

# Council Questions and Answers

## City of Edinburgh Council

10.00 am Thursday, 25th November, 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

#### Nick Smith

Service Director, Legal and Assurance

This page is intentionally left blank

## Item no 10.1

### QUESTION NO 1

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

At the 19 August 2021 meeting of the Transport Committee, and following a discussion on the business bulletin item covering the Kirkliston cross roads, committee voted to agree “that a report setting out options for reconfiguring the junction and any other appropriate action should be presented to committee for decision in November 2021”.

**Question** (1) Why was a report not presented to committee at the November meeting?

**Answer** (1) A detailed update of the proposed junction improvements was provided in the Business Bulletin for Transport and Environment Committee on [14 October 2021](#).

**Question** (2) When will the report be presented?

**Answer** (2) A report on progress on the proposed signal control improvements will be presented to Transport and Environment Committee on 27 January 2022.

## Item no 10.2

### QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

- Question** (1) What engagement has there been with Living Streets Edinburgh since the October meeting of the Transport & Environment Committee regarding the review of pedestrian waiting times at road crossings?
- Answer** (1) There is ongoing engagement with Living Streets on the Travelling Safely pedestrian prioritisation at traffic signals workstream and broader study. This engagement will continue for the workstream and will focus on the findings of the study when complete.
- Question** (2) How many crossing waiting times have been reviewed since this meeting of the committee?
- Answer** (2) Prior to Committee meeting on 14 October 2021, there were seven pedestrian crossings which had not been reviewed as part of the Travelling Safely programme that was agreed by Transport and Environment Committee. These seven have now been completed.
- Question** (3) What programme is in place to review pedestrian waiting times at crossings throughout the city?
- Answer** (3) As set out in answer 2 there was a programme of work focusing on key routes as part of the Travelling Safely programme. As part of the on-going discussions with Living Streets, where concerns are raised regarding waiting times at crossings, officers are seeking to improve these crossing times wherever possible.

## Item no 10.3

### QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Howie for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

- Question** (1) According to our equalities data, what percentage of staff identify as disabled?
- Answer** (1) 2.9% of our employees have self-classified and recorded themselves as having a long-term condition or disability. This is based on response rate of 80.8%. The remaining 19.2% of employees have either stated they prefer not to say (5.2%) or left the question blank (14%).
- Question** (2) In terms of degree of disability, how many of these staff have been offered support to get Department of Work and Pensions Access to Work funding for assistance with their role?
- Answer** (2) The Council does not hold this information since the Access to Work scheme operated by the UK Government requires employees to submit their Access to Work application directly to the Department for Work and Pensions. The Council does, however, provide appropriate support and advice to employees on reasonable adjustments through its occupational health provider, health and safety professionals and our property and facilities management teams.
- Question** (3) What steps has the council taken to make the recruitment process easier for people who experience neurodivergence (e.g. on the autistic spectrum or with attention deficit disorder) but don't qualify as disabled?

**Answer**

- (3) The Council is committed to building an inclusive recruitment culture where all people feel valued, included and able to be at their best during the recruitment process. The Council recognises that every person will potentially have different needs and may require different reasonable adjustments, therefore, recruiting line managers work with individuals to ensure they have a positive experience when applying to work for the Council.

In addition, the Council is a Disability Confident Employer in accordance with the UK wide scheme operated by the Department for Work and Pensions. This means that the Council offers guaranteed interviews for jobs where candidates meet the essential requirements and consider themselves to have a disability or long-term condition. It should be noted that, for employment purposes, disability is a matter of self-classification, not a requirement to meet a specification 'qualifying criteria'.

**Question**

- (4) For each of the past 3 years:
- How many, both in numbers and as a percentage of all applicants through myjobscotland.gov.uk indicated they identified as disabled and were eligible for the Guaranteed Interview Scheme and what percentage of those were Modern apprenticeships?
  - How many of these were invited to an interview?
  - How many of these required adjustments to attend the interview?
  - How many of these adjustments were accommodated by us enabling them to attend?
  - How many of these were offered the job?

**Answer**

- (4) Appendix 1 provides the figures requested for Local Government Employees.

This information is drawn from the national recruitment portal for Local Government, operated by the Improvement Service, known as MyJobScotland. It should be noted that this does not require mandatory disclosure by job applicants about whether they consider themselves to have a disability or long-term health condition.

