

Item no 5.1

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question (1) What were the key messages received by the Convener and Council Officers at the public meeting held on 28 August?

Answer (1) Concerns that the changes being proposed were unfair and undemocratic, in particular that the East Craigs Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) is being treated differently to the Leith LTN.

Concerns that the LTN is not being implemented to respond to COVID-19 and therefore the use of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) is not justified.

That it may cause further congestion and air pollution, particularly on Craigs Road and Drum Brae South.

The developments to the West of Maybury Road are undesirable to the local people, due to impacts on views and increased vehicles.

Concerns that turning right from Craigs Road to Drum Brae South will be difficult and unsafe.

Concerns that turning right from North Gyle and Craigs Gardens on to the A8 will be difficult and unsafe.

That by closing the west end of Craigs Road it will lead to more people turning in the street at school drop off time, which may decrease safety on the street.

That the changes will disproportionately impact elderly and car dependant people.

Question (2) What practical suggestions put forward at the East Craigs Public Meeting on 28 August are being taken forward in the technical design and workings?

Answer

(2) All practical suggestions made at the meeting have been assessed and, as stated in recent email correspondence with many residents, modified designs are being considered. These include addressing:

- Difficulty of turning right across Drum Brae South from Craigs Road;
- Difficulty of turning right across Glasgow Road from North Gyle Road, North Gyle Grove and Craigs Gardens;
- Enforcement of restrictions in areas where double-yellow lines are in place e.g. for Craigs Road school drop-off;
- Journeys for car dependent people;
- Congestion; and
- Impact on car dependent people when accessing the Gyle Shopping Centre..

Item no 5.2

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener or Vice-Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

On what basis is East Craigs being progressed as a Low Traffic Neighbourhood in preference to other areas of the City?

Answer

The proposal for a Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in East Craigs included designs developed as part of the West Edinburgh Link (WEL) project. Although a permanent scheme has not been brought forward through WEL, the information gathered provides a strong basis for the temporary scheme proposed for East Craigs.

The other potential LTNs in the city are not as far advanced and therefore further work is required prior to bringing any other schemes forward.

Item no 5.3

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

Where Objections to the proposed Low Traffic Neighbourhood at East Craigs have been expressed by all three local ward Members, the constituency MSP, and the Community Council, as well as hundreds of residents in writing or through attendance at public meetings, in what way can the decision to progress the scheme be perceived as democratic or publicly supported?

Answer

Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTN) are included in the list of temporary Spaces for People actions which no party proposed removing when Committee agreed in May 14th, 2020. The process for implementation was agreed by 4/5 parties at that committee.

The retention of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods as part of the Spaces for People programme was reaffirmed again at Committee on August 20th, 2020.

Through the process stakeholders and residents have raised concerns which are being assessed and worked through by officers. The report for October 1st, 2020 Transport and Environment Committee will cover larger schemes and this will include revised details of the East Craigs scheme for consideration.

Item no 5.4

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

What Public Meetings on a Council decision has the Convener attended since her election, that were attended by more than the 500 to 600 residents that turned up to East Craigs meeting held at Gyle Park on Friday 28 August?

Answer

I have attended a number of public meetings since my election. However, I do not hold records of the attendance at such meetings.

Whilst I support and fully encourage participation in local democracy, I am deeply concerned that the event in Gyle Park on 28 August 2020 breached legislation and public health guidance introduced to ensure public safety during the current Covid 19 pandemic.

The restrictions in relation to gatherings and open space live events were amended from 24 August to enable gatherings to take place under strict controls, ensuring spectator and public safety, which the event organiser is expected to adhere to.

These measures and controls include restricting numbers, enabling physical distancing and providing enhanced hygiene measures.

Police Scotland have advised that very few control measures were observed as being in place and no efforts appeared to have been made to limit the crowd numbers by the organiser. Indeed, it was quite the opposite with leaflet drops and promotion on social media conducted prior to the event to encourage persons to attend. Under normal circumstances of course high attendance would be welcome as part of local conversation. However these are extraordinary circumstances and greater care should have been taken by the event organiser.

