

Item no 10.1

QUESTION NO 1

**By Councillor Campbell for answer
by the Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 4 May 2023**

Question (1) Can the convener provide a breakdown of HRA revenue payments to the General fund over the last 3 years, and the services that were paid for?

Answer (1) The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is a ring-fenced fund which sits separately from the general Council budget. The HRA must pay the General Council budget for its use of general Council services and assets. HRA Income and Expenditure is subject to external audit scrutiny as part of the annual audit of accounting statements. Within this process, the charges levied against the HRA are reviewed annually. A three-year comparison is summarised below in Table 1.

Overheads relate to use of premises, facilities management, back-office functions and dedicated management time.

Question (2) Can this please be broken down into the service that was being purchased, and the number of units purchase i.e. hours of work or whatever unit of measurement is used?

Answer (2) See answer (1).

Question (3) Can this please be presented in a way that allows a comparison between different years?

Answer (3) See answer (1).

Table 1 – Three-year comparison of General Fund recharges to Housing Revenue Account

Recharge Description	Recharging Department	2019/20 Outturn £000	2020/21 Outturn £000	2021/22 Outturn £000
Overhead Related Costs				
CEC - Central Support Costs	Central	6,056	5,692	6,653
SSC - Central Support Costs	Safer & Stronger	250	228	97
Place - Departmental Support Costs	Place	550	720	335
Corporate & Democratic Core	Place	166	254	208
Recharges from Front Line Service				
Contact Centre	Business Support	1,134	977	1,016
Rent Collection	Business Support	109	110	114
Assisted Technology - Core	H&SC	542	745	681
Assisted Technology - Sheltered.	H&SC	470	457	430
The Access Point	H&SC	76	83	86
Housing Property - Direct Staff	Place	1,282	1,971	1,932
Family & Household Support Mgmt Team	Safer & Stronger	129	145	175
Family & Household Support	Safer & Stronger	1,457	1,485	1,464
Housing Options Team	Safer & Stronger	367	421	415
Grounds Maintenance - Core	Parks & Greenspace	2,207	2,225	1,743
Grounds Maintenance - Sheltered Housing	Parks & Greenspace	88	88	96
Grounds Maintenance - Garden Aid	Parks & Greenspace	386	409	399
Total		15,269	16,010	15,844

Item no 10.2

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Campbell for answer
by the Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 4 May 2023**

Question (1) Can the convener please provide a timeline for development of the hospital site including:

- Any investigative works
- Design and development
- Planning permission
- Expected dates of onsite development
- Expected dates of completion

Answer (1) NHS Lothian will occupy part of the building for up to two years from 31 March 2023 while they relocate services. Recent experience in bringing forward complex sites of this nature has shown that progression through a good quality procurement process, design, consultation and planning process will take a number of years. A Prior Information Notice (PIN), seeking interest from potential development partners, has been issued to the market. The outcome from this exercise will inform future procurement routes and community engagement will also be key to the success of the project.

It is expected that a development partner will be in place towards the end of this year/early next year and a period of site investigation, design work and consultation will then commence. This will shape the delivery route and planning approach.

The developing project timetable will also be influenced by timescales for statutory consents and utility connections but opportunities to accelerate the programme will be reviewed regularly. It is likely to be at least two years before development will begin on-site and the first homes to be completed in 2026/27. Ward Councillors will be kept updated on key milestones and approvals will be sought from Committee as required.

Question (2) Can the convener confirm if there have been discussions with H&SC colleagues about the scope for delays, and any cost/benefit analysis of delaying development to enable continued use of beds including the reduction in costs to H&SC of not extending the PFI contract for Ferryfield House?

Answer (2) Place Directorate officers are supporting Health and Social Care colleagues in the delivery of the bed-based review and all options will continue to be explored until this process has concluded, and Members have agreed the optimal approach.

Question (3) Has this been provided to H&SC colleagues in order for them to assess whether delaying services coming off Liberton Hospital might be more financially viable than extending private finance contracts to provide continuity of care.

Answer (3) See answer (2).

Item no 10.3

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Campbell for answer
by the Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 4 May 2023**

Question (1) Can the convener please provide details of any discussions that have taken place regarding the potential for a sinking fund for private owners on low incomes in mixed tenure blocks where the council is taking forward improvements?

Answer (1) The Council offers a [Scheme of Assistance](#) for homeowners to improve the quality of their homes, with advice, information and practical support provided by the Edinburgh Shared Repairs Service.

The Scheme of Assistance also signposts to financial support which may be available to support homeowners, including financial assistance from the Council for people with disabilities.

To date, however, there have been no discussions about the potential to create a sinking fund to support homeowners with the cost of life cycle building repairs.

Question (2) Does the convener believe this is an area where we should consider whether the general fund should make contributions as happens in other council areas?

Answer (2) Officers will continue to gather information on the schemes operated by other local authorities and will analyse further the allocation of this funding and will report back in due course

Item no 10.4

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor McNeese-Mechan for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Question (1) Why was the Council Leader or no member of the Labour Group at the Tram All Party Oversight Group on 18/04/23?

Answer (1) Cllr Arthur and myself were unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments.

I am aware that Cllr Arthur did catch up with the TTN team afterwards to understand if any issues had been raised, the meeting lasted less than an hour and all issues raised were addressed.

Question (2) What is the Council Leader actually doing about meaningfully addressing ongoing issues?

Answer (2) Cllr Arthur keeps me apprised of the regular contact he has with the TTN team. They are proactive in contacting myself or Cllr Arthur with any issues which may impact on project delivery as they arise.

The project remains on time, on budget and will be delivered as specified. We look forward to welcoming Leithers (and others) onto the service in the coming weeks.

I know that you could not attend the community walkabout on 28th April for good reason. I along with local councillors and members of Community Councils Together on Trams (CCTT) walked the length of Leith Walk looking at the progress of the works. Any issues identified along the way have already been raised with the Trams team. If you would like to discuss any issues you have noticed, I would be happy to speak to you.