The Council's recruitment process clearly advises that if a candidate for a post requires any reasonable adjustments to enable them to attend an interview, that they should contact the recruiting line manager to facilitate this.

No request for a reasonable adjustment should be declined by a recruiting line manager and professional advice on reasonable adjustments is available from different experts, as outlined in the answer to question 2, if an individual is selected for employment. In addition, it should be noted that pre-employment occupational health screening questionnaires will review if any reasonable adjustments are required.

**Question**

- (5) Part time contracts (Temporary and permanent):

- Does the council operate a scheme whereby disabled people work part time and at the same time retain full benefits?
- If so, how many are employed on a temporary basis?
- If so, how many are employed are on a permanent basis?

**Answer**

- (5) The Council does not offer a scheme whereby employees that consider themselves to have a disability or long-term health condition can request part time hours but retain a full-time salary. As with all part-time employment arrangements, salary is pro-rated to the hours worked.

The Council does however offer a range of flexible working options to all employees which these includes, part time working, permanently working from home and variable hours, etc.

**Question**

**(6)** Pay grades, career development, promotion:

- What grades are disabled employees on?
- How many disabled employees are offered career development opportunities?
- How many disabled employees occupy promoted positions?
- How many disabled employees are currently occupying grade 10 posts or above?

**Answer**

**(6)** A breakdown by grade for Local Government Employees that have self-classified as having a disability or long-term condition is provided in Appendix 1 to these responses.

All employees, irrespective of any protected characteristic, including disability or long-term health conditions are offered career development opportunities and any individual a disclosed disability or long-term health condition who meets the minimum essential criteria will be guaranteed an interview should they apply for a promotion, as stated.

The Council does not have a recording category of 'promoted positions.' However, the Workforce Dashboard, which is regularly reported to the Finance and Resources Committee classifies employees at Grade 5 or above to be a Frontline Manager or Specialist, based on this description the Council has 259 colleagues who have declared a disability or long-term health condition to be in a promoted post (excluding teachers). 7 of these colleagues are Grade 10 or above. On the basis of this definition, employees in these roles could be deemed to be 'promoted.'

In addition, employees with self-classified disabilities or long-term conditions are employed within Chief Officer roles. However, this detail is not provided, because of the limited number of employees at this level, which may make individuals directly identifiable



## Data for Question 4

	2020		2019		2018	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Candidates declaring a disability (from the total number of candidates applying)	4077	5.4	3082	5.1	3017	4.7
Invited to interview (from those declaring a disability)	920	22.5	726	23.6	637	21.1
Offered a role (from those invited to interview)	74	8	111	15.3	36	5.7
Candidates for Modern Apprenticeship roles	15		36		47	

## Data for Question 6

Grade	Employees self-classifying with a disability or long-term condition
GR1	14
GR2	33
GR3	89
GR4	107
GR5	69
GR6	56
GR7	74
GR8	41
GR9	12
GR10	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>502</b>

## Item no 10.4

### QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

- Question** (1) Please can the Convener confirm whether the cost of fully bilingual Gaelic/English signage throughout the new Meadowbank building has been investigated, either by the council or by Edinburgh Leisure?
- Answer** (1) The cost of fully bilingual signage has not been investigated. For the new Meadowbank Sports Centre, Edinburgh Leisure's approach is to keep the signage clear and uncluttered, taking cognisance (in the design of the signage) of the challenges that people with dementia and other cognitive issues face regards to signage and what would support their ease of use. There are several TV/ electronic screens throughout the building to identify areas/ spaces and share information with customers. The TV screens identifying the activity areas will also detail the Gaelic equivalent.
- The Welcome to Meadowbank Sports Centre sign to the right-hand side of the main entrance on the external wall will also be displayed in Gaelic.
- Question** (2) If so, what was the estimated cost of fully bilingual signage? What was the estimated cost of monolingual signage?
- Answer** (2) As noted above, the cost of fully bilingual signage has not been investigated.
- Question** (3) If this has not been investigated, why not?
- Answer** (3) This is answered in the response to question 1.

## Item no 10.5

### QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

**Question** (1) Please can the Convener confirm whether the cost of fully bilingual Gaelic/English signage on the Newhaven tram extension has been investigated?

