit report also recognised *‘the challenges associated within urgent implementation of SfP initiatives to support citizens during initial Covid-19 lockdown measures’*.

The internal audit report is a very useful document which serves to provide guidance on this particular project and to provide lessons for future project implementation.