Item no 10.5

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor McNeese-Mechan for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Question (1) Why was the Convener or no member of the Labour Group at the Tram All Party Oversight Group on 18/04/23?

Answer (1) Myself and Councillor Day were unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments.

I did, however, catch up with the TTN team afterwards to understand if any issues had been raised. I understand the meeting lasted less than an hour, and all issues raised were addressed.

Question (2) What is the Convener actually doing about meaningfully addressing ongoing issues?

Answer (2) I have regular contact with the TTN team, and they are proactive in contacting me as issues arise which may have potential to impact on project delivery.

You last contacted me directly regarding the TTN project on Sunday 2nd of April at 4:01am, and I responded at 8:37pm the same day. The issues you raised were dealt with fully at the TTN meeting requested by Councillor Caldwell (5th of April).

You have raised no further issues with me since then. Indeed, I think this is the only issue you have ever raised directly with me in relation to TTN.

The project remains on time and on budget and will be delivered as specified. Indeed, myself and Councillor Day look forward to welcoming Leithers (and others) onto the service in the coming weeks.

I know that you could not attend the community walkabout on 28th of April for good reason, but please let me know if you have any issues I can help you address.

Item no 10.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Thornley for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Capital Delivery Priorities

Given the Capital Delivery Priorities approved by TEC on 20th April, and the Convener's praise for the 'Pothole Killer' the Council has acquired on trial:

- Question** (1) By what measure is it determined where the 'Pothole Killer' will be deployed across the city?
- Answer** (1) The Pothole Killer team is deployed on a citywide basis with the locations identified through the Council's reporting system (Confirm) following site inspections to check suitability.
- Question** (2) Is there a long-term plan for its use outwith the agreed Delivery Priorities?
- Answer** (2) Pothole Killer is in the 1st month of a 6-month trial period. Following the trial, an assessment will be undertaken to determine if it is cost effective (taking account of plant, reinstatement quality, workforce and output against traditional methods to ensure best value).
- The trial is progressing well, and I have been contacted by a number of residents who were pleased to see this incredible machine in their area.
- Question** (3) If so, would he share this below?
- Answer** (3) Please see response to Q2.

Item no 10.7

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

In February, the Scottish Government's Planning Minister announced planning deregulation as part of NPF4 as well as additional funding to allow more playparks and greenspaces to be developed and upgraded.

Question (1) What physical impact will this new policy have on very high-density, urban wards such as Leith Walk and Sighthill/Gorgie which currently have an inequitable level of provision compared to other areas of the city?

Answer (1) The creation of new space will be shaped by development and the aspirations of City Plan 2030 across the city. Officers will also consider impact and improvements in existing spaces to make best use of investment and additional funding opportunities, particularly in high-density areas, as part of the Council's replacement Open Space Strategy and Thriving Greenspaces Strategy, working with communities, partners, and agencies.

Question (2) Can the Convener please list any new, additional public greenspaces that are in the Council's pipeline, particularly for high-density areas where there is less access to gardens and private greenspace?

Answer (2) City Plan 2030 proposes new greenspace provision in Gypsy Brae Park, Leith Western Harbour Central Park, Leith Links Seaward Extension and Crammond Road. Densities in these areas vary, although overall they are higher than many other parts of the city. These parks are generally to be delivered alongside new development and are expected to also benefit existing communities.

Question (3) Can the Convener please list any new, additional public playparks that are in the Council's pipeline, particularly for high density areas with limited outdoor play access?

Answer

- (3)** City Plan 2030 proposes new play facilities in areas of high density such as Orchard Brae Avenue, the Royal Victoria Hospital and Lanark Road where it crosses the Union canal.

These facilities are to be provided as part of new development. They may be in private ownership however, per the Council's Open Space Strategy, the overwhelming majority of existing non-Council play spaces in Edinburgh are still publicly accessible. It is expected these new proposed play facilities still provide benefit to existing communities.

An update on Playparks Investment was reported to Culture and Communities Committee on 7 March 2023. This included a programme of 14 play area projects in the pipeline for 2023/24.

Item no 10.8

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Leith Walk and Elm Row Pavements Post-Completion of Trams to Newhaven

I understand that there will be a Service Level Agreement period after the completion of the Trams to Newhaven project. Can the Convener please confirm:

Question (1) What Council departments will be involved directly in this programme and how will existing knowledge and guidance from officers who worked on the Project be retained?

Answer (1) It is important to note that there will not be a Service Level Agreement in place after the completion of the Trams to Newhaven project. Instead, a handover plan is currently being developed for the management of the asset, to be taken forward as part of 'business as usual' activities by the Council and Edinburgh Trams. For the duration of the contractual defects period, project management support is being procured.

As noted above, the handover plan is currently being finalised with colleagues who will be responsible for asset management going forward, but it is anticipated that the support provided will include some continuity to capture existing knowledge.

Question (2) How often will officers under this SLA programme seek to formally meet with relevant ward councillors, community councils and relevant public stakeholders?

Answer (2) As noted in answer 1, there is no formal SLA programme in place. Meetings take place as part of normal business.

Question (3) Will part of the programme's remit include identifying elements of the design that do not meet current Edinburgh Street Design Guidance and exploring solutions at those locations post-completion?

Answer

- (3)** The Trams to Newhaven contractor is obliged to meet the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance (ESDG) in place at the time the contract was awarded in 2019 (unless specific derogations have been sought and approved by the Council).

Where this obligation exists and the design does not meet the ESDG, non-compliances are raised as defects through the contract and work to identify any such non-compliances is already underway. Any aspects not raised by the project prior to completion can be raised as part of the defects' resolution process post completion.

I acknowledge, however, that there are concerns regarding some aspects design despite it being constructed as specified by the last administration.

Item no 10.9

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Can the Convener please confirm if (and how) population density and number of residents being impacted by surface water is factored when Council officers respond to;

Question (1) Blocked drains and gully reports, and

Answer (1) Population density and number of residents being impacted is not generally a consideration when responding to blocked drain and gully reports. Risk to public safety and disruption to the transport network are ultimately the main drivers for responses.