**Answer** (1) Discussions have taken place between the project and the Capital Gaelic Development Officer. A translation of the location signage to be installed on the Tram to Newhaven project has been requested. Initial costings for the translation are awaited from Gaelic Place- Names of Scotland.

**Question** (2) If so, what is the estimated cost of fully bilingual signage? What is the estimated cost of monolingual signage?

**Answer** (2) The cost of signage is borne by Edinburgh Trams as they instruct design to accord with brand requirements. Any additional cost for the inclusion of a Gaelic translation will be assessed when the translation (which will inform the size of each sign and in turn support requirements) has been prepared and discussed with Edinburgh Trams.

**Question** (3) If this has not been investigated, why not?

**Answer** (3) As noted above.

## Item no 10.6

### QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

#### Question

Please could the Convener set out in table form (1) the number of parking spaces currently available to N3 permit-holders in the following streets, (2) the net gain or loss to N3 permit-holders should TRO/21/16 be implemented in these streets, and (3) totals for both.

- Bedford Street
- Cheyne Street
- Comely Bank Avenue
- Comely Bank Grove
- Comely Bank Place
- Comely Bank Row
- Comely Bank Street
- Comely Bank Terrace (both sides)
- Dean Park Street
- Learmonth Avenue
- Learmonth Crescent
- Learmonth Gardens
- Learmonth Grove
- Learmonth Park
- Learmonth Place
- Learmonth View
- Portgower Place
- Raeburn Place
- South Learmonth Gardens

#### Answer

The table below sets out the requested information. Please note that permit and shared use parking places are marked in continuous blocks rather than individual parking places. Therefore, the figures below are estimated parking space numbers based on the current available lengths of kerbside parking and the lengths of parking that may be lost should TRO/21/16 be implemented

<b>Zone N3 streets</b>	<b>Parking spaces currently available to N3 permit-holders</b>	<b>Net gain or loss to N3 permit-holders should TRO/21/16 be implemented</b>
-	-	-
Bedford Street	33	-2
Cheyne Street	26	-4
Comely Bank Avenue	101	-10
Comely Bank Grove	46	-6
Comely Bank Place	36	-10
Comely Bank Row	32	-6
Comely Bank Street	40	-8
Comely Bank Terrace (both sides)	31	-4
Dean Park Street	36	-14
Learmonth Avenue	56	-10
Learmonth Crescent	56	-4
Learmonth Gardens	69	-2
Learmonth Grove	60	-10
Learmonth Park	19	0
Learmonth Place	30	-2
Learmonth View	13	-2
Portgower Place	15	-2
Raeburn Place	0	0
South Learmonth Gardens	73	-2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>-98</b>

## Item no 10.7

### QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

#### Question

Please could the Convener set out in table form (1) the number of parking spaces currently available to N2 permit-holders in the following streets, (2) the net gain or loss to N2 permit-holders should TRO/21/16 be implemented in these streets, and (3) the totals for both.

- Bangholm Terrace
- Eildon Street
- Goldenacre Terrace
- Howard Place
- Howard Street
- Inverleith Avenue
- Inverleith Row
- Inverleith Terrace
- Monmouth Terrace
- Montagu Terrace
- Royston Terrace
- Warriston Crescent

#### Answer

The table below provides the requested information. Please note that permit and shared use parking places are marked in continuous blocks rather than individual parking places. Therefore, the figures below are estimated parking space numbers based on the current available lengths of kerbside parking and the lengths of parking that may be lost should TRO/21/16 be implemented.

<u>N2 zone streets</u>	parking spaces currently available to N2 permit-holders	net gain or loss to N2 permit-holders should TRO/21/16 be implemented
-	-	-
Bangholm Terrace	20	-2
Eildon Street	84	-8
Goldenacre Terrace	18	-4
Howard Place - included with Inverleith Row	-	-
Howard Street - included with Inverleith Row	-	-
Inverleith Avenue	0	0
Inverleith Row	70	0
Inverleith Terrace	108	-2
Monmouth Terrace	12	-2
Montagu Terrace	10	0
Royston Terrace	20	-4
Warriston Crescent	44	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>-22</b>

## Item no 10.8

### QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

In the report about Lanark Road provided to the Transport and Environment Committee on 14 October, in the Active Travel Measures Travelling Safely update in item 7.1, Appendix 2 (Lanark Road: Monitoring Results, Feedback from Engagement Exercise and Recommendations) contains cycle and vehicle count data for Lanark Road near Redhall Bank Road and Spylaw Bank Road.

