

Item no 10.1

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 February 2022

This question was asked at the Council meeting on 10 February 2022, however, due to the complexities of the information requested, and after discussion with Councillor Webber it was agreed that a fuller response to this question would be available for the next meeting of Full Council on 17 March 2022

Question

- (1) Delivery of KEY critical services have been impacted by the guidance for individuals with possible coronavirus infection. Can the Convener provide information on the weekly number of absences related to Covid since the emergence of the Omicron variant on 29th November 2021.

By department and job category (ie Team Member operational / Team Leader / Manager / Senior Manager) by each week.

A separate table can be provided for each department.

Answer

- (1) The data that we hold does not allow us to provide an answer in the format requested and after consultation with Cllr Webber we have provided the data as we hold it.

Additionally, there has not been a requirement for colleagues to declare or record if their covid related absence has been as a result of PCR, LFT result or close contact imposed isolation.

Employee covid related absences have been recorded as follows (albeit the reasons have changed during the course of the pandemic in response to changing guidance):

Unable to work from home:

1. **COVID-19 - Self isolating (up to 10 days) - unable to work from home**

Employee has coronavirus symptoms or contact with someone who is symptomatic, is self-isolating, and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.

2. **COVID-19 – High risk - unable to work from home**

Employee is clinically vulnerable and, following risk assessment, can't attend work, and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative role, from home.

3. **COVID-19 - Care for a dependant - unable to work from home**

Employee is unable to attend work due to caring responsibilities and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.

4. **COVID-19 - Sick / infected - unable to work from home**

Employee has contracted coronavirus and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.

5. **COVID-19 - Cannot return from travel - unable to work remotely**

Employee is not able to return home from travel and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, remotely.

6. **COVID-19 – Building or office closure - unable to work from home**

Employee's normal place of work is closed and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.

7. **COVID-19 – Covid vaccine reaction - unable to work from home**

Employee experiences illness following Covid vaccination and is unfit to attend work or to work from home.

Able to work from home reasons

1. **COVID-19 - Self isolating (up to 10 days) - working from home**
Employee has coronavirus symptoms or contact with someone who is symptomatic, is self-isolating, and they're able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.
2. **COVID-19 - High risk - able to work from home**
Employee is clinically vulnerable and, following risk assessment, can't attend work. They're able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home
3. **COVID-19 - Care for a dependant - working from home**
Employee is unable to attend work due to caring responsibilities, and they're able to perform their role, or a suitable alternative role, from home.
4. **COVID-19 - Sick / infected - working from home**
Employee has contracted coronavirus and is able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.
5. **COVID-19 - Building or office closure - working from home**
Employee's normal place of work is closed and they're able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.
6. **COVID-19 - Can't return from travel - able to work remotely**
Employee is unable to return home from travel and is able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, remotely.
7. **COVID-19 - Carry out role & redeployed/repurposed**
Employee's place of work is closed but they've been temporarily moved to another role or service to support the delivery of key Council services.

Based on the above reporting definitions, the number of absence instances related to Covid (which could range from 1 day to longer absences) for the period 29/11/2021 to 13/03/2022 are:

Count of Absence Reason		
Absence Reason	Gr9 and above	Grand Total
Covid-19	GR8 and below	117
	GR9 and above	3
COVID-19 - Building or office closure - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	7
COVID-19 - Can't return from travel - unable to work remotely	GR8 and below	5
COVID-19 - Care for a dependant - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	229
	GR9 and above	1
COVID-19 - COVID vaccine reaction - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	410
	GR9 and above	2
COVID-19 - High Risk: Unable to work from home	GR8 and below	51
COVID-19 - Self isolating (10 days) - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	1185
	GR9 and above	1
COVID-19 - Shielding - able to work from home	GR9 and above	1
COVID-19 - Sick / infected - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	1675
	GR9 and above	32
Grand Total		3719

Therefore, there has been a total of 3,679 instances of absences for Grade 8 and below roles (which account for 95.6% of total organisational FTE) and 40 instances of covid related absences for Grade 9 and above (which account for 4.4% the total organisational FTE). These absences span a substantial range of roles across services including key services

w/c	Department / Service	Job Role	Covid +ve (PCR or LFT)	Close Contact imposed Isolation	1st Absence due to Covid +
29 th November 21		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
6 th December 21		Senior Man			
		TMO			
		TL			

		Man			
		Senior Man			
13 th December 21		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
20 th December 21		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
27 th December 21		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
3 rd January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
10 th January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
17 th January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
24 th January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
31 st January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
7 th February 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			

Item no 10.2

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) What percentage of (a) primary and (b) secondary school teachers are on fixed term contracts as opposed to permanent contracts?

Answer (1)

Row Labels	CFSLSP Primary Schools	CFSLSS Secondary Schools	Grand Total
Fixed Term	17.42%	11.00%	14.35%
Permanent	82.58%	89.00%	85.65%
Grand Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Question (2) What is the reason and rationale for using fixed term contracts for Council funded teaching posts?

Answer (2) Fixed term contracts are required for probationer teachers (c.230/year) as well as cover for maternity leaves, career breaks, flexible work options, secondments and acting up posts where the permanent post must be held for the substantive postholder to return to.

Question (3) What additional monies have been received from the Scottish Government since January 2021 for the recruitment of permanent teaching posts in Edinburgh and how has this funding been used?

Answer (3) City of Edinburgh Council received funding of £3.628m as it's share of £50m nationally for the establishment of permanent Teacher and Support assistant posts. This rises to £4.809m as a share of £65.5m nationally to reflect the full year cost of these posts.

The funding was invested per Scottish Government requirements to establish 73 permanent Teaching and 36 permanent Support Assistant posts.

Within our authority this included the establishment of Wellbeing Hubs in all secondary schools, Transition Teachers for each cluster and additional Support Assistants for P1-P3.

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 17 March 2022

Question

How many public litter bins have been removed since 1 January 2020, broken down by council ward?

Answer

We do not hold data on the number of litter bins removed since 1 January 2020.

The policy on litter bin siting is reviewed annually and was last reported to Transport and Environment Committee on [11 November 2021](#).

The objective of the litter bin siting policy is to ensure that the location and size of a litter bin is based on the demand and changing usage patterns at individual locations.

Item no 10.4

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

At the 10 February 2022 meeting of the Council and in response to a Leader's question on delays to the safety improvements at the Davidson Main's roundabout, the Council Leader said:

"I am happy to follow this up with officers and find out exactly where this is in the process and exactly why this has taken so long."

Question (1) Can the Council Leader confirm what discussions he has had with officers since 10 February regarding the Davidson Mains roundabout?

Answer (1) I raised this with officers on the day of February 10th Council and have had a number of exchanges since, as has the Convener.

Question (2) What explanation has he received as to why the promised safety improvements have been delayed?

Answer (2) My understanding from officers is that the timeline has moved due to the work required to find the right solution, but the urgency is understood.

Following the occurrence of six collisions at the roundabout between 2013 and 2016, three of which involving pedestrians, the Road Safety team sought to identify potential engineering interventions aimed at improving safety for vulnerable road users at the roundabout.

Over the 2017-2019 period, various options were investigated, including replacing the existing roundabout with a traffic signal-controlled junction. However, following traffic modelling, this was not deemed to be a suitable option, mainly due to the lengthy pedestrian waiting times that would have been required to ensure adequate traffic flows were maintained during busy periods.

In addition, the extents of new parking restrictions that would have been required to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the junction would have had a significant impact on loading facilities for nearby businesses and there would have been a requirement to relocate the listed structures at the entrance to East Barnton Gardens.

While the above work was underway, a fatal collision involving a pedestrian occurred on one of the zebra crossings at the roundabout.

The proposals that are now being developed for implementation involve retaining the current mini roundabout format, but with significantly reduced crossing widths on all approaches, which will be achieved by localised footway widenings with tightened corner radii and by removing the central traffic islands.

A section of raised road surface will also be provided at each of the zebra crossings to encourage reduced traffic speeds.

Question (3) What information he has received as to the current timetable for getting the promised changes in place?

Answer (3) The statutory process for the Redetermination Order required to deliver the proposed changes to the junction layout will happen by the end of March 2022.

Finalise the street lighting design will also be by the end of March 2022.

Stage 2 Road Safety Audit on the proposals will start by end of May 2022.