Question (2) Active, ongoing flood and water-based emergencies, and

Answer (2) When responding to flood events over multiple areas, consideration may be given for prioritising areas with higher number of residents. This depends on the nature and severity of flooding.

Generally, the population density and number of residents being impacted is not a primary consideration when responding to emergencies.

Question (3) New SuDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) project requests / ideas

Answer (3) New SUDS projects will be designed to take into consideration the number of properties draining to the system and any existing surface water issues in the area.

Population density is generally not a consideration for the design of SUDS schemes

Item no 10.10

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Younie for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Further to the answer provided question 10.3 (4) at the 30 June 2022 meeting of the Council,

Question (1) Was a decision taken in August 2022 on whether to retain, remove or modify the existing measures?

Answer (1) A decision has not yet been taken, as the School Travel Plan for Royal High School has not yet been formally signed off. However, it is in final draft form and I understand there is strong support from the school community to retain the existing temporary measures on a permanent basis.

Question (2) If so, what decisions were taken?

Answer (2) Noting the support for retaining the existing temporary measures, it is proposed to progress designs and formally consult via any traffic orders necessary for permanent measures to replace the current temporary layout.

Question (3) What is the timetable for implementing these decisions?

Answer (3) A plan is currently being developed for implementing the measures supported through the school travel plan review. There is not currently a timescale for implementing individual measures within each travel plan.

Item no 10.11

QUESTION NO 11

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023**

4.8 of the Council's 'Management Rules for Public Parks and Greenspace' states that "*metal detecting in any park without the written permission of the Scottish Detector Club, subject to an agreement between the Council and the Scottish Detector Club being valid*" is prohibited:

Question (1) Does the Council have any valid agreement in place with the Scottish Detector Club?

Answer (1) The Council does not have a valid agreement in place with the Scottish Detector Club. An agreement was previously in place, but this was relinquished, and the Council informed in March 2021.

Question (2) How many requests for metal detecting on council land have been received in the last 5 years?

Answer (2) Since 2018, there have been 2 requests received.

Question (3) Of these, how many have been granted?

Answer (3) None.

Question (4) What guidance or criteria exists for council officers to use when considering whether to grant permission for metal detecting on council owned land?

Answer (4) When considering whether to grant permission, advice is sought from the Council's Archaeology Officer. However, in order to protect parks and open spaces (many of which are sites of historical interest) no permissions have been granted since 2016.

Item no 10.12

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Development
Management Sub Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023**

Question (1) What is the total Healthcare Infrastructure Contribution expected from the legal agreement associated with planning permission 16/01797/PPP?

Answer (1) The expected rate of contribution is £210 per household. As the application was for a planning permission in principle the total number of units is not finalised but the expected number of units is 980 units.

Question (2) How much, if any, of this money is expected to be spent by the Council directly and how much is expected to be transferred to NHS Lothian?

Answer (2) Any monies due in planning legal agreements for healthcare provision are forwarded to NHS Lothian to spend and deliver the infrastructure. This approach is set out in the [Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery 2018](#) section 4 'Legal Agreements and use of monies'.

Question (3) What discussions have taken place with NHS Lothian on how any monies transferred would be spent to improve healthcare provision in Queensferry?

Answer (3) The expansion of the medical practice in South Queensferry was completed in 2018 – this was an action in the LDP 2016's action programme to mitigate the impact of development in Queensferry. This action was delivered, and front funded by NHS Lothian, using developer contributions collected retrospectively to recover relevant costs. This is set out in Section 8 'Completed Actions 2023' of the recently adopted [2023 LDP Action Programme](#).

Item no 10.13

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Question (1) Further to my supplementary to question 10.9 at the 16 March 2023 meeting of the Council and given we are approaching the sixth anniversary of the tragic death at the Davidson's Mains roundabout, has the Convener managed to get an explanation as to why this project is taking so long?

Answer (1) I am sorry for the delay in responding to the supplementary question which you asked at the Council meeting on 16 March. As I said in my response to your question, it is unacceptable that it has taken so long for this project to be progressed.

Officers have advised me that there have been a number of challenges to progressing this project, including time to assess the feasibility of various options for this location and to develop scheme designs. Resourcing has been a challenge throughout, and delivery of the project was further impacted by COVID-19.

There are some upcoming changes in responsibilities and team structure within the transport area. While I have asked officers to prioritise this project, I also recognise that there are many competing priorities in this area and therefore I expect a report to Transport and Environment Committee in the autumn on the upcoming priorities of the team.

Item no 10.14

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor McFarlane for answer
by the Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023**

Question (1) Can the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee share the correspondence sent to the Administrators of 88 Lothian Road as mandated by the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 21 March 2023 regarding the City of Edinburgh's agreed position to retain the site for cultural use.

Answer (1) The Convener asked the Executive Director of Place to make contact with the Administrators to see if the Council could give any support. The Administrators were contacted on 17 March and responded that the process was confidential and ongoing, their duty was to maximise value to the Company and creditors and that they would update the Council at an appropriate time.

He also sent a letter to the Scottish Government. A copy of this is attached along with the response.

Question (2) Can the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee further share what efforts were made subsequent to the Emergency Motion passing to engage or support cultural bids to purchase 88 Lothian Road.

Answer

- (2)** Officers have been contacted by 3 separate organisations/individuals interested in bidding for the property (with a view to operating it as a cinema) since the Emergency Motion was passed.

Officers have also been in regular, at least weekly, contact with Screen Scotland and have had meetings jointly with Screen Scotland and Scottish Government on 12, 17 and 25 April to get updates and discuss possible ways to support the use of the building as a cultural cinema.

The Council Leader and the Convener met earlier with representatives from Screen Scotland and Scottish Government with a further meeting arranged for 3 May.

The Convener and Spokespersons have been given verbal updates as the situation evolves, with the latest update on 18 April.