For each of the survey periods, please could you provide the daily counts for each date within the survey period for both locations:

- Question**
- (1)** October 2020 data, in the report all that was provided was an average from the 5 working days. Please provide the individual counts for each of 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 October, to include the weekend for both cycle and vehicles.



**Answer****(1)**

Cycles per Day	Location	
	Spylaw Bank	Redhall Bank
07/10/2020	120	149
08/10/2020	140	155
09/10/2020	130	136
10/10/2020	89	141
11/10/2020	131	183
12/10/2020	99	91
13/10/2020	98	98

Vehicles per Day	Spylaw Bank
07/10/2020	10,628
08/10/2020	10,688
09/10/2020	11,222
10/10/2020	12,929
11/10/2020	10,886
12/10/2020	9,128
13/10/2020	10,635

There were no vehicle counts carried out at Redhall Bank during October 2020.

**Question**

**(2)** August 2021 data - the data for the school holiday period is missing. Please provide data for each of 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 August for both cycle and vehicles

**Answer****(2)**

Cycles per Day	Location	
	Spylaw Bank	Redhall Bank
16/08/2021	92	115
17/08/2021	92	120
18/08/2021	112	141
19/08/2021	128	136
20/08/2021	103	131

Vehicles per Day	Location	
	Spylaw Bank	Redhall Bank
16/08/2021	9,008	8,475
17/08/2021	9,420	8,838
18/08/2021	9,992	9,097
19/08/2021	10,085	9,763
20/08/2021	9,987	9,859

**Question****(3)**

In the July 2021 and August 2021 survey periods, it appears from the report that the weekends were excluded from the survey.

- a) Why wasn't a full week of data captured in the survey periods to include weekends?
- b) If it was included, please can you provide cycle and vehicle counts for both locations for the weekend days for July and August 2021.

**Answer****(3)**

- a) Traffic counts generally focus on working days which provide the most consistent data in terms of levels of use. Data at weekends is more variable, and involves more optional trips, thus is less reflective of the general level of use.
- b) Not applicable.

## Item no 10.9

### QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Depute Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

The Depute Leader will be aware of considerable comment on this policy approved by the Transport and Environment Committee on 17 May 2018 regarding litter and litter bins in Victoria Park.

The policy review is annually, or as required.

**Question** (1) Can the Depute Leader confirm which Committee of Council will next review this policy, and when this review is due to take place?

**Answer** (1) The Litter Bin Siting Policy is reviewed annually as part of the annual review of Waste and Cleansing Policies. The most recent review was reported to Transport and Environment Committee on [11 November 2021](#).

**Question** (2) Would the Depute Leader agree that a review would be a helpful in response to the comment from the community around Victoria Park?

**Answer** (2) I agree that a brief review by officers of the number of bins and their location in Victoria Park, alongside the current frequencies, would be helpful with the outcome to be circulated to ward Councillors.

**Question** (3) Finally, would the Depute Leader accept that more frequent servicing of the litter bins where they are currently sited in Victoria Park, and other locations throughout the city, would reduce the unacceptable spectacle of litter overflowing from Council litter bins and contaminating the public realm?

**Answer** (3) Litter bin servicing is carried out by the Council's street cleansing team. At the end of October 2021 the service began to roll-out Routesmart, with the routes designed using a range of parameters including frequency of servicing. Officers will include data gathered from the Routesmart system alongside other available information in the review noted in answer 2.

## Item no 10.10

### QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Doggart for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

#### Question

In November 2018, Council approved a motion that prevented the erection of large structures in Princes St Gardens East prior to Remembrance Sunday. Could the convener explain why the construction of the “big wheel” this year breached that motion?

#### Answer

At the meeting of Council on 22 November 2018 the following adjusted motion by Councillor Doggart was approved:

*Council:*

*Asks Officers to investigate and report back to the Transport and Environment Committee how the work to construct the Princes Street Gardens Christmas Market and attractions could be programmed so that:*

*1) a dignified no-work cordon is maintained round the Garden of Remembrance, and*

*2) the erection of high structures are delayed till after Armistice Day and Remembrance Sunday from 2019 on?”.*

The Big Wheel is an important part of Edinburgh’s Christmas and one that the producers are contractually obliged by the Council to supply. The wheel’s location is fixed due to piling and foundation works that were undertaken to support it in 2013.