Finalised construction drawings, Bill of Quantities and tender package, so that the project will be tender ready in advance of the conclusion of the Redetermination Order process.

The final timescales for full delivery will depend on the Redetermination Order process and while this will depend on whether any formal objections are received, I am determined this is processed as quickly as possible.

I will arrange a meeting with ward members and officers to go through this in more detail.

Item no 10.5

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) Which of the road strengthening, resurfacing and surface treatment projects listed in appendix 1 of the 17 June 2021 Transport & Environment committee report "Transport Infrastructure Investment - Capital Delivery Priorities for 2021/2022" have been delivered, as at 15 March 2022?

Answer (1) Table 1 below shows the number of carriageway schemes completed as at 11 March 2022. In addition to the schemes in the table, a further 11 schemes are expected to be completed by the end of April 2022.

Question (2) Which of the footway surface treatment and footway reconstruction projects listed in appendix 1 of the 17 June 2021 Transport & Environment committee report "Transport Infrastructure Investment - Capital Delivery Priorities for 2021/2022" have been delivered, as at 15 March 2022?

Answer (2) Table 2 below shows the footway schemes completed, as at 11 March 2022. A further three schemes are expected to be completed by the end of April 2022.

Table 3 shows a number of footway schemes which were identified for surface treatment but have been identified as not suitable for slurry sealing and will now be reprioritised.

Table 1 - Carriageway schemes completed as at 11 March 2022

Scheme	Treatment
Greenbank Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Oxgangs Park, Oxgangs Row & Oxgangs Rise	Carriageway Resurfacing
Regent Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Buckstone Gate	Carriageway Resurfacing
Longcraig Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Inverleith Row	Carriageway Resurfacing
Stevenson Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Lothian Road Phase 2	Carriageway Resurfacing
Blackford Hill Grove, Blackford Hill Rise & Blackford Hill View	Carriageway Resurfacing
Cliftonhall Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Queen Anne Drive	Carriageway Resurfacing
Newmills Crescent	Carriageway Resurfacing
Stenhouse Drive	Carriageway Resurfacing
Craigleith Crescent	Carriageway Resurfacing
Silverknowes Road & Silverknowes Road East (inc. Davidson Mains Roundabout)	Carriageway Resurfacing
East Trinity Road	Surface Treatment
Hopetoun Road	Surface Treatment
Barnton Park Drive	Surface Treatment
Durham Square	Surface Treatment
Almondhill Road	Surface Treatment
Silverknowes Gardens	Surface Treatment
Laverockbank Road	Surface Treatment
Old Kirk Road	Surface Treatment
Saughton Grove	Surface Treatment
Durham Road	Surface Treatment
St Katharine's Crescent	Surface Treatment
Silverknowes Eastway	Surface Treatment
Langton Road	Surface Treatment
Saughton Mains Avenue	Surface Treatment
Hosie Rigg	Surface Treatment
Telferton	Surface Treatment
New Mart Road	Surface Treatment
Farrer Terrace	Surface Treatment
Echline Avenue	Surface Treatment
High Street to St Mary's Junction	Carriageway Setts

Table 2 – Footway schemes completed as at 11 March 2022

Scheme	Treatment
Ryehill Gardens	Footway Reconstruction
Buckstone Gate	Footway Reconstruction
Colinton Mains Road	Footway Reconstruction
Rutherford Drive	Footway Surface Treatment
South Gyle Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Clermiston Grove	Footway Surface Treatment
Baird Grove	Footway Surface Treatment
Silverknowes Loan	Footway Surface Treatment
Comiston View	Footway Surface Treatment
Ferry Road/Crewe Toll/Boswall Drive	Footway Surface Treatment
Bailie Terrace Phase 2	Footway Surface Treatment
Dolphin Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Pentland View	Footway Surface Treatment
Colinton Mains Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Craigeith Drive	Footway Surface Treatment
Crewe Road South	Footway Surface Treatment
Belford Gardens	Footway Surface Treatment
Kekewich Avenue	Footway Surface Treatment
Mountcastle Gardens	Footway Surface Treatment
Ulster Crescent	Footway Surface Treatment
Swanston Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Orchardhead Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Easter Drylaw Grove	Footway Surface Treatment
Longstone Avenue	Footway Surface Treatment
Gardiner Road	Footway Surface Treatment

Drylaw Crescent	Footway Surface Treatment
Priestfield Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Glenallan Drive	Footway Surface Treatment
Pentland Terrace	Footway Surface Treatment
Ladysmith Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Pilton Drive Phase 2	Footway Surface Treatment

Table 3 - Streets deemed unsuitable for slurry sealing

Scheme	Treatment	Progress
Langton Road	Footway Surface Treatment	Assessment deemed no treatment was required
Parkgrove Drive	Footway Surface Treatment	Assessment deemed no treatment was required
Bailie Grove	Footway Surface Treatment	Assessment deemed no treatment was required
Pilton Place	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
South Oswald Road	Footway Surface Treatment	Assessment deemed no treatment was required
Blackford Road	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Pilton Park Phase 2	Footway Surface Treatment	Only partially suitable for slurry sealing
Oswald Road	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Woodhall Bank Phase 1	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Woodhall Bank Phase 2	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Eva Place	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Lennel Avenue	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Longstone Avenue	Footway Surface Treatment	Treated in 2021
Baird Drive	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing

Item no 10.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Vice-Convenor of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

I refer the Vice-Convenor to my question and her answer at Council on 26 August 2021 regarding the investigation into the burning of memorial benches by Council staff in 2020.

Given that it is now more than two years since the Evening News reported this matter noting that the Vice Convenor of the Transport and Environment Committee, Councillor Doran would be “devastated” if she found out a loved-one’s bench had been burned and that “she did not know how the scandal could have happened” and that “the person behind the decision must be held accountable”, and directly quoted Councillor Doran as saying: ““I don’t know how this would have happened and that is what we need to investigate. We need to find out who made that decision.”

Can she please now answer the four questions I posed in August 2021 with regard to the second investigation she indicated was ongoing at that time, namely:

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Question | (1) Has the investigation concluded? |
| Answer | (1) The investigation has now concluded, and action is now being taken in line with the Council’s disciplinary policy. The relevant disciplinary hearings have been arranged but have not yet taken place. |
| Question | (2) How did the incident happen? |
| Answer | (2) Given that the full disciplinary process has not yet concluded, it is not possible to provide this information yet. |
| Question | (3) Who made the decision? |
| Answer | (3) Given that the full disciplinary process has not yet concluded, it is not possible to provide this information yet. |
| Question | (4) Has anyone been held accountable? |

Answer

- (4)** As referred to in the last council question response, if it is the case that there is evidence that shows that there has been a breach of the Council's Disciplinary Code or Employee Code of Conduct, then the appropriate sanctions will be applied. However, it is not appropriate to pre-judge the outcome of the disciplinary process to ensure that it remains impartial.

Item no 10.7

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

I refer the Convener to the answer she provided with regard to this site on 12 March 2020. She will recall the details that:

A project team was first initiated for this site in 2014 – some eight years ago;

Committee agreed the site should be redeveloped in January 2016 – some six years ago;

A planning application was lodged in 2018 and then paused with no indication of further progress towards planning permission being publicly obvious – four years ago;

Even taking into account the delay she indicated in buying back homes to allow redevelopment this concluded before her last answer in Summer 2019 – almost three years ago.

Given that two years have now elapsed since her last answer:

Question (1) Can she indicate whether any progress has been made, other than the demolition she indicated was impending in 2020?

Answer (1) The demolition of the homes for the development at Coatfield Lane commenced in September 2020 and was completed April 2021.

As outlined in the answer on 12 March 2020, as site of significant archaeological interest an archaeological survey was required. The findings of the survey were submitted to the Planning service in June 2021. Taking account of the archaeological requirements and feedback from Planning, the scheme design has been altered.

In early April 2022, a public event will be held to update the community and allow comments to be made on the revised design, before the revised scheme is submitted to Planning at the end of April 2022.

Question (2) Does she consider these delivery timescales acceptable either in terms of providing new social housing or with regard to leaving an empty and blighted site at the heart of a community for so long?