Councillor Cammy Day
Leader of Edinburgh City Council
City Chambers
High Street
Edinburgh
EH1 1JY

22 March 2023

Dear Minister,

Edinburgh Filmhouse

You will be aware that following the demise of CMI in October 2022, the sale of the former Edinburgh Filmhouse at 88 Lothian Road to a hospitality chain now appears to be imminent. I am writing to urge Scottish Government to intervene and save this valuable cultural asset for the capital city of Scotland.

Without a dedicated centre for the showing of cultural cinema and international film, the reputations of Edinburgh and Scotland as national and international cultural magnets are diminished, as is our ability to discover and nurture homegrown film-making talent.

Council officers have been working with colleagues in Screen Scotland/Creative Scotland since October to encourage and support any offer that is in line with the Administrators duties; a) returns full value to the creditors; b) secures 88 Lothian Road as a continuing cultural cinema; and c) ensures a swift conclusion to the administration process, and fair compensation to the administrators for same.

I am aware that there is a standing bid from a private individual who seeks to maintain the use of 88 Lothian Road as a cultural cinema and is close to matching the current highest bid for the property. Acceptance of this bid would, we understand, satisfy the Administrators' duties to the creditors, and allow the reopening of Filmhouse, however this bid is currently not being considered by the Administrators.

As Leader of Edinburgh City Council, I urge Scottish Government to use any means at their disposal including the necessary financial support to ensure this valuable cultural asset – which both the City of Edinburgh and the Scottish Government have invested significant sums within over the decades - is saved for the city and the nation. I, and officers of the Council stand ready to support in any way that is helpful.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Cammy Day
Leader, The City of Edinburgh Council
Labour Party
Edinburgh Ward 4 – Forth

M: Minister for Culture, Europe and International Development

Councillor Cammy Day
Alan.Irvine@edinburgh.gov.uk

Our Reference: 202300348851

Your Reference: Edinburgh Filmhouse

19 April 2023

Dear Councillor Cammy Day,

Thank you for your correspondence of 22 March 2023 regarding cultural cinema in Edinburgh and the sale of 88 Lothian Road. I am responding as these matters now fall under my portfolio as the Minister for Culture, Europe and International Development.

I am aware that Council officers have been engaging with Creative Scotland/Screen Scotland and Scottish Government officials, and I am pleased that this positive engagement continues. I would like to pass on my thanks to all involved at the City of Edinburgh Council for their ongoing efforts, and assure you that the Scottish Government joins in your commitment to supporting cultural cinema and the Edinburgh International Film Festival. As your letter sets out, the Filmhouse and the Festival are key cultural assets both in Edinburgh and for Scotland as a whole, and their contribution to our creative landscape cannot be overestimated.

As the sale of the Filmhouse is a matter for the Administrators, I'm sure you will appreciate that it would not be appropriate for the Scottish Government to comment on those proceedings.

I appreciate the time you have taken to write on this important issue. Please be assured that these matters continue to be a high priority for the Scottish Government, and we are committed to protecting and celebrating our important cultural assets; recognising the important role these play in sustaining and nurturing culture to flourish and to evolve as a diverse, positive force in society, across all of Scotland.

Thank you again for your letter, and I hope that our two organisations, along with the many others committed to preserving cultural cinema, can continue to work together positively and productively to find a solution for the people of Edinburgh and Scotland.

Yours sincerely
Christina McKelvie

M: Minister for Culture, Europe and International Development

Scottish Ministers, special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

St Andrew's House, Regent Road, Edinburgh EH1 3DG

www.gov.scot

Item no 10.15

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 4 May 2023**

Low Traffic Neighbourhood

Question (1) What criteria is used to determine whether an area should be considered for a low traffic neighbourhood?

Answer (1) For the two LTNs (Liveable Neighbourhoods) that are currently being progressed in Leith and Corstorphine the following information was used to inform their layout and interventions:

- Traffic levels and speeds, compared against criteria in the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance for levels of traffic considered safe and attractive for active travel;
- Walking and cycling counts;
- Accident and collision data; and
- Local community engagement and feedback on challenges, barriers and opportunities to walking cycling and wheeling.

Both of these schemes were progressed before the draft Active Travel Action Plan and Road Safety Action Plans were approved.

Moving forward, the draft Active Travel Action Plan 2030 sets out that the following issues will be taken into account in considering where to take forward future Liveable Neighbourhoods:

- a. Could significantly reduce volumes of rat-running traffic;
- b. Improve the safety of streets, particularly in SIMD areas;
- c. Help children travel to school more actively;
- d. Could provide a viable alternative to the main road network for the city's cycle network; and
- e. Would enable people to access local services more easily by walking,

Community engagement will be carried out wherever proposals for Liveable Neighbourhood are identified.

Question (2) What formal traffic monitoring is required to be undertaken before an area is considered for a low traffic neighbourhood?

Answer (2) From a formal statutory perspective, there is no specified traffic monitoring requirements before a Liveable Neighbourhood is introduced. However, the Council approach has been to undertake traffic monitoring (speeds and counts) on all the key roads within a liveable neighbourhood area, including the boundary distributor roads on the periphery of the liveable neighbourhood area.

Question (3) Which areas are currently being considered for possible low traffic neighbourhoods in the future?

Answer (3) Assessment work is still under development to identify which areas may be most appropriate for potential Liveable Neighbourhoods. I would welcome suggestions from Councillors and Community Councils for schemes to take forward.

Item no 10.16

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor O'Neill for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Question (1) What does the Council do centrally with data from Scottish National Standardised Assessments (SNSA) and Measaichean Coitcheann Nàiseanta airson Foghlam tron Ghàidhlig (MCNG)?

Answer (1) The local authority has facilitated professional learning for school staff to support the effective delivery of NSA (shared platform for Scottish National Standardised Assessments (SNSA) and Measaichean Coitcheann Nàiseanta airson Foghlam tron Ghàidhlig (MCNG)).

We support the transfer of NSA data at the point of P7 transition between primary and secondary schools. With the implementation of NSA we have ensured that historic SNSA reports are available for schools to access.