The installation of the wheel takes several days. It is the first element that must be installed as all the rest of the Christmas site must be constructed around it because of its size.

A delay in the installation of the big wheel would delay the opening of the Christmas markets by at least 3 weeks, to the

second week in December. The dates of the Christmas market are detailed within the contract and to delay or shorten these would put the Council in breach of its contract.

Proposals for this year's activities were agreed at the All-Party Oversight Group on Festivals and Events on 25 March 2021. A further update, including construction dates, was circulated to Group spokespeople on the Culture and Communities Committee and City Centre ward Councillors on 19 October 2021.

While the wheel must be constructed before Remembrance Sunday, there is a strict works embargo in response to the approved motion. For 2021, this was as follows:

11 November – no Christmas works for an hour around 11:00. Remembrance sites are kept clear and unoccupied.

14 November – no Christmas works in the East gardens at all, all day

15 November – Royal British Legion Scotland start to remove Garden of Remembrance.

The Star Flyer is not installed until after Remembrance Sunday.

Two planning applications for the site at East Princes Street Gardens have been approved by Development Management Sub-Committee (20/03707/FUL – for 2020 to 2022; and 21/04953/FUL for 2021/22) Both of these approved applications detail that construction will commence 20 days prior to opening, including erection of the big wheel.

This issue will be reviewed when revised arrangements for Christmas in Edinburgh are put in place next year.

### QUESTION NO 11

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for  
answer by the Convener of the  
Transport and Environment  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 25 November 2021**

I thank the Convener on the understanding that Scotrail have been written to in terms of the earlier Decision of Council.

**Question** (1) Can the Convener share a copy of her letter?

**Answer** (1) Content shown below:

**‘Tackling Poor Air quality and ensuring Edinburgh meets its net-zero carbon target**

The City of Edinburgh Council has a strong desire to deliver significant improvements to air quality across the city, in partnership with Scottish Government and other valued key stakeholders such as Network Rail Scotland.

A key area of concern for Edinburgh is the impact that rail emissions have on the city’s air quality and the need to ensure that this sector is contributing effectively to meeting air quality requirements.

The City of Edinburgh Council remains dedicated to meeting our ambitious 2030 net-carbon emissions target and we are seeking an understanding or assurance that ScotRail’s future investment plans also reflect this aim.

We have a shared vision for the Waverley Valley and the future of Waverley station and we recognise its importance as a welcoming gateway into the city. However, we must also consider the environmental impact of the Inter7City fleet, at a time when we are working to implement a low emission zone to help achieve a cleaner green city for all. This will be key to reducing polluting vehicles into our historic city centre.

It is considered that the Inter7City Fleet account for a significant source of diesel emissions into the Waverley.

Service levels will no doubt have been impacted by the pandemic but I would assume that you are working towards a situation where passenger numbers return to previous levels. In light of this I wondered if you could provide more information on the projected engine emissions for the fleet running a full timetable in terms of CO2, NOX and particulate matter. It would also be useful for us to understand the emissions standards that these engines conform to presently and your intentions for the future.

Finally, as we consider our sustainability targets, there will be the requirement for a new public transport strategy and there is a need to consider the contribution of rail services within that plan as we look towards integrated ticketing, for example. We deeply value the relationship with your company and would be keen for early engagement on this subject as our plans develop.

If you feel an online meeting would be helpful my service and policy advisor would be happy to set this up. You can contact her at [victoria.baillie@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.baillie@edinburgh.gov.uk) ‘

- Question** (2) Can the Convener share a copy of the response?
- Answer** (2) I am happy to do so when it is received.
- Question** (3) If the same EURO VI emissions standards that are proposed for commercial vehicles in the delayed Edinburgh Low Emissions Zone (LEZ) were applied to diesel power trains, what penalty income could the Council expect to receive from Scotrail?
- Answer** (3) The LEZ proposals are designed on the basis that ‘Low emission zones set an environmental limit on **certain road spaces**, allowing access to only the cleanest vehicles and can help to transform towns and cities into cleaner, healthier places to live, work and visit.’, to quote the Scottish Government website (my bold)? While understanding the contribution to air quality levels that rail can make is useful, addressing those levels does not lie within the remit of our proposed Low Emission Zone.
- Question** (4) Will the Convener use the delay in the LEZ scheme to request that all transport modes within the area comply to the same standards?