It concerned me that Police Scotland were unnecessarily put in a position of having to consider using powers to either impose prohibitions, requirements or restrictions on the organiser holding the event or, if necessary, to direct the event to stop.

Item no 5.5

QUESTION NO 1

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Leader of the Council at a meeting of
the Council on 17 September 2020**

Question

Further to the Council Leader's answer to Item 5.3 question 2 at the 25 August 2020 meeting of the Council, when will he publish the letter to Lothian Buses?

Answer

Attached is the letter sent and answer received from the Chair of Lothian Buses, as per appendices 1 & 2.

JMcF/AM

14 September 2020

Council Leader Adam McVey
The City of Edinburgh Council
City Chambers
High Street
Edinburgh
EH11YJ

Dear Adam

Transport Arm's Length External Organisations: Interim Managing Director

Thank you for your letter of 19th August. Your comments regarding the company's response to Covid 19 is very much appreciated. Our senior team's handling of the situation has been exemplary. As the lock-down commenced services were immediately scaled back while maintaining key NHS routes. Longstone and Marine garages were temporarily closed with the tours and coach businesses mothballed. These actions and other cost cutting measures including accessing the UK Governments job retention scheme with the support of our trade union colleagues helped protect our cash reserves which was the most significant initial risk. Services are now being progressively ramped up with the benefit of the Scottish Government's bus operator cost support scheme but patronage is at best only 40% of pre-Covid 19 levels. Consequently, our outlook will remain challenging until guidance and public confidence considers public transport to be entirely safe.

As indicated previously your sentiments in regard to the bonus provisions in our Interim Managing Director's terms and conditions are acknowledged. From my perspective it was disappointing that views expressed at the 11 June Policy and Sustainability Committee appear to have been influenced by prior misleading press reporting. These reports implied that the Interim Managing Director would be due to receive a bonus for 2020 financial year. This is incorrect and once again I am pleased to be able to explain what the actual contractual position is. This being an entitlement to be *considered* for a bonus based on personal and company performance. Being due a bonus and having the entitlement to be considered for a bonus under certain circumstances are two quite different contractual positions.

For the benefit of wider councillor colleagues, I also think it would be further helpful to clarify my own position and the track record of our current Board in relation to the terms and conditions of our senior executives. On becoming chairman in July 2016 I was very mindful of then current concerns regarding the salary levels and bonus entitlements of our senior team. Consequently, amongst a number of governance enhancements I introduced was the creation of a strong remuneration committee composed entirely of Non-Executive Directors. Under the chairmanship of Steve Cassidy and more recently Mark Yexley this committee undertook an independent bench-marking review of senior team terms and conditions with a framework for periodic re-assessment now also in place. Based on the recommendations of this initial bench-marking review new contracts for all senior team positions were introduced. For all positions other than the Managing Director an annual bonus entitlement was removed by negotiation. For the Managing Director position the provision for the consideration of a performance based bonus remains since the prevalence of such incentive based schemes for comparable positions was a standard feature emerging from the benchmark review.

However it should also be noted that since 2016 when the current Managing Director contract was put in place the MD performance bonus has never been awarded at the full entitlement level despite record levels of passenger numbers and related revenues being achieved. For 2019 no element of MD bonus was awarded.

From the above explanation I trust that you and councillor colleagues can be convinced regarding the rigour that is applied to the consideration of Lothian senior team salaries including the matter of our MD's bonus and the factors relating to its consideration. Be further assured that our remuneration committee is acutely aware of the concerns which you and other councillor colleagues have expressed. I am confident that these views will be given due consideration in related future decision making which will also be guided by wider companies act obligations that requires judgement to be exercised in the best interest of the business.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jim McFarlane', written in a cursive style.