Question (2) What do teachers do with data from SNSA and MCNG?

Answer (2) The NSA provides teachers with objective data about learner progress. Teachers use the NSA as a diagnostic tool to plan next steps in teaching and learning. It is also used to support professional judgement of achieving CfE levels. They draw on a range of assessment evidence to determine learner progress and plan next steps. If a child is not on track then teachers can plan appropriate interventions to accelerate learning.

Question (3) What improvements have been made in the past year (since May 2022) at an individual, classroom, school and local level off the back of SNSA and MCNG data?

Answer

- (3)** The NSA forms part of the suite of assessment evidence that teachers draw on to assess the progress of individual learners and plan next steps. Tracking and monitoring pupil progress to ensure attainment continues to improve is a local authority and school priority. With the introduction of Scottish Government Stretch aims, the NSA data is supporting the rigour of professional judgements about achievement of CFE levels.

Item no 10.17

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor O'Neill for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Question (1) How has the Council deployed the capital funding from the Scottish Government to support the expansion of free school meals?

Answer (1) To date the Council has only received a limited amount of capital funding for tranche p4/5 - £1.8m. The Council has a working group who have conducted a needs-based analysis within the limited budget to take forward 4 projects across the estate due for completion by September 2023. These will ease over capacity in 4 key localities across Edinburgh. A further 22 projects have been identified and early feasibility studies have been conducted to allow the council to submit updated cost estimates for the next round of capital funding.

Item no 10.18

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor O'Neill for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Question

(1)

To ask for an update on actions the Council has taken following the signing of Transport for All's Equal Pavements Pledge to improve the accessibility of the city, which was agreed in 2021.

With specific reference to:

1. How have clear pavements been encouraged?
2. How has business clutter such as A-boards and street furniture been reduced?
3. How has waste removal scheduling been changed?
4. How many dropped kerbs have been installed?
5. How many broken kerbs or kerbs that need to be dropped have been identified?
6. How many Blue Badge Bays have been removed?
7. How many meetings has the convener had with Disabled People's Organisations (DPOs)?
8. How has the Social Model of Disability been embedded into future streetspace schemes?

Answer

(1) Strategic Context

The [City Mobility Plan 2021-2030](#) (CMP), approved by Transport and Environment Committee in February 2021, provides the strategic policy framework for ensuring that the needs of all street users are considered when footways and routes are designed and maintained – this includes consideration of footway widths, gradients, surfacing and clutter. The CMP committed to a 2-yearly review cycle primarily to assess progress of and update committed actions in its associated [Implementation Plan](#). This review is expected to be finalised by the end of this year.

Five draft actions plans to support the delivery of the City Mobility Plan were approved for consultation by Transport and Environment Committee in December 2022 and February 2023. These plans cover Active Travel, Public Transport, Parking, Road Safety and Air Quality and have been drafted together alongside the emerging strategic Streetspace Allocation Framework/Circulation Plan ('Future Streets'). They contain several actions which will further improve the city's accessibility and inclusivity. [Consultation](#) on these plans started on 17 April, running until 9 July.

The [Edinburgh Street Design Guidance Factsheets](#) are currently being reviewed. They contain specific guidance for road infrastructure projects and new developments on all aspects of street design. Specific guidance in relation to the Equal Pavements Pledge is included on how to:

- Design barrier free footways for pedestrians in new developments
- Ensure streets are inclusive and free of hazards and clutter
- Ensure footways are designed sufficiently wide for all users
- Ensure street furniture and use of tables and chairs on footways has no adverse impact on vulnerable street users

Following approval by the Council in 2022, enforcement of a ban on pavement parking will be introduced from December 2023, the earliest date allowed by national enabling legislation. This will reduce the impact of obstruction caused by vehicles parking on footways across the whole of Edinburgh.

On 29 March, the Convener of Transport and Environment Committee and officers held an Accessible Streets roundtable discussion with stakeholders representing a range of disability groups. Discussion focussed on challenges faced and how the Council can further support greater ease of movement for all along the city's streets. Steps to establish an Accessible Streets Commission and Charter with this group are now in progress.

I am grateful for your constructive contribution to this event.

A Boards and Street Furniture

In 2018 a citywide ban on 'A' boards and other temporary advertising was introduced – the ban is enforced by Council enforcement officers and compliance continues to be very high. In terms of street furniture, the Edinburgh Street Guidance sets out what is expected, and the permit and planning process ensures that any street furniture (including applications for outdoor tables and seating at cafes, restaurants and licensed premises) will not have adverse impacts on pedestrians by ensuring sufficient pavement widths are clear of structures. This guidance continues to evolve – for example at the April Transport and Environment Committee we agreed that EV feeder cabinets should no longer be placed on footpaths.

Bin Scheduling

In respect of bin scheduling, for kerbside bins the Council seeks to achieve same day collection wherever possible which limits the number of collection days that bins are presented. It is not always possible to adhere to this, but it is recognised good practice. The communal bin project is addressing all communal bin locations, some of which are located on pavements, with a view to moving bin hubs into dedicated bays in the carriageway.

Dropped Crossings

The Capital Investment Programme approved by Transport and Environment Committee on 20 April 2023 includes £80,000 dedicated to the installation of dropped crossings. In addition, all major capital works will include dropped crossings in scheme design.

The Council does not hold a record of all dropped crossings introduced but this is known for some areas of activity including:

- As part of phase 1 of the Active Travel Action Plan's dropped kerb programme, 51 dropped kerbs have been installed. Pending funding from Sustrans, there are plans to install around 150 as part of phase 2 which will cover "Stream 1" streets in Edinburgh; and
- Four dropped kerbs were introduced as part of general maintenance in 2021/22. 25 were installed in 2022/23. I accept, however, that more progress is needed in this area.

Blue Badge Bays

The Council doesn't hold a record of how many Blue Badge bays have been removed. However, details of the total number of bays across the city is held. This shows that in August 2019, there were 270 bays and in August 2022, there were 325.