**Answer**

- (4) Officers are working hard to address the terms of the committee amendment to the proposed LEZ and we expect to see a report back to committee in January. If accepted by Committee it is expected that there would be no significant variance in the anticipated enforcement date.

As stated above the LEZ terms of reference relate to road space only.

The very careful preparation of the LEZ proposals included all motor vehicles except motorcycles or mopeds. This reflects both Scottish Government advice and similar approaches in the other Scottish cities leading on LEZs and helps to reinforce consistency for road users in the four cities.

**Decision of Council, October 2020**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jim Campbell:

- 1) To note the low numbers of passengers currently traveling by all modes of public transport, including intercity train. Recognise this had substantially increased the emissions and the costs of public transport, when expressed in terms of passenger kilometres.
- 2) Wish to understand the environmental impact of Scotrail's Inter7City fleet, which were anticipated to be a significant source of diesel emissions in the Waverley Valley and therefore request the Transport Convener to write to Scotrail to seek their direct commitment to Edinburgh's 2030 net-zero carbon target and get assurance that their investment plans will reflect this aim with:
  - a) Information on the emissions standards these engines conformed to; and
  - b) The projected engine emissions in the Waverley Valley of the Inter7City fleet of trains running a full timetable, in terms of CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and Particulate matter.



## Item no 10.12

### QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Johnston for answer  
by the Convener of the Planning  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 25 November 2021**

**Question** (1) How many Council lease holders have been written to as part of CityPlan 2030 and the proposed changes in land use?

**Answer** (1) Statutory notifications were sent out as required to all properties on or within 20 metres of a plan proposal site, in a similar way as planning applications are notified.

Of these we have established through the Estates database that 46 are direct Council leaseholders. Taking into account sublets by ground leaseholders that figure rises to some 85 premises.

**Question** (2) Can a breakdown of these lease holders' activities be provided?

**Answer** (2) The lease holders and sublet activities are:

Car Park; light industrial workshops; fitness; storage; trade counter/retail; trades (electricians, joiners, plumbers); charity office/depot; dry cleaning; brewery; government office.

**Question** (3) In terms of the lease duration of these lease holders, what is the longest, the mean and mode value?

**Answer** (3) Lease duration:

- Longest – to 2120 (ground lease) 99 years
- Mean – 10.2 years
- Mode – 4 years

## Item no 10.13

### QUESTION NO 13

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021**

**Question** (1) Please can the Convener list the number of old/obsolete items of IT equipment which have been returned to Digital Services in the last two years from

- a) the Corporate division, and
- b) the learning & teaching division.

**Answer** (1) Any IT equipment returned to the Council's Digital Services which can be re-used either in the Corporate or Learning and Teaching digital estate is recycled and reissued for use within the Council. This can include devices previously deemed to be either 'old' or potentially 'obsolete' prior to being upgraded.

Detailed information is not held on the specific number/types of equipment which are returned, however the overall asset register of devices in use on the Council's networks is monitored to ensure that this remains within our licensed use thresholds.

**Question** (2) In each case will the convener please also specify:

- a) the number of items that have been rebuilt/reused within the council?
- b) the number of items that it is not possible to rebuild/reuse within the council?

- Answer** (2) a) As stated in response to question 1, detailed information is not held on the number/types of equipment which are specifically re-used, however the overall asset register of devices in use on the Council's networks is monitored to ensure that this remains within our licensed use thresholds.
- b) A total of 2,592 laptops or desktops over the last 2 years have been unable to be recycled/reused within the Council.
- Question** (3) Of those that cannot be reused within the council, how many are donated to charity, and how many are recycled?
- Answer** (3) Where devices are unable to be reused or rebuilt, then these are fully wiped and sent onto ReUsingIT, to enable these to be recycled for the benefit of the community. Over the last 2 years, a total 2,592 desktops or laptops have been recycled and reissued through this route as part of our community benefits approach.
- Question** (4) What steps is the council taking to increase the proportion of old IT equipment which is reused or donated to charity?
- Answer** (4) The Council is currently planning to work with a local partner on the re-use of old iPads and iPhones to mirror our approach to laptop and desktop community benefit recycling.

This page is intentionally left blank