**Jim
McFarlane
Chairman**

Jim McFarlane
Chairman of Lothian Bus Board
Annandale Street
Edinburgh
EH7 4AZ

Date 19 August 2020

Dear Jim

**TRANSPORT ARM'S LENGTH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS: INTERIM
MANAGING DIRECTOR**

I'd like to start by paying tribute to the hard work of Lothian Buses, staff, management and board. I fully appreciate that Lothian Buses are operating during exceptionally challenging circumstances due to the ongoing prevalence of COVID 19. Both our organisations are working under enormous pressures, especially in terms of revenue attainment.

As you know, the issue of the bonus of the interim Managing Director was discussed at the Council's Policy and Sustainability Committee on 11th June 2020, where it was understood that as this is an interim appointment, the salary package would be reviewed when a permanent appointment is made.

At committee, Members including myself, acknowledged the difficulty in untangling the remuneration terms of this appointment. However, I wanted to write to follow up on Council representations at the time to encourage the bonus aspect of the terms and conditions of this role to be reconsidered. We're aware that bonus have been stripped out of almost all roles in the company for staff and management. You will also be well aware that many of our residents are facing an uncertain financial future. Taking account of both of these, we don't feel awarding a bonus to the Interim Managing Director, appointed in early March 2020, is an appropriate measure to take at this stage.

I acknowledge that the appointment of the interim Managing Director was made pre-COVID 19, but considering the current situation, I am writing to you as Chairman of the Lothian Buses board to encourage you not to award a bonus when this is to be considered at Lothian Buses Remunerations Committee in February 2021 for the reasons above. I would also ask that the Board take a decision to remove bonuses from future contracts.

Should you have any further enquiries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Council Leader Adam McVey

Item no 5.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

Further to the Convener's answer to Item 5.4 question 3 at the 25 August 2020 meeting of the Council, when will this additional information be circulated to elected members?

Answer

In respect of the number of notices issued because of overgrown trees, shrubs or hedges obstructing the public footway during the period 01/03/2020 – 17/08/2020:

- 148 advisory letters have been issued; and
- Two (2) statutory notices have been issued.

Item no 5.7

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

At the Policy & Sustainability Committee meeting of 14 May 2020, it was resolved that authority would be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader and Depute Leader of the Council, to implement temporary spaces for people schemes following the agreed five-day consultation period.

Question (1) Can the leader confirm he has been consulted in relation to the implementation of each 'spaces for people' scheme?

Answer (1) Yes. The Chief Executive, Depute Leader and I meet regularly to sign off decisions which have been agreed by CIMT as part of the delegated authority process, not only those relating to Spaces for People. A copy of the local feedback is also emailed for that discussion. We also discussed and agreed the Spaces for People interventions introduced to provide safe spaces for people to walk and cycle prior to the Creating Safe Spaces for Walking and Cycling report being approved by Policy and Sustainability Committee on 14 May 2020.

Question (2) Can he confirm the dates on which he was consulted in relation to the implementation of each individual 'spaces for people' scheme?

Answer (2) Schemes agreed by CIMT are discussed at the following meeting with the Chief Executive and Depute Leader. I'm happy to provide Cllr Lang with a specific date if he has a question in relation to a specific scheme.

Question (3) What comments did the leader provide in relation to each scheme when he was consulted?

Answer (3) I agreed with the outcome of the engagement processes in relation to the schemes taken forward for implementation to help people walk, cycle and wheel around Edinburgh.

Item no 5.8

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question (1) What is her position with respect to making the online booking system for using recycling centres a permanent arrangement?

Answer (1) The booking system was introduced to manage demand and manage the number of people on the sites to ensure health and safety during the Covid-19 pandemic. The system has worked well in doing this and the service would wish to retain the system.

Question (2) Would any decision to make the booking system permanent require the approval of the Transport and Environment Committee?

Answer (2) The booking system was introduced following approval of the Council's Incident Management Team, with the costs associated with Covid-19. This was done by waiver to the Council's Contract Standing Orders.