Meetings with Disabled People's Organisations

I have not kept a count of these meetings, but a priority for myself and Cllr Day has been to rebuild and strengthen the Council's relationships with these organisations. For example, I ensured the Edinburgh Access Panel received an invite to a recent George Street workshop, and I was pleased to meet them again on Leith Walk on the 28th of April along with a RNIB Scotland activist. Although Edinburgh is progressing in this area, a focus for me is ensuring we work towards minimum criteria set out in the Sustrans "Disabled Citizens' Inquiry" report.

Social Model of Disability

All future streetscape schemes will be designed and progressed considering the Social Model of Disability. All streetspace schemes involve early and ongoing engagement with a range of user groups, including Edinburgh Access Panel, and are subject to detail integrated impact assessments. Design of all schemes ensures that they are fully inclusive for all users and key to achieving that is working with different user groups, including the new Accessible Streets Commission once established.

Item no 10.19

QUESTION NO 19

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

A71 Dalmahoy Junction

The installation of a fully signalised junction at Dalmahoy was agreed at the December TEC Committee. The Ratho Community Council and local residents are concerned that no works have started.

Question (1) Please could you explain what is holding up the works?

Answer (1) While Committee on 8 December 2022 approved the motion from yourself and Cllr Jenkinson to proceed with the delivery of a traffic signal controlled junction, the decision on approving the proposed funding package was deferred for alternative proposals to be brought forward (due to a shortfall of £1.1m being identified).

Since Committee, work has proceeded to develop the detailed design for the traffic signal controlled junction and a contract will shortly be awarded for advanced works to implement the planned localised reduction in the speed limit to 30mph.

Discussions are ongoing over possible options for alternative funding packages.

In addition, three areas of land need to be acquired to permit the construction of the junction and a right of servitude is also required (through land outwith the Council's ownership for the piped drainage outfall that is required for a traffic signal controlled junction). None of these legal agreements have yet been concluded.

Question (2) If there are blockers to works starting, what are they?

Answer (2) Prior to issuing tenders to construct the junction, the Committee would have to approve a funding package to meet the shortfall in the project budget and all of the necessary land acquisitions/servitudes would have to be successfully concluded.

Question (3) How and when will these blockers be resolved?

Answer (3) A further report on funding options will be brought to the Committee for consideration in June 2023.

Officers are working on concluding the necessary land acquisitions/servitudes as quickly as possible.

Question (4) When do you expect the actual works to start?

Answer (4) It is not currently possible to provide a date for the conclusion of the land acquisitions/servitudes, and therefore for the start of construction work, with any degree of certainty.

Question (5) How long do you expect the works to take to complete?

Answer (5) A detailed construction programme will not be available until after a contract has been awarded. However, from previous experience of similar projects elsewhere, a construction duration of between six and nine months is considered to be likely.

Item no 10.20

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Ratho Bus Service

Question (1) When do you expect the residents of Ratho and surrounding area to have a direct bus service to the centre of Edinburgh that is reliable and frequent?

Answer (1) A direct and frequent bus service from Ratho to the city centre is not affordable within the current supported bus services budget and therefore provision of such a service would require significant cuts to be made from other supported routes in the city.

In the short to medium term, bus operators have indicated that they would be unable to divert one of their existing commercial city centre routes to include Ratho due to the perceived negative impact this would have on the journey times (for passengers who currently use these routes) and because they do not believe that increased patronage would justify such a move.

In the longer term, it is anticipated that there may be amendments or enhancements to the commercial network as a result of planned West Edinburgh developments, but it is too early to say whether this will result in significant changes to bus provision in Ratho.

Question (2) If such a direct bus service to the city centre is not proposed, then when do you expect to have a reliable frequent shuttle bus service for Ratho that picks up transport hubs at Ingliston P&R/Gyle and Hermiston Gait?

Answer

- (2)** The Service 20 (which is fully subsidised by the Council) connects Ratho to Ingliston P&R/Gyle and Hermiston Gait and is currently contracted to McGill's.

The Council is aware of the impact that lack of reliability has on the local community and is working with the McGill's to try to ensure that there are improvements to reliability of the current service.

While reliability can be due to a number of factors, in this case it has mainly been mechanical issues and 'on the day' staff issues.

To address this, McGill's have indicated that they will soon receive newer vehicles for their operation, and this will help alleviate the mechanical issues. In addition, in respect of staffing, they are hopeful that they will soon rely less on agency workers and, in order to help staff retention, wages have risen significantly in the last year. The company are also making changes to their commercial service network in May 2023 which should free up additional drivers to further improve reliability and speed up the return to their original contracted frequencies.

All existing supported bus services are currently being reviewed, including some route amendments and services are currently proposed to be re-tendered later this year

Item no 10.21

QUESTION NO 21

By Councillor Doggart for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Cost of Replacing Swift IT System

In light of the admission at the previous Policy & Sustainability Committee that, as part of the 2019 Budget preparation, officers did not bring a proposal to members for the replacement of the Swift IT system, could the Convener confirm:

Question (1) What was the estimated replacement cost for the system in 2019?

Answer (1) The Business Case as presented in 2019 contained proposed implementation costs of between £4.5M and £5.7M. With recurring annual charging of between £270K and £730K for each of the subsequent 5 years.

Further work with our Digital Partners including all costed implementation works returned costs of between £6.5M and £7.5M.

Question (2) Given the flaws discovered in the Swift system, why was the proposal for a replacement not brought to members in subsequent Budget proposals?

Answer (2) Due to the prioritisation of the Council's Capital Budget the decision was reached that there were no available funds within the budget on each occasion that the replacement of this system was raised.

Question (3) What are the overpayments for the last five financial years as discussed in report 7.3 to the emergency F&R meeting on 30 March 2023?

Answer

- (3)** Officers are working on pulling together requested information, however owing to the complexities in extracting information from Swift, this is not yet available.