Answer (2) This is a particularly difficult site, in no small part down to the requirement to buy back properties that had been sold under the Conservative Right to Buy Policy. A policy that has made it especially difficult for the council to manage and maintain homes in mixed tenure blocks, as well as bringing about the loss of around 40k council homes in Edinburgh alone. Now that buy backs and demolition are complete, and the archaeological survey is also complete, we expect to consult with the community – as we have done successfully on many council sites, ensuring that we deliver regeneration in a way that meets the community’s needs – and then progress swiftly with delivery of these homes.

Question (3) Can she say whether any action can be taken to improve the appearance of the area (other than the graffiti boards which are sometimes damaged by those seeking access to the area) given that the lack of progress means it may be some time before any further work is undertaken?

Answer (3) In order to improve the appearance of the site, local artists have been granted permission to use the hoarding for street art. To maintain the security of the site, regular health and safety checks are undertaken and any identified issues are rectified. In addition, the concierge officer located within Linksvie House completes a regular visual inspection of the perimeter of the site and reports any issues.

Item no 10.8

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 17 March 2022**

Further to my question to the Transport and Environment Convener at the August 2018 meeting of the Full Council and the follow up meeting in her office can the Convener please confirm;

Question (1) How many non-compliant chicanes have been eliminated across the city since the question was first raised?

Answer (1) The Council does not keep a central record of the installation or removal of chicanes. Since August 2018, 18 chicane/barrier/bollard locations have been identified and action taken to remove or adjust (or are planned for before the end of June 2022) as part of the Active Travel programme where they impede access by people in wheelchairs, mobility scooters and non-standard bikes. A further programme is planned

Questions (2) Has the Convener actively engaged with the Planning Convener to help ensure no new non-compliant chicanes are put in place?

Answer (2) A discussion took place on 3 September 2018 between the Transport and Environment Convener, the Planning Convener and officers on the issue of Developers installing footway chicanes in new developments which did not form part of their consent.

Developers should be complying with the principles of the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance, Designing Streets and guidance in Cycling by Design.

The Conveners and officers continue to work together to seek to ensure that there is compliance with the principles of the guidance.

Questions (3) How many new non-compliant chicanes have been installed across the city since the question was first raised?

Answer (3) As noted in the answer to question 1, the Council does not keep a central record of the installation or removal of chicanes.

Question (4) Does the Convener believe that her efforts in taking the simple step of removing non-complaint chicanes to aid permeability for cyclists have been successful?

Answer (4) Yes, and I also look to the significant progress made in this city in recent years to provide improved safe cycling infrastructure which is key to cyclists' and potential cyclists' view of permeability, safety and their likelihood to choose greener, more sustainable transport options, where suitable.

The funded £118m active travel programme recently approved by the Transport and Environment will build upon actions such as the removal of non-compliant chicanes, street clutter etc to continue creating a much more welcoming environment for all those who wish to walk, wheel or cycle in this city.

Item no 10.9

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Planning
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 17 March 2022**

Further to my question to the Transport and Environment Convener at the August 2018 meeting of the Full Council and the follow up meeting in her office can the Convener please confirm;

- Question** (1) Whether the issue of non-compliant chicanes has been discussed in consideration of planning applications by his committee?
- Answer** (1) Designs submitted as part of planning applications are expected to eliminate any requirement for barrier chicanes. If such measures are proposed, then the applicant is expected to demonstrate both the requirement and compliance with acceptable design. Details of such proposals would be considered as part of any Quality Audit and Road Safety Audit and would require further permission under Road Construction Consent.
- Questions** (2) Whether his committee have approved any new non-compliant chicanes since August 2018.
- Answers** (2) The Planning Service is not aware of any such approvals.
- Questions** (3) If so, how many and why?
- Answers** (3) N/A

Item no 10.10

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Can the convener provide information on the methods and processes for charging our EV fleet.

Question (1) What locations are used to charge - please specify if public or on CEC owned land?

Answer (1) There are various locations across the city where Electric Vehicle charging can take place. Details of the publicly available charging points are included on the [Chargeplace Scotland](#) website. There are also dedicated charging points within Council depots and at other Council buildings which are dedicated to charging of fleet vehicles. These sites are not publicly accessible and are not externally advertised as such.

Question (2) What time of day is charging taking place?

Answer (2) Charging of vehicles takes place throughout the day, depending on the operational needs of the service.

Question (3) Is charging carried out during shifts/working hours?

Answer (3) Wherever possible, charging should take place outside the hours which the vehicle is required to be operational however there may be instances where this is not possible.

Question (4) If during shift, how long are employees at charging points?

Answer (4) Where this charging is required during shifts, the time taken would be dependent on the amount of charge required for the vehicle.

Question (5) Can the Charge Place Scotland monthly statements be provided for last 12 months?

Answer (5) As there is no charge tariff currently in place for use of either Council fleet chargers or publicly accessible chargers there are no statements available. However, these tariffs will be implemented from 1 May 2022 and thereafter, monthly statements will be available.

Question **(6)** How is the account managed (eg - the CPS card is linked to vehicle or the member of staff has a card that can be used for any CEC vehicle)?

Answer **(6)** CPS cards are issued with the Council fleet vehicle. This card will allow charging of that or any other Council fleet vehicle.

Item no 10.11

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) How many affordable homes have been built in Edinburgh per year since 2017?

Answer (1) The table below shows the number of affordable homes approved and those completed between 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2021, as well as, the estimated outturn at the end of March 2022.

Financial Year	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22*	
Approvals	1,475	1,626	1,914	1,285	1,300	7,600
Completions	966	1,152	1,367	1,087	968	5,540

* Estimated outturn

Question (2) How does this compare with the target for affordable house building as outlined in the Capital Coalition 52 Pledges

Answer (2) The programme to deliver 20,000 homes by December 2027 is on track.

Question (3) How is the “energy efficiency” of these homes determined, have all of the homes been built to the same standard or if there are different standards please record these for each year since 2017

Answer (3) Section 7 of current Scottish Building Standards relates specifically to sustainability, setting out a range of different standards homes can be built to (ranging from Bronze to Platinum). All Council homes built since 2017 achieve ‘Silver Standard Active’ level and have a minimum energy efficiency rating of EPC B.

Since November 2020, all Council homes in development are being designed to achieve a net zero carbon (NZC) outcome with the first homes expected to complete in 2023. The NZC approach takes into account the technical

performance of the buildings, inclusion of zero emission heating as well as low carbon impact that can be achieved through approaches such as green infrastructure, active travel routes, sustainable drainage and tree planting.

Item no 10.12

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council has promoted its intention to have a Short Term Lets Control Area including in a press release on 23 February 2022.

Given that the changes to Planning rules will not affect properties that have operated in this way for more than 10 years:

Question (1) What number and proportion of short term-lets is it expected will be required to seek planning permission to continue operating?

Answer (1) The automatic requirement for planning permission to operate a short-term let (STL) applies only to letting of a dwelling that is not a principal home, it does not apply to home sharing or home letting. The majority of short-term lets in Edinburgh are entire property lets.

In October 2021, 4,022 entire properties were registered on Airbnb (which is one of the online platforms that enable bookings of short-term lets). This was 77% of all registrations.

The forthcoming short-term licensing scheme will require applicants within the short-term let control area to demonstrate planning permission or that it is not required. It is not known how many properties will seek planning permission however from our planning enforcement investigations, it is thought the majority of those operating will have been doing so for less than 10 years.

Question (2) What is the expectation with regard to how many of these may be successful in gaining planning permission?

Answer

- (2)** It is not possible to pre-judge the outcome of planning applications. Current planning policy allows consideration of the appropriateness of short-term letting within a residential context. Where this is appropriate it allows for STLs. In 2021 there were 25 applications for planning permission for STLs determined. 15 of these were granted.

Item no 10.13

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council recently started a project to provide iPads to every pupil in the city from P6 upwards which was promoted by the Council Leader last month.

Question (1) What proportion of P6 to S6 pupils will have been issued with an iPad by 5 May when the Council election takes place?

Answer (1) As of 11/03/22 we have delivered **8,261** new Ipad to Schools. We have also migrated across **6,181** devices that were in scope and now on the new Empowered Learning Platform.

So, in total, **14,442** are now in use by Pupils and teachers in Primary, Secondary and Special Schools.

The ratio is 1:1 for Pupils in P6 – S6 and all teachers will be 1:1.