To introduce a system on a permanent basis would require a funding source to be identified and then for a full procurement exercise to be undertaken. This would then require to be reported to Finance and Resources Committee for approval, rather than Transport and Environment Committee.

Item no 5.9

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 17 September 2020**

The Council's main switchboard telephone number 0131 200 2000 has been restricted for emergency use throughout the pandemic. Various telephone numbers are being advertised on the Council's website under the heading 'Contact telephone numbers' but the lines are currently either operating for emergencies only or are closed because of reduced staff levels.

Question (1) When does the Council aim to re-open telephone lines for routine and general queries?

Answer (1) The Contact Centre plans to support the fuller range of routine telephone lines and general enquiry lines from October 2020.

Whilst contact telephone numbers have been focused predominately on critical and emergency provision, some key service lines have remained operational (social care, repairs, welfare and Council Tax) and a general enquires option has remained available.

Question (2) Are there indicative dates for re-opening the lines referred to above and, if so, what are they?

Answer (2) The remaining routine lines are planned to be available from October 2020.

Question (3) What plans does the Council have to publicise telephone access to non-emergency services, e.g. parking permits, for residents who either have difficulty using computers and smart phones or who don't have one?

Answer (3) The Council will ensure that social media messaging and the Council's website publicise the resumption of the fuller range of routine lines, including parking permit processing. This information will also be cascaded to the 5 Council Resilience Centres for awareness and response to enquiries

and an elected member briefing note will be issued. Additionally, the Council's initial message to callers to 0131 200 2000 will be updated and options will continue to include a general enquires number to support residents who have difficulty using or accessing online services.

Item no 5.10

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Cyclehoop on-street secure bike parking

- Question** (1) How many bikes can be stored securely on street with the current deployment of containers?
- Answer** (1) The roll out of on-street secure cycle parking currently approved by the Transport & Environment Committee consists of 180 hangars, in approximately 90 streets. Each hangar contains space for 6 cycles, giving a total of 1,080 spaces.
- Question** (2) Will this be increased before the end of this year, if so by how many?
- Answer** (2) The roll out is being delivered in two tranches. Installation of the first tranche is currently underway and is expected to be complete before the end of 2020. This will deliver 109 hangars (654 spaces).
- Question** (3) How many more spaces will be provided by the end of next year?
- Answer** (3) The second tranche of 71 hangars (426 spaces) is expected to be delivered in the first half of 2021. This will complete the currently approved roll out.
- Question** (4) How much unmet demand (measured by enquiries from residents minus spaces implemented) is there currently, expected at the end of this year, and expected at the end of next year?
- Answer** (4) Requests have been received for hangars to be provided at 215 locations where there are no planned installations as part of the currently approved roll out.
- Question** (5) Please give details of the process to respond to requests for new locations

Answer

- (5) A page has been created on the Council's website called Bicycle Security and Storage. This can be viewed at: www.edinburgh.gov.uk/cycling-walking/bicycle-security-storage/1

This provides a contact email address to use for requesting a new location. All requests are acknowledged and a desk-based assessment is undertaken to determine whether the location meets the criteria set out by Committee. These assessments are undertaken regularly, as requests are received.

The applicant is then contacted to inform them of the outcome of this assessment and, if the location does not meet the criteria, to explain why this is the case.

If the location does meet the criteria, it is added to the database to be considered for potential future roll-outs.

Locations are prioritised based on:

- Population density;
- Number of requests received;
- Decile within the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation; and
- Practicality of installation (e.g. on-street parking supply and demand).

Question

- (6) Please give details of the process to respond to greater demand than current supply, evidenced for example by fully subscribed bikehangars and waiting lists

Answer

- (6) Consideration is currently being given to options to extend the scope of the current roll out and it is intended to report to the first meeting of the Transport & Environment Committee in 2021 on this issue.