Due to the limitations and inflexibility of the Swift system, it is necessary to pay carers in advance which may result in overpayments when a placement ends. When this occurs, our default is to reclaim overpayments, however there may be some circumstances where this is not possible.

Item no 10.22

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor Doggart for answer by the Convener of the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Swift IT System - Council is asked to continue this question in its entirety to its June meeting.

- Question** (1) When did officers become aware that social work information was held outside the Swift system?
- Answer** (1)
- Question** (2) When did officers become aware that storing social work information outside the Swift IT system was not compliant with GDPR?
- Answer** (2)
- Question** (3) On discovering Swift was not GDPR compliant, what actions did officers take to mitigate the data security risks?
- Answer** (3)
- Question** (4) On discovering Swift was not GDPR compliant, what actions did officers take to mitigate the data security risks?
- Answer** (4)
- Question** (5) Does the current Swift usage remain non-compliant with GDPR and do the data security risks remain live?
- Answer** (5)
- Question** (6) Did individuals referenced in the Tanner report have unrestricted access to sensitive personal data held outside Swift?
- Answer** (6)

Item no 10.23

QUESTION NO 23

**By Councillor Mitchell for answer by
the Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 4 May 2023**

Care Homes Procurement

Please could the Chair confirm:

Question (1) How many formal procurement exercises were conducted in relation to the North Merchiston and Castlegreen care homes?

Answer (1) Following the original commissioning of the care services in the two care homes in 2007 and 2008, a Prior Interest Notice (PIN) was published in 2019, and 2022.

Question (2) If any “informal” procurement exercises were conducted?

Answer (2) No.

Question (3) How much was spent in total in relation to procurement exercises associated with the two care homes?

Answer (3) There are no additional costs associated with procurement as any procurement exercises were undertaken as part of an officers normal duties.

QUESTION NO 24

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

5 Winton Drive, Planning Appeal

Question (1) “Interested parties” who made comments on the original planning application did not receive notification by the Council of the above appeal being submitted:

- a. How many were notified and on what date?
- b. How many were not notified?
- c. What was the reason for the ‘non-notification’?

Answer (1) a. 298 were notified on 16 March 2023.

b. There were no people who made representations not notified, however a person who made a representation contacted the Planning service stating that they had not been notified.

c. Initially it had been thought that it was an administrative error that had resulted in the person not being notified. However, on further checks it was found it was the case that the email address that had been supplied to Planning records was different to the email address that the person currently used.

Question (2) Following representations to the Council by interested parties regarding the absence of notification that a planning appeal had been lodged:

- d. What steps were then taken by the Council to notify those who the Council had initially failed to contact?
- e. On what date was the delayed notification to interested parties issued by the Council?

Answer

- (2) d. Interested parties were renotified. The Planning and Environmental Appeals Division of the Scottish Government (known as the DPEA) was notified of this.
- e. This was done on 7 April 2023.

QUESTION NO 25

**By Councillor Whyte for answer by
the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023**

Smart Bins

The Leader recently issued a press release about his visit to Taiwan to promote Edinburgh as a 'Smart City'. It is important for the City's reputation that when we tell the world we are doing something it is actually happening. In the press release [How hi-tech is helping us plan the city's future – The City of Edinburgh Council](#) He said:

“For instance, we’ve been busy installing Scotland’s first cloud-connected smart sensors in on-street bins so that we can better coordinate collections.

*In recent months we’ve placed over 4000 sensors within street litter and communal waste bins across the city, putting us **on target** to hit an impressive 11,000 sensors as part of our citywide trial. They will proactively monitor and manage fluctuations in how full bins can get – think a hot summer’s day in the Meadows versus a rainy Monday in March.”*

As the Leader knows the initiative to install 11,000 sensors in bins across the City commenced in July 2022 and is planned to be completed by **June 2023**. I welcome the progress with installations of sensors which has increased from 2,800 in February (as reported by the Convenor of TEC in answer to my Council question on 9 February 2023) to the Leader's report of 4,000 by 5 April 2023. However more than half (7,000 or 63%) of the sensor installations still need to be undertaken in the next eight weeks for this project to complete 'on target' and this compares with actual delivery of only 1,200 being installed in the eight weeks between my question and the press release.

Question

- (1) Could the Leader provide us and the public with assurance that this project is indeed 'on track' to complete all 11,000 installations **by** June 2023 by providing the following:
- a. Confirmation of the total number of sensors installed at 4 April 2023
 - b. The number of sensors that have now been installed as at early May.
 - c. The number of installations of sensors that are scheduled to be completed in each week between 4 April 2023 and 30 June 2023.

Answer

- (1) The project to deploy smart sensors into on street litter and communal bins is on track to hit the target of 11,000 bins by 30th June 2023.
- a) As of close of play on 4 April 2023 the project team deployed 5,669 sensors. This meant the Council hit its ERDF funding target of 5,500 by 31 March 2023.
 - b) As of close of play on 1 May 2023 the project team deployed 7013 sensors. Deployment to on-street litter bins is complete and we are continuing to deploy to the new bins made available through the communal bin review.
 - c) At the current rate of 90 sensors per day the Council will meet the target of 11,000 by the end of June.

Question

- (2) Given that this project is part of a £6.4m of taxpayers' money (£2.5m coming from the European Regional Development Fund) can he please outline
- d. the project's full cost within that £6.4m funding
 - e. the success criteria for the project
 - f. What he expects to be delivered from the scheme given that previous attempts to use smart bin sensors in the City have produced no measurable impact and are no non-operational and the only justification the Convener of TEC could give for the spend in his answer on 9 February was that it "could contribute to street cleanliness".