The ratio is 1:5 for pupils in P1 – P5.

iPads have been deployed to all teachers and pupils in Secondary elevate schools(8 High Schools)

IPads deployed to all Build and Grow Secondary teachers (15 high schools)

We will have deployed to **50%** of all pupils by the 5th may and on track to complete by the end of the year.

Question (2) When is the roll out expected to be complete?

Answer (2) The programme will be complete by December 2022. All pupils from P6 – S6 will have received an Ipad and we will have also deployed iPads for shared use at a ratio of 1:5 for pupils from P1 – P5. The programme will also make sure that all teachers have an Ipad and a keyboard.

Item no 10.14

QUESTION NO 14

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council Leader is very keen to promote the Edinburgh City Deal, seemingly indicating that it is a very particular achievement of his Council Administration:

Question (1) How many other Scottish City Deals have been signed and how many were concluded earlier than Edinburgh's?

Answer (1) In the first weeks of this administration I led the Council and City's participation in negotiations to conclude agreement on final details of the Deal. Even at this late stage of the deal's discussions, many key agreements, including the overall envelope of UK Government investment were not agreed along with other key aspects of the deal.

The UK Government could have been a more effective and honest partner to work with. This is a common complaint among colleagues who have also signed deals. Even upon the deal's agreement, UK Conservative Ministers broke communication agreements- this is just one example of the unconstructive behaviour from the UK Conservative Government. I complained in person about this and other matters of unhelpful conduct to a junior UK Government Minister.

The £1.3bn Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal will deliver the largest investment of any Scottish City Region or Growth Deal. It was the fourth to be signed of the nine City Region or Growth Deals that have reached Full Deal agreement and are in delivery in Scotland.

Question (2) What share of the £1.3Bn (both in cash and percentage terms) is being provided by the UK Government, the Scottish Government, the City of Edinburgh Council?

Answer (2) The Scottish Government and UK Government are providing £300m of investment each to the Deal.

The City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) is providing £21m of investment to the Deal made up of £5m towards the Dunard Centre and £16m towards the West Edinburgh Transport Improvement Programme. CEC are also providing £248m of on-lending to Edinburgh Living.

The original value of the Deal amounted to £1.330bn but is now estimated to be £1.384bn.

Funder	Funding	Percentage of Overall Deal value
UKG	£300m	22%
SG	£300m	22%
CEC	£269m*	19%

*includes on-lending

Question (3) What share of the £1.3Bn (both in cash and percentage terms) is being spent on Council services in Edinburgh, Regional Transport services, the Universities?

Answer (3) The City Region Deal is delivering transformational programmes and projects across Innovation, Skills, Transport, Culture and Housing to deliver a step-change in inclusive growth to benefit the Edinburgh and South East Scotland city region, Scotland and the United Kingdom. City Region and Growth Deals are not intended to fund existing Council services.

Council led projects (West Edinburgh Transport Improvement Programme, Edinburgh Living, Dunard Centre and share of the Integrated Regional Employability and Skills Programme) amount to £377m which equates to 27% of the Deal.

Regional Transport initiatives (West Edinburgh Transport Improvement Programme and Sheriffhall) amount to £156m which equates to 11% of the Deal.

Investment in the region's University led projects amounts to £719m which equates to 52% of the Deal.

Question (4) What City Deal projects have delivered to date?

Answer

- (4) The City Region Deal is a 15 year programme. Already business cases for 18 out of the 20 projects have been approved. The City Region Deal's Data-driven innovation initiative is helping to ensure that the region is the Data Capital of Europe.

Having our universities play a greater role in the economy helps our region become a counterbalance to investment in the South East of England. Our City region Deal is proving to be a catalyst for greater regional prosperity and is delivering economic growth, social change and improved services for residents, driving the region forward in a sustainable and inclusive manner. Our Deal is also leading the way in the development of a Benefits Realisation Plan.

The National Robotarium will open in the summer and will be a world-leading centre for Robotics and Artificial Intelligence, translating cutting edge research into new technologies delivering substantial benefits for society. This complements and enhances the other data-driven research, development and innovation sectoral hubs – Edinburgh Futures Institute, Easter Bush, Bayes Centre and Usher Institute.

Key achievements are set out in the latest Annual Report <https://tinyurl.com/447nubnh>

Highlights delivered across the various programmes to date include:-

- Over 344 families have moved into quality affordable homes delivered by Edinburgh Living;
- Launch of the Advanced Care Research Centre, a £19.5m collaboration with Legal & General to transform care in later life, bringing together data science and technology;
- The Covid-19 Data Collaborative of the DataLoch programme (Usher Institute) provided the data foundation for regional and national research into the outbreak;
- The End Violence Lab secured a \$7m donation from the Human Dignity Foundation to set up a global Data Institute for Child Safety, dedicated to fight online sexual abuse and exploitation of children;
- Through the Data Driven Innovation programme, over 1100 jobs have been created or secured in construction and start-ups;

- The Data-Driven Entrepreneurship (DDE) programme has supported over 50 start-ups in through skills development, accelerator programmes and connecting innovators with investors;
- Over 7,465 skills improvements have been delivered through the Integrated Regional Employability and Skills programme; and
- The dedicated jobs portal created in response to the pandemic has advertised over 3,800 job vacancies.

Item no 10.15

QUESTION NO 15

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question

The Council is often keen to promote the achievement of the provision of 1140 nursery hours per child. When was this delivered and how does it related to the promised timescale as outlined in the Capital Coalition 52 Commitments or any official Council pledge?

Answer

Commitment 32 – Achieved. Edinburgh has been phasing in the early years expansion since August 2017 and was on track to fully delivery this by the original due date in August 2020. Due to the pandemic the Scottish Government delayed the delivery to August 2021 and since this date all eligible children in Edinburgh are able to access their funded entitlement which begins the term after their third birthday.

Commitment 33 – Partially Achieved. Whilst all eligible children now receive their funded entitlement. The flexibility we had hoped to deliver has been impacted by COVID restrictions. (Morning and Afternoon only places have not been available in local authority settings due to the cleaning requirements and footfall across the middle of the day.)

At the moment we can only provide the following:

Term time places

- Asymmetric week to match school days

Or

Full year places

- 10 hour day placements

We had planned to offer morning and afternoon places as one of the full year options. This would have provided 5 days at 4 hours 35 minutes each morning or afternoon

COVID cleaning requirements and the number of adults entering or leaving the building across the middle of the day means this option has not been available

We are hopeful we will be able to reintroduce these from August 2022.

Item no 10.16

QUESTION NO 16

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 17 March 2022**

The Council has promoted that it has achieved “Living Wage City status” for Edinburgh.

Question (1) What actions had to be taken to achieve this?

Answer (1) In November 2021 Edinburgh became the second Scottish city to be recognised under the Living Wage Places programme. This accreditation is provided by the Scottish Living Wage Foundation in recognition of a city’s commitment to fair work, the strength of its employer partnerships, and credibility of its plans to increase real living wage accreditation through local action.

In order to achieve this accreditation, the Council:

- Led the establishment of an action group of real living wage accredited employers in the city, including representatives from private sector employers, business representative organisations, higher education, third sector organisations, and trades unions.
- Agreed an action plan for delivery by the group over the next five years including a target to double the number of living wage accredited employers in the city.

Further details on the Living Wage Places programme administered by the Scottish Living Wage Foundation are [available here](#).

Full details on the Edinburgh Living Wage City Action Group, its membership, targets and planned actions are [available here](#).

Question (2) How many employees have seen a wage increase directly related to their employer signing up for accreditation following encouragement by the Council?

Answer (2) Data on new living wage accreditations are provided to the action group by Living Wage Scotland on a quarterly basis. The first substantive update on progress against these metrics since the launch of the Edinburgh Living Wage City Action Plan will be available in April 2022.

Over the next five years the Edinburgh Living Wage Action Group aims to secure Living Wage provision for up to 40,000 employees, with a specific target to ensure that at least 10,000 employees benefit from an immediate pay uplift as a result of accreditation.

Question (3) How many additional employers have been accredited each year since the Capital Coalition 52 commitments was published in 2017 and how does this compare with the target in the Council's Performance Framework to increase the number by 100 per year?