Item no 5.11

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question (1) Which neighbourhoods within the authority have been consulted regarding LTN options in their local area, broken down by year, and how many households/residents are there within each of these neighbourhoods?

Answer (1) No formal consultations have been undertaken by the Authority regarding projects specifically termed as Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs).

A notification exercise was undertaken in July 2020 as part of the Spaces for People Programme in East Craigs. This was sent by email to a defined stakeholder email distribution list including the local Community Councils.

The North West Locality team recently undertook a local consultation exercise in partnership with the Community Council regarding a filtered permeability proposal in Featherhall, Corstorphine. Approximately 200 households / businesses were involved in this consultation which was undertaken by letter and via web platforms.

Question (2) What type/method of consultation has been undertaken with each neighbourhood and what were the results from each neighbourhood?

Answer (2) As noted above, no formal consultation has yet been undertaken on an LTN in the city, as the agreed processes would indicate at this point.

Item no 5.12

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Gloyer for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

Public consultation on the second phase of the proposals from the Strategic Parking Review was originally expected to take place in the first quarter of 2020. It was delayed in order to take account of feedback from the consultations in Gorgie and Leith, and was then expected to commence in April which, for obvious reasons, was not possible. Will the Convener confirm the new timescale for consultation, design and subsequent implementation of appropriate parking controls for Roseburn, Saughtonhall and Corstorphine?

Answer

Work on the Strategic Review of Parking has continued through lockdown. Officers have been working with the Council's appointed Consultant, investigating potential methods of safely and effectively carrying out the planned consultations whilst maximising the potential for engagement. Further work has also been carried out on the consultation results from Phase 1, as planned. A business bulletin outlining current progress and the new consultation timetable for Phases 2 and 3 of the review will be submitted to November's Transport and Environment Committee. A full report on the Strategic Review will be submitted to the Transport and Environment Committee in January 2021. That report will detail the impact that Covid-19 has had on proposed timescales, as well as details of upcoming consultations.

Item no 5.13

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question (1) Who is the data controller for 'Commonplace' data?

Answer (1) Commonplace is the data controller for the platform operation.

Sustrans is the data controller for the demographic information collected (which is not available to the public).

The Council is the data controller in relation to personal data it collects regardless of whether this is collected directly by the Council or on its behalf as a third party.

Question (2) On how many other occasions in the last two years has the Council invited residents to share their data via the City of Edinburgh Council website, when their data was to be controlled by a third party?

Answer (2) This information is not available.

Question (3) What warnings were included on the Council website, or provided to residents, that their data would not be controlled by the Council, before they entered it using the 'Commonplace' online tool?

Answer (3) This prompt is automatically generated prior to comments being saved - 'Your comment will be public. Please don't mention any personal details or names. By commenting you agree to our [terms of use](#). Read our [privacy policy](#).' In addition, individuals also had to 'verify' their comment by clicking on a link in their email, otherwise it would not be made public.

Question (4) What agreements, if any, were formalised between the Council and the controller of 'Commonplace' data, prior to the Council inviting residents to use the 'Commonplace' tool?

Answer (4) A Scope of Services was agreed at the outset of the Council's partnership with Sustrans in order to manage and extract data from the Commonplace tool. Commonplace is compliant in line General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) requirements.

Question (5) How can any such data agreements be made available for scrutiny by councillors?

Answer (5) The GDPR requirements for the Commonplace tool were agreed and set out on the Commonplace website as per part 3 of this question.

The Council has procedures in place around data sharing processes and agreements which can be made available to Councillors on request.

Question (6) Has the Council any knowledge of data provided via the City of Edinburgh Council website to 'Commonplace' being shared with any other organisations?

Answer (6) Sustrans are the only other organisation in receipt of this data. Comments made via Commonplace are publicly available. The Commonplace tool and outputs from it comply with GDPR requirements.

This data is only made public if the respondent agreed and verified their email by clicking on the link that they receive.

You can read more about Commonplace and how it collects and uses information in their [privacy policy](#).