Answer

(2)

- d) The full cost of the project is £3.624m, with £1.064m anticipated to be made available through the ERDF grant.
- e) Success criteria for this project includes the following:
- Improve health and well-being of tenants living in the social housing provided by the City of Edinburgh Council
 - Predict and monitor potential damp damage to the property and environmental risks to the tenants' health to ensure better housing quality
 - Proactively monitor and manage housing quality such as damp across the city to ensure sustainable resource management and good health conditions
 - Proactively monitor and manage fluctuations waste across the city to protect the environment, maintain attractiveness to tourists and ensure good quality of the public spaces
 - Ensuring that the right bin capacity, is in the right locations, collected on the right frequency.
 - Lay the foundation for Smart Mobility, Smart Environment, Smart Living and Smart Governance solutions
 - Build analytics and data-driven capabilities across service delivery teams
- f) The Smart Cities Operations Centre Phase 1 project is expected to deliver an extendable and adaptable platform, allowing a network of bin and property environment sensors to drive better insight for the City of Edinburgh Council and enabling us to take more proactive action in delivering services to our citizens.

Sensors placed in litter and residential communal bins around Edinburgh will enable service teams to see accurate usage of bins, predict when they will overflow and take a proactive action to mitigate that. The property environment sensors installed in social houses will enable the service team to predict, manage and prevent extensive damage to the properties caused by issues including but not limited to damp conditions and related mould growth. Utilising this technology will not only reduce the council's costs of maintaining social housing properties but will also improve the health of our citizens due to improvements in the quality of living conditions.

The current smart waste sensor rollout was developed using lessons learned around sensor design and installation best practice derived from the initial c.400 sensor trial previously undertaken by Place Operational Services. This trial provided Operational Services with initial data sets around bin fill levels and the opportunity to complete initial upskilling of service teams around how to invoke action off the back of sensor data received.

Item no 10.26

QUESTION NO 26

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

In relation to the Gaelic Medium Education Secondary School Site Review recently circulated to councillors, please can the Convener confirm:

Question (1) What consultation took place with the GME community on the terms of reference to this review before it was tendered?

Answer (1) The purpose for the study – to assess if there was a site available that would meet the national SNP manifesto commitment to deliver a stand-alone GME secondary school in the city centre - was discussed at the Gaelic Implementation Group.

Question (2) Why were the size criteria set as a minimum of 2 hectares?

Answer (2) This was chosen as it was less than the legislative minimum site size for a 600 capacity school (which is 2.02 hectares without playing fields). A new GME secondary school would ideally be constructed for a 600 roll as a minimum and the clear view from previous consultations is that the city centre school must be stand-alone, including sports facilities, to ensure full immersion.

Question (3) Why the location criteria were set using distance from the foot of the mound, as opposed to some other criteria such as accessibility by public transport?

Answer (3) The requirement for a city centre location was based on the national SNP manifesto commitment. The Council asked for a 3 mile radius from the city centre as that is the distance for the secondary walk to school policy. The consultants chose the location as being the foot of the mound.

Question (4) Was any consideration given to smaller sites in close proximity to existing or planned CEC schools, with the ability to share sports facilities?

- Answer** (4) The focus of this exercise was to see if any sites were available to deliver the national SNP manifesto commitment for a dedicated city centre stand-alone school.
- Question** (5) What assumptions were made about the likely future school roll?
- Answer** (5) If a site and budget were available, then the construction of a new school would ideally be for a minimum of 600 pupils with an expansion plan to accommodate any future growth in pupil numbers. However, the resulting school building could be used for a smaller roll if required.
- Question** (6) How many new GME primary schools would be needed to achieve the likely secondary school roll in question 5)?
- Answer** (6) Approximately 4 streams of primary school children (28 classes) would be required to sustain a 600 secondary school roll. In theory, that could be achieved by one large 4 stream primary school or a variety of other combinations involving two, three or four primary schools. However, there are currently no approved plans or budgets allocated to develop proposals for additional GME primary schools in Edinburgh.

Item no 10.27

QUESTION NO 27

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023

Question (1) Please will the Convener list the size (in acres/hectares) of each of the City of Edinburgh Council's secondary schools and in each case list whether the size complies with school premises regulations?

Answer (1) The table below includes data based on a desk top exercise. Further on site assessment would be recommended to obtain definitive site sizes.

For those schools that do not comply with the legislation, they either have a dedicated all weather sports pitch or use off site sports facilities (or both). The legislation was introduced in 1967 when all weather sports pitches were not available therefore this provision is not taken into consideration in the legislation.

High School	Capacity	Total Site (HA)	School Premises Regulations 1967
Balerno Community HS	850	5.92	Complies
Boroughmuir HS	1,560	1.67	Does Not Comply
Broughton HS	1,200	6.83	Complies
Castlebrae Community HS	700	3.91	Does Not Comply
Craigmount HS	1,400	6.07	Does Not Comply
Craigroyston Community HS	600	3.89	Does Not Comply
Currie Community HS	900	8.81	Complies
Drummond Community HS	600	1.93	Does Not Comply
Firrhill HS	1,150	4.89	Does Not Comply
Forrester HS	900	9.7	Complies
Gracemount HS	650	5.59	Complies
Holy Rood RC HS	1,200	19.49	Complies
James Gillespie's HS	1,950	4.21	Does Not Comply
Leith Academy	950	7.34	Complies
Liberton HS	1,000	7.93	Complies
Portobello HS	1,400	7.7	Complies
Queensferry Community HS	1,200	6.42	Complies
St Augustine's RC HS	900	9.7	Complies
St Thomas of Aquin's RC HS	750	0.69	Does Not Comply
The Royal HS	1,350	9.22	Complies
Trinity Academy	950	5.09	Does Not Comply
Tynecastle HS	900	2.26	Does Not Comply
Wester Hailes HS	750	5.73	Complies

Item no 10.28

QUESTION NO 28

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 4 May 2023**

Question (1) Further to his answer to my question on 16 March 2023, please can the Council Leader outline whether he considered there to be a risk of inquorate meetings of the Licensing Board if he reduced the size of the Board from 10 members to 9?

Answer (1) Once again, I'm sure the persistent questions regarding the new composition of the Licensing Board are not personally targeted.

I have no concerns about the risk of inquorate Licensing Board meetings. All members are highly trained and aware of their responsibilities, I'm sure they will do their utmost to attend meetings and ensure the Licensing Objectives continue to be upheld.