Answer (3)

Financial year	Living wage employers in Edinburgh	New accreditations per annum
2016/17	151	
2017/18	216	65
2018/19	281	65
2019/20	359	78
2020/21	422	63
Dec-21	497	75 (year to date)

Since publication of the Capital Coalition 52 commitments the number of living wage accreditations in Edinburgh has risen by an average of some 69 employers per annum.

The target of 100 new accreditations per annum was introduced in November 2021.

Item no 10.17

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council has publicly promoted that it has reduced its carbon footprint by around 60%, claimed the award of £7.7m from Zero Waste Scotland for communal recycling as a success and regularly claims to have planted additional trees.

Question (1) What proportion of the cut in the Council's carbon footprint relates to external factors like grid decarbonisation and the new Energy from waste Plant at Millerhill which has been criticised by Friends of the Earth Scotland for exporting Edinburgh's carbon emissions?

Answer (1) The Council's carbon footprint decreased by 66% between 2005/06 and 2020/21.

During this time, the carbon content of a unit of electricity has been cut by more than half (52%), thanks to the closure of coal power plants and the growth in renewables to generate electricity. Had the decarbonisation of the grid not occurred, the Council's carbon footprint would have decreased by 54%, not 66%.

Since 2019/20, the Council has diverted most of the previously landfilled waste to Millerhill for energy recovery via incineration. Emissions from incineration are included in the Council's footprint, in line with our legal responsibilities under the Public Bodies Climate Change Duties reporting and are therefore reported using the methodology set down by the Scottish Government. The impact of diverting waste from landfill to the Millerhill plant is responsible for 40% of the Council's decrease in greenhouse gas emissions. If the Council was still landfilling 100% of the non-recyclable waste, its carbon footprint would have decreased by 40%, not 66%.

Question (2) What was the recycling rate inherited by the Convener in 2017 and what has it been in each of the years since?

Answer (2) The recycling rates per year are set out in the table below:

Date	Recycling rate
2017	41.0%
2018	38.8%
2019	38.6%
2020	37.0%
2021	41.9% (still to be validated by SEPA)

The decrease in the recycling rate from 2017 – 2020 is in line with the decrease of the Scottish national average over the same period.

It is useful to note that the significant award from Zero Waste Scotland of £7.7m to support Edinburgh’s Communal Bin Review was designed to improve our recycling rates and recognises that the wider context for recycling has changed.

Question (3) How many trees has the Council pledged to plant and by when and how many have actually been planted?

Answer (3) The Council is committed to:

- Planting an additional 1,000 trees in communities (as set out in the Council Commitments 2017- 2022); and
- Becoming a Million Tree City by 2030. To achieve this, 250,000 trees will need to be planted over the next 10 years across a range of public and private land. It is currently projected that around 30% (i.e. 75,000) of these trees will be on Council-owned land.

Question (4) What proportion of the trees planted are still in place and thriving?

Answer (4) Given the high number of trees which have been planted since 2017/18, it is not practicable for officers to be able to record where there has been a loss of any of the new trees planted.

Question

(5) What is the net change in number of trees in the City since 2017 given that many have been removed including in high profile cases by the Council or on Council land such as in East Princes Street Gardens and at Ocean Drive?

Answer

(5) From the 1 April 2017 to 31 December 2021, there has been a net increase in the number of trees in the city of 49,443.

The form of the question seems to indicate that the author was casting doubt on what has emerged under this administration in this important part of our Council response to climate and other pressures. I trust that the information provided proves that the 'claims' are correct and indicates a progressive, coordinated approach across these and other related areas.

Item no 10.18

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Convener regularly refers to “record investment” in terms of spending on roads, paths, pavements and bridges.

Question (1) What was the breakdown of funding between each of these categories in each year since 2017?

Answer (1) The table below shows the investment each year since 2017 on roads, pavements, paths, structures, and (capital only) public transport:

2017/18	£20.356m
2018/19	£31.791m
2019/20	£44.081m
2020/21	£41.091m
2021/22	£26.221m (to January 2022)

Question (2) What is the repair backlog in Edinburgh and at the current rate of spend how many years will it take to resolve?

Answer (2) During the term of this Administration, the Council's road condition index has improved thanks to the investment and approach delivered by the Council, but we accept there is more to do. As a result, the road backlog figure, as outlined in the road condition index score, has reduced from £94,823,000 to £77,346,000. Due to continual deterioration across the network, and in particular in years with severe winter weather, there will always be roads that should be considered for investment so this number will never will zero. But the reducing trend does highlight the progress being made in delivering better quality roads, pavements and paths for the people of Edinburgh.

Item no 10.19

QUESTION NO 19

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council used a press release on 24 November 2021 to welcome planning approval for the Dunard Concert Hall project.

Question (1) What proportion of the funding for the Dunard Concert Hall is sourced from the Council and what proportion from philanthropic sources?

Answer (1) As reported to Finance and Resources Committee on [3 March 2022](#), the funding package for the centre includes £5 million of funding from the Council's capital budget. Philanthropic donations amount to £35 million, with a further £15 million to be raised from general fundraising. The overall project cost is £75 million so the proportion of Council funding is 1:14 or 7%.

Question (2) How far behind schedule is the project following legal disputes over the Planning Consent process which relates directly to the functioning of the Council?

Answer (2) The project is approximately two years behind schedule.

The previous design received planning consent in Autumn of 2019 but was subsequently the subject of a petition for a Judicial Review by the developers of the St James Quarter. Following a mediation process, IMPACT Scotland agreed to submit a revised design for the centre.

Question (3) What increase in cost or reduction in scope was required as a result of these delays?

Answer (3) The project was redesigned as a result of the mediation process, leading to some changes in scope. Costs have been impacted by Brexit, COVID -19, labour and material costs, inflation and conformity requirements.

Question (4) What were the direct costs to the Council Taxpayer in legal fees?

Answer

(4) The cost to the Council of legal fees was £5,950 plus VAT.

Item no 10.20

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council created what the Council Leader has described as “a free face-to-face service that helped thousands of EU citizens living in Edinburgh secure settled status after Brexit.”

Question (1) How many EU citizens are living in Edinburgh at present?

Answer (1) 66,000 people

[from National Records Scotland publication - Population by Country of Birth and Nationality, Scotland, July 2020 to June 2021]

Question (2) How many have secured settled status?

Answer (2) There have been 69,190 applications processed (as at December 2021). 36,020 have secured settled status and further 30,300 have pre-settled status (right to remain for 5 years).

[Above figures for Edinburgh from Home office publication - EU Settlement Scheme quarterly statistics local authority tables, December 2021. These statistics are released as Experimental Statistics]

Question (3) How many used the free face-to-face service and how many secured their settled status without this help?

Answer (3) From September 2018 until March 2020, 2265 people from all over Scotland attended an appointment with the free EUSS Service provided by City of Edinburgh Council. Additionally, on a daily basis, individuals turned up to the office without appointments requesting support – in some cases a follow up appointment was made, for others some brief guidance on the mobile app was sufficient for them to complete the application on their own. A record for individuals where guidance on the app only was provided

was not made and so cases are not included in the figures quoted above.

The figures in part 2 reflect the totals for settled and pre settled status applications for Edinburgh.

Question (4) What did the service cost in total and per service user?

Answer (4) It is not possible to give an exact total or per service user cost as this service was provided by Registration colleagues as part of their regular activity. However, the following staff were involved in providing this support with their work split between normal registration services and the support services for people seeking settled status - 1 Grade 5 and 1 Grade 3 Modern apprentice for period Sept 2018 to Sept 2019 and 2 Modern apprentices (Grade 3) for period Sep 2019 to March 2020.

The number of applications using this service reached a peak of 506 appointments in September 2019, dropping to 477 in October, 129 in November, 55 in December and 38 to 14 January 2020. During September due to the high levels of demand an additional Saturday session was added to the usual appointment schedule. The service otherwise carried out this work as part of their regular activity. The apportioning of exact costs is further complicated by the following:

- The service was demand led with 2,265 EU, EEA and Swiss citizens and their family members receiving face to face appointments. However, it should be noted that on a daily basis citizens arrived at the office without appointments. In those cases staff either made an appointment for them or in some cases they were provided with brief guidance on how to use the mobile application which was sufficient for them to complete the application on their own. Only those who received a face to face appointment are accounted for in the numbers above.
- Whilst appointments were scheduled for 15 minutes this time was often over run due to the complexity or lack of relevant documentation required for the process.