Item no 5.14

QUESTION NO 14

By Councillor Smith for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

- Question** (1) Since the launch of this scheme, how many individual bike stations have been destroyed or damaged beyond use?
- Answer** (1) At full capacity there are 1,471 physical docking hoops. 635 docking hoops have been damaged or destroyed since launch. Of these, 230 have been replaced since 2 September 2019 and 405 remain out of use.
- Question** (2) What has been the cost of repairing or replacing individual bike stations?
- Answer** (2) An individual hoop is made of 2 parts – a ‘flex pin’ (cost c£22) and the aluminium hoop (cost c£200). Labour costs vary dependant on scale and location.
- Question** (3) Who bears the costs of such repairs?
- Answer** (3) Transport for Edinburgh (TfE) is responsible for the cost of repairs to its assets (c80 stations); and Serco are responsible for the cost of repairing their assets (c20 stations). At present labour costs for the TfE assets are absorbed as part of day to day operations within the terms of the current contract.
- Question** (4) Has any comparison of the rate of damage in the Edinburgh been made with other UK schemes? If so, what was the outcome?
- Answer** (4) There are no direct comparators with other UK schemes. However, there are multiple schemes in Norway that use the same technology as the Edinburgh scheme. These see an extremely low number of hoops broken each year (<10).
- Question** (5) Can any communication with the Police or prosecuting authorities regarding the apparent wanton destruction of these public asset be shared with Council?

Answer

- (5)** It would not be appropriate to share such communications. However, TfE, the Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme (ECHS) and Police Scotland (PS) work closely on this. This has resulted in increased PS activity in support of the ECHS and a significant increase in the number of recent arrests. Prosecution is being actively sought by PS where appropriate, however PS intelligence (and anecdotal operator findings) suggest that the most prolific offenders tend to be of a younger age. PS are working with ECHS to conduct a further full security audit of all 100 cycle hire points and further network optimisation meetings will be held in Q4 2020 to improve security.

Item no 5.15

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 17
September 2020**

Question

At the Policy and Sustainability Committee meeting on 6th August 2020, it was agreed that attendance at Committee Agenda Planning Meetings (APM) should be reduced to make the best use of Officer time.

Microsoft Teams software records 50 participants 'joined the meeting' at the recent Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee APM held on Wednesday 26 August.

- a) Is this a reduced level of attendance?
- b) How can this disruption to working time of officers be further reduced?

Answer

- a) I believe this is not accurate. Microsoft Teams records everyone who is invited to the meeting, not those who actually joined. The 50 figure is the distribution list for papers to that committee. The clerk to that meeting only noted the elected members in attendance rather than all participants. Essentially as it was a one item agenda, and only two senior are known to have attended.
- b) As the answer to part a) highlights, the following agreed process is being kept to for Council when calling meetings;

“Please note that, following on from the Political Management Arrangements report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 6 August 2020, papers have been circulated to all Executive Committee Conveners for information. Officer attendance should be kept to a minimum.”

Item no 5.16

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Doggart for answer by the Vice-Chair of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

- Question** (1) Can the Vice-Chair provide a breakdown of the budget expenditure in the Edinburgh Health & Social Care Partnership, split by below and above state retirement age and by age bands for those older than state retirement age, for the period 2016 to 2020 and anticipated expenditure from 2020 to 2030?
- Answer** (1) The service is unable to provide this within the timescale as this would require a level of data gathering which would take more time than provided and a degree of modelling not currently undertaken. For example, the usual age bands utilised are over 65 and under 65 and not state retirement age which is 67. Undertaking this analysis would divert resources currently focussing on the IJB's medium term financial strategy and partnership resource focussing on wider service remobilisation during Covid.
- Question** (2) What work has been undertaken to understand the impact of the Coronavirus pandemic and particularly COVID 19 infections and on the trends shown by the answer to question 1?
- Answer** (2) As above, the response to the