- There was no recording of time spent on telephone call, emails or for those who attended as drop in appointments.

Item no 10.21

QUESTION NO 21

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 17 March 2022**

The Council has supported Lothian Buses during the pandemic with a package of Council and Scottish Government Covid support that apparently amounted to £70m.

Question (1) What proportion of the £70m directly related to Barnett consequential of support provided for bus services by the UK Government and passed to the Scottish Government as additional funding to allow it to provide the equivalent support in Scotland?

Answer (1) 74% being £52m Transport Scotland funding with the remaining sum being loss of Lothian Buses dividend £18m.

Question (2) What proportion of this fund relates to the UK Government's Covid Furlough Scheme?

Answer (2) Zero, as this funding was not provided by either Scottish Government or the Council. For information, £17m was received from the UK Government's Furlough Scheme.

Question (3) Please give an estimate of the future reductions in turnover for Lothian Buses because of each of the following: i) the opening of the Tram completion project to Newhaven, ii) the "to not through" policy in the City Centre transformation and iii) any alterations to Lothian Bus Tours and Lothian Buses Airport services as a result of Council traffic changes?

Answer (3) Given current uncertainties in overall passenger numbers, I am unable to provide estimates for these events.

Item no 10.22

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) The Census or the Census?

In school and council communications for parents and children relating to the Health & Wellbeing Census, it is often referred to as “the Census”.

However, this is an optional survey and not an official “Census” where there is a legal obligation to participate.

There is obvious risk of causing confusion as this is running concurrently with the once-in-a-decade real Census.

- a) Has the council liaised with the Scottish Government team managing the real Census to ask for their approval to refer to this survey as “the Census”?
- b) Was it a conscious decision to run the two exercises concurrently?

Answer (1) Census is a statistical term and refers to the fact that all pupils are asked to take part. It does not mean it’s mandatory (unlike the Population Census). The HWB Census is optional and there is no legal obligation to participate. This differs from a sample survey, where only a selection of pupils are asked to participate.

“The census” is not a protected term in the UK. The Population Census in Scotland also uses the phraseology “the census” as do census offices across the UK and internationally. Approval to use the term “the census” is not required.

All references to the HWB Census as “the census” by the Scottish Government are within clearly titled Health and Wellbeing Census documentation, on the SG Health and Wellbeing website.

Question

(2) Health & Wellbeing Census Data processing

The Health and Wellbeing survey responses are being cross linked with other personal information held against a child's Scottish Candidate Number (SCN) such as free school meal status, exclusion, attendance and absence.

- a) Please can you confirm all other categories of data that are linked with a child's SCN?
- b) Is this data being merged and analysed in the SmartSurvey platform?
- c) Please explain fully how long data will be stored and in what format and whether this will be linked with the SCN:
 - i) At school level
 - ii) At local authority level?
 - iii) At Scottish Government level?
- d) When will the SCN link be permanently deleted at each level?
 - i) At school level
 - ii) At local authority level?
 - iii) At Scottish Government level?

Answer

- (2) a) The SCN will be used by the Scottish Government to link the HWB Census data to the Pupil census data (which does not contain variables which allow direct identification of pupils, such as a child's name).

This information will only be linked in order to enable the Scottish Government to undertake statistical analysis and research based on these socio-economic and characteristics, for example to monitor and assess the impact of its policies on sub-populations and diverse equality groups.

The Scottish Government DPIA states Scottish Government may share the HWB Census dataset in order to enable other organisations (public bodies, third sector organisations and academics) to undertake research which can provide evidence on the health and wellbeing of children and young people in the broader public interest. Researchers and academics can apply to access Scottish Government data, for research purposes.

Any onward sharing will be on a case by case basis and with a clearly identified legal gateway and data sharing agreement in place. Any sharing or linkage of data by the SG will be done under the strict control of Scottish Government, and will be consistent with our data policy and the National Data Linkage Guiding Principles. Decisions on the sharing or linkage of data will be taken in consultation with relevant colleagues and individuals within and outwith Scottish Government as part of a Data Access Panel. At all times the rights of the individual (children or adults) under the UK GDPR and other relevant legislation will be ensured. There are processes and procedures in place to ensure that any data shared with externally approved researchers does not include direct identifiers (such as the SCN).

b) No. The responses are downloaded from SmartSurvey prior to any linking or analysis happening. Data cannot be linked in SmartSurvey – it is a digital data collection platform only.

c) Please explain fully how long data will be stored and in what format and whether this will be linked with the SCN:

i) At school level

Schools do not hold or have access to any individual level data at any point. When a pupil responds, the response is stored on the SmartSurvey platform, accessed by the relevant local authority SmartSurvey contact.

ii) At local authority level?

Once the data has been shared with the Scottish Government, we will remove the SCN and store the rest of the data in SmartSurvey

iii) At Scottish Government level?

The SG DPIA , published on the SG Health and Wellbeing website, sets out all the data management and security, including access, by SG after they receive the data shared by local authorities.

SG DPIA and Privacy Notice state regarding the retention of data, Article 5 of the UK GDPR “Principles relating to processing of personal data” states:

“personal data may be stored for longer periods insofar as the personal data will be processed solely for archiving purposes in the public interest, scientific or historical research purposes or statistical purposes in accordance with Article 89(1) subject to implementation of the appropriate technical and organisational measures required by this Regulation in order to safeguard the rights and freedoms of the data subject”.

The data are processed in line with this legislation. The information collected will be used to inform planning and provision of education, and the linkage of such data to educational outcomes or health data. For example, researchers or charities may be interested in applying for access to education data to meet their own research needs.

d) i) At school level

Schools do not hold or access individual level data. Schools will receive their own aggregated data which has been disclosure controlled data only.

ii) At local authority level?

We will delete it once we have shared the data with the Scottish Government.

iii) At Scottish Government level?

The Scottish Government retain the SCN in the data shared with them. The Scottish Government does not have access to any data which contains pupil's name or address. Therefore the Scottish Government is unable to link the child's SCN to other information in order to directly identify any pupil (such as a child's name). The SCN allows internal linkage with other datasets, following existing procedures. The SCN is not shared with any external data users.

Question **(3) Health & Wellbeing Census Disclosure Scotland**

Some IT support workers and other staff within the council and external supplier, SmartSurvey, may be able to identify vulnerable children and have access to an unprecedented range of personal data for each individual. They will be working in a position of trust, even if they shouldn't have direct contact. Although they would be committing an offence, staff would have the data to be able to email a child directly or would be in a position where they could provide that data to others.

Do all internal and external staff with direct or indirect access to this data, including IT support workers, have a PVG Disclosure Record?

Answer **(3)** PVG disclosure applies to 'regulated work' and can also apply to certain positions of trust within organisations, even where the role doesn't involve any direct contact with children or protected adults. The HWB Census does not fall within this. The Local Authority (as data controller of their data) and the Scottish Government (as data controllers for the data shared by Local Authorities) are required to meet the data protection principles as set out in the Data Protection Act 2018. The Scottish Government DPIA sets out how the data is shared, stored, who has access, and security measures in place. The Data Processor Agreement between the local authority and the SG sets out security. The SG contract with SmartSurvey sets out the security processes for SmartSurvey in providing use of the platform. Again, IT support workers and other staff outwith the local authority do not have any information (such as name or address) in which to directly contact individual pupils.

The local authority staff with access to the data both have a PVG Disclosure Record

Question (4) Health & Wellbeing Census Validation

We are led to believe that several of the census questions have been adopted from several different established surveys. Conventionally these individual surveys have been developed after a rigorous validation process for a specific purpose. Therefore, the set of questions posed in the census is a new survey; one in which questions can be removed, changed or added reflecting local authority preferences.

Has the census been subjected to an independent validation process to ensure it fulfils the task in the least restrictive manner?

Answer (4) The questionnaires were developed by the Health and Wellbeing Census Content Group. The Content Group consisted of representation from: Scottish Government, NHS Health Scotland (now Public Health Scotland), University of Glasgow (formerly University of St Andrews), Glasgow City Health & Social Care Partnership, Education Scotland, Perth & Kinross Council, Falkirk Council, MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, an Independent consultant, South Lanarkshire Council, NHS National Services Scotland, Education Institute of Scotland (EIS), Association of Headteachers and Deputes in Scotland (AHDS), and ScotCen Social Research. There was also representation from 2 schools. NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Health Board provided an advisory role rather than a formal member of the Content Group.

Question (5) Health & Wellbeing Census Ethics

Has CEC and/or Scottish Government put its chosen question sets for the Health & Wellbeing Census through an ethical review process, that considers all questions in the full context in which they are asked?

Answer (5) Yes. The Health and Wellbeing Census questionnaires have been ethically approved by independent researchers within the Scottish Government. An Ethics Peer Review is an internal process by which a group of independent Social Research colleagues supports the assessment of challenging ethical issues relating to a particular social research project. Ethics Peer Review is a form of self-regulation by qualified members of the profession to maintain professional quality standards, improve performance and maintain credibility. The principles are set out in the Government Social Research ethics guidance [2021-GSR Ethics Guidance v3.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#). The process applies to the survey as a whole.

Question (6) **Health & Wellbeing Census future intentions**

This “census” has chosen to link all responses to a child’s Scottish Candidate Number, rather than work on an anonymous basis. We are now led to believe it is the intention to repeat the census every four years.

- a) Is it the intention to repeat the HWBC survey in future years with the same responders - how is this possible if the original linking mechanism (SCN) will be deleted?
- b) Is it the intention to cross link additional data from participants in future years?
- c) If additional data will be cross linked, what could this include, eg exam results?

Answer (6) a) Local authorities can undertake the census at any interval that provides them (and their partners) with the evidence they need to fulfil their legislative duties.

The Scottish Government agreement was originally to share the data from local authorities every four years, using existing surveys in between to report national level measures. Covid-19 has impacted the timing of the HWB Census and other data collections, so further consideration of the future timeline is required, taking into account the timing of other data collections.

If local authorities and/or the Scottish Government were to delete the SCN, they could each consider

involving a third party organisation in order to pseudonymise the data. Pseudonymisation is a technique that replaces or removes information in a data set that identifies an individual. The UK GDPR defines pseudonymisation as:

“...the processing of personal data in such a manner that the personal data can no longer be attributed to a specific data subject without the use of additional information, provided that such additional information is kept separately and is subject to technical and organisational measures to ensure that the personal data are not attributed to an identified or identifiable natural person.”

Pseudonymisation may involve replacing names or other identifiers which are easily attributed to individuals with, for example, a reference number. Whilst you can tie that reference number back to the individual if you have access to the relevant information, you put technical and organisational measures in place to ensure that this additional information is held separately.

Pseudonymising personal data can reduce the risks to the data subjects and help meet data protection obligations. However, pseudonymisation is effectively only a security measure. It does not change the status of the data as personal data. Recital 26 makes it clear that pseudonymised personal data remains personal data and within the scope of the UK GDPR.

- b) Scottish Government will initially link the HWB Census data with the Pupil Census data, as noted above. However, as stated in its DPIA, the HWB Census could be linked with other data sources for statistics and research purposes and that there are already processes in place for this to occur safely, securely, lawfully and legally.
- (c) Yes, the Scottish Government could include examination results.

Question (7) Health & Wellbeing Census Timescales

This census has been planned by the Scottish Government for four years.

CEC completed the initial Data Protection Impact Assessment nearly six months ago in September 2021.

When members of the public, including parents submit information requests or complaints to the council, they have to wait 20 working days for a response.

Why have parents across the city only been given 10 days' notice of this census taking place in their schools?

Answer (7) Local authorities may notify parents at any point, but it must be a minimum of 10 days prior to pupils completing the HWB Census. This is so that parents and pupils are given notice of the census and are able to decide whether or not to participate.

Question (8) Health & Wellbeing Census latest statistics

How many schools

- a) Have begun data collection?
- b) Have completed their involvement in the surveys?
- c) How many opt outs have been received in total in Edinburgh?
- d) How many of these were from parents?
- e) How many of these were from children on the day?

Answer (8)

- a) 57
- b) 10 schools have so far let us know that they have completed the census.
- c) We won't know this until the census has been completed in early April. Anecdotally, some schools have told us that there have been no or very few (less than 5) opt outs but we know of at least one school where that figure will be higher.

d) see c above

e) see c above

Question (9) Health & Wellbeing Census Opt-out process

Different schools are using different processes to manage opt outs.

- a) Please outline all the different opt-out processes being used by schools in Edinburgh. Eg paper forms, ParentPay lunch booking/school trips system
- b) Please provide the numbers of schools using each one.

Answer (9) a) The options of a tear-off slip to the parents' letter or using ParentPay have been suggested in the information sent to schools but it is for schools to decide how best to manage the process.

b) We won't know until the census closes in early April.

Question (10) School email addresses for children

The HWBC census has raised concerns about the use of a child's Scottish Candidate Number (SCN) as their email address and the visibility of a city-wide directory of children's names, schools and SCNs. Other councils do not use SCN in children's email addresses.

- a) Why was SCN chosen as a basis for children's email addresses?
- b) What risk assessments were carried out in relation to this?
- c) Were parents advised that there would be city-wide visibility of their children's information and that it would be easy for children/adults at other schools to contact their children directly or indeed, any adult from any external email address?

Answer

- (10)**
- a) Using SCN as a pupil's computer and Office 365 username is considered best practice nationally. It is a unique identifier that does not identify them by name or location. This approach is used by many local authorities across the country and by Education Scotland in their national provision of Glow
 - b) SCN has been used for pupils' computer usernames and email addresses since the inception of our wide area network and network services in CEC schools, dating back possibly as far as the 1990s and the council's first in-house email service. Risk assessments carried out at that time are not readily available but may be archived, although accessing documents that old may be challenging
 - c) Our teachers and pupils all have accounts within our Office 365 tenancy, so they can communicate and collaborate in learning activities within, across and outwith schools as required, as well as to learn vital digital skills. Schools issue pupils and parents with an ICT Responsible Use Agreement to outline appropriate use of this technology and will deliver Digital Safety lessons to ensure pupils are aware (for example) of what to do if they receive an unsolicited or inappropriate email. It is also necessary that pupil email addresses can receive external communication so they can make use of certain tools or sign up for online services, but pupils' SCNs are not publicised or available externally, and we have robust filtering in place to remove spam and emails with inappropriate content, so the risk of unsolicited or inappropriate email is low. We do have the means to exclude identified key individuals from our internal address list if specific personal circumstances require that, but in doing so, it may also limit that pupil's ability to participate in certain digital activities undertaken by their class, as a result of those restrictions

Item no 10.23

QUESTION NO 23

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question

Please could the Convener confirm the (a) current status and (b) expected delivery date of the following active travel projects which had previous levels of consultation and design work.

- i) Junction of Queensferry Road - Learmonth Terrace - Oxford Terrace - Clarendon Crescent walking and cycling improvements.
- ii) Carrington Road walking and cycling improvements.
- iii) Botanics - Inverleith Park crossing.
- iv) Leslie Place - Deanhaugh Street / Haugh Street crossing and signal improvements.

Answer

At present the current status and expected delivery dates of the four projects concerned are as follows:

- i) Junction of Queensferry Road - Learmonth Terrace - Oxford Terrace - Clarendon Crescent walking and cycling improvements

Temporary measures were implemented in 2021 as part of Spaces for People. It is proposed to retain these temporary measures using an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order as part of the Travelling Safely programme. Permanent measures will be considered further during the experimental period.

- ii) Carrington Road walking and cycling improvements.

In June 2019, a report to Transport and Environment Committee noted that affordability of the project by 2023/24 was under review. Following the review of the [Active Travel Investment Programme](#) in 2021, this project was not

included in the programme for delivery to 2025/26. This means that delivery will be deferred for inclusion in future Active Travel Investment Programmes.

iii) Botanics - Inverleith Park crossing.

Temporary measures were implemented in 2021 as part of Spaces for People. It is proposed to retain these temporary measures in place using an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order as part of the Travelling Safely programme. Alongside this, work on a detailed design for the permanent project will be progressed, with a view to implementation during 2023.

iii) Leslie Place - Deanhaugh Street / Haugh Street crossing and signal improvements.

In line with the Active Travel Investment Programme which was reported to Transport and Environment Committee in October 2021, construction of this project is now due to take place in financial year 2023/24.

Item no 10.24

QUESTION NO 24

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question

Broken down by ward, how much money has been spent on either fixing or upgrading roads and pavements across each of the last five years?

Answer

The table below shows the expenditure on roads and pavements across each of the last five years, broken down by ward where it is possible to do so.

Ward	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Ward Total
1	£447,000	£1,091,000	£780,000	£632,000	£2,413,000	£5,350,000
2	£171,000	£981,000.00	£239,000	£409,000	£603,000	£2,403,000
3	£141,000	£310,514	£625,000	£125,000	£1,020,000	£2,221,514
4	£757,000	£354,000	£762,000	£636,000	£661,000	£3,170,000
5	£254,000	£469,000	£1,010,000	£919,000	£804,000	£3,456,000
6	£640,000	£438,000	£986,000	£402,000	£649,000	£3,115,000
7	£426,000	£756,000	£229,000	£517,000	£502,000	£2,430,000
8	£742,000	£1,065,000	£341,000	£632,000	£701,000	£3,481,000
9	£978,000	£485,000	£552,000	£197,000	£661,000	£2,873,000
10	£242,000	£1,286,000	£410,000	£1,441,000	£702,000	£4,081,000
11	£802,000	£1,133,000	£120,000	£1,686,000	£1,980,000	£5,721,000
12	£890,000	£780,000	£1,100,000	£481,000	£201,000	£3,452,000
13	£970,000	£100,000	£617,000	£896,000	£104,000	£2,687,000
14	£421,000	£886,377	£709,000	£401,000	£468,000	£2,885,377
15	£1,127,000	£298,000	£332,000	£362,000	£601,000	£2,720,000
16	£758,000	£331,000	£616,000	£750,000	£1,010,000	£3,465,000
17	£634,000	£505,000	£1,370,000	£909,000	£497,000	£3,915,000
Sub-total	£10,400,000	£11,268,891	£10,798,000	£11,395,000	£13,564,000	
Revenue	£5,080,756	£4,401,335	£3,861,755	£3,570,000	£5,650,000	
Bus Stop Maintenance	£120,000	£240,000	£500,000	£500,000		
In-Year Priorities		£.895,000		£1,000,000		
Surface Enhancements		£1,000,000	£1,000,000			
Design, Supervision & Miscellaneous Costs	£1,372,440	£1,900,000	£1,572,000	£1,598,000	£1,636,000	
Drainage	£200,000	£300,000	£200,000	£200,000	£200,000	
Dropped Crossings	£50,000	£100,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	
Total	£17,223,196	£20,105,226	£17,981,755	£18,313,000	£21,100,000	

Item no 10.25

QUESTION NO 25

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question How many reports of fly tipping have been received in each of the past three years broken down by ward, and what were the timescales for dealing with these once reported?

Answer Table 1 below shows the number of recorded service requests for dumping and fly tipping, by ward, in each of the last three years.

Table 2 below shows the average number of days taken to close requests, by ward, in each of the last three years. The time taken can include arranging for investigations by the Council's Street and Environmental Enforcement team

Table 1 - Dumping and Fly Tipping Service Requests for 2019 to 2021 by Ward

Ward	2019	2020	2021	Grand Total
01-Almond	384	532	626	1,542
02-Pentland Hills	1,082	712	724	2,518
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	249	283	357	889
04-Forth	711	859	1,075	2,645
05-Inverleith	374	442	447	1,263
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	164	193	169	526
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	1,043	1,320	1,867	4,230
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	324	276	320	920
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	422	466	646	1,534
10-Meadows/Morningside	551	626	904	2,081
11-City Centre	629	545	710	1,884
12-Leith Walk	715	875	1,081	2,671
13-Leith	653	769	793	2,215
14-Craigentinny/Duddingston	532	668	790	1,990
15-Southside/Newington	517	538	843	1,898
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	385	565	740	1,690
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	494	645	886	2,025
No code allocated	93	47	3	143
Grand Total	9,322	10,361	12,981	32,664

Table 2 - Dumping and Fly Tipping Service Requests for 2019 to 2021 by Ward

Average Number of Days to Close Requests

Ward	2019	2020	2021	Average
01-Almond	4.0	5.2	4.6	4.7
02-Pentland Hills	4.7	3.6	3.4	4.0
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	3.2	4.5	4.5	4.1
04-Forth	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.7
05-Inverleith	3.3	4.2	3.7	3.8
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	3.0	3.2	4.4	3.5
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.2
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.3
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.8
10-Meadows/Morningside	2.9	1.7	1.8	2.0
11-City Centre	2.7	2.0	2.2	2.3
12-Leith Walk	2.4	2.0	1.6	1.9
13-Leith	2.5	1.9	1.8	2.0
14-Craigentinny/Duddingston	3.9	1.9	1.9	2.4
15-Southside/Newington	2.4	1.4	1.7	1.8
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	4.4	2.9	2.3	3.0
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	4.7	3.3	3.0	3.5
No code allocated	7.7	8.4	6.0	7.9
Average	3.5	2.9	2.8	3.0

Item no 10.26

QUESTION NO 26

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) How many garden waste permits have been issued across the city broken down by ward for each year since the system came into effect?

Answer (1) Table 1 below provides details on the number of garden waste permit subscriptions in each calendar year between 2018 and 2021, broken down by ward.

Question (2) How many requests have been received by the council from residents wishing to register for garden waste collections outside of the registration window?

Answer (2) This information is not recorded.

However, Transport and Environment Committee in June 2021 requested details of this, and a report has been prepared for Committee on 31 March 2022.

The analysis of information available shows that approximately 260 people contacted the Council via email between September and end of November 2021 (after the summer window closed and the mid-year window opened) requesting details of how to register for the service.

The reasons for missing the summer window are mixed and include:

- Missing the reminder notification; and
- Moving into a property; and not realising that the property had not been registered.

It is not possible to specify the number of telephone calls in respect of registration for garden waste. However, there were 831 calls between September and October 2021 covering a range of garden waste topics including asking to register, as well as questions on non-exempt customer

paying for the service, requests for replacement bins, reports of missed collections from current customers, and asking when permits will arrive.

Table 1 - Garden Waste Permits by Ward from Jan 2018 to Dec 2021

Ward	2018	2019	2020	2021
01-Almond	7,875	8,465	9,039	8,762
02-Pentland Hills	5,720	5,775	6,413	6,464
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	4,767	5,228	5,517	5,394
04-Forth	4,081	4,493	4,799	4,715
05-Inverleith	4,694	4,990	5,289	5,269
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	6,046	6,489	6,781	6,815
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	3,076	3,459	3,779	3,571
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	6,478	6,978	7,089	7,172
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	3,263	3,193	3,684	3,380
10-Meadows/Morningside	4,183	4,446	4,531	4,629
11-City Centre	581	574	614	660
12-Leith Walk	780	792	938	945
13-Leith	816	882	982	960
14-Craigentinny/Duddingston	4,030	4,360	4,645	4,566
15-Southside/Newington	3,882	4,238	4,349	4,409
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	6,204	7,127	7,830	7,672
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	4,186	4,594	4,904	4,847
Not available	2	1,398	102	243
Grand Total	70,664	77,481	81,285	80,473

Item no 10.27

QUESTION NO 27

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) What monitoring is being done of the increased congestion and pollution levels in and around Picardy Place since the westbound entrance to York Place was shut off due to the tram works?

Answer (1) Congestion at this location is being monitored centrally, as part of the Council's monitoring of congestion across the city. In addition, Lothian Buses are sharing their information with the Council's Traffic Management Review Panel.

In terms of the Council's statutory duties to review and assess air quality, consideration is given to likely exceedances of NO₂ (predominately traffic related) Air Quality Objectives (AQO) in terms of an annual average. Where significant issues arise, longer term trends are assessed with a minimum assessment period of 5 years. Pollution concentrations can fluctuate on an annual basis with local road changes or favourable/less favourable meteorological conditions. With the short term nature of the tram construction diversion, it would be unlikely to have significant impact on the findings of the review and assessment process.

There is no additional monitoring in place in response to construction diversions.

Question (2) What measures are the council taking to help alleviate the increased congestion?

Answer (2) Council officers are working closely with Lothian Buses and the Traffic Management Review Panel. This has resulted in all of the traffic signals in this area being switched to the Urban Traffic Control system. This allows officers to control lights to ease congestion in real time and has resulted in a reduction in congestion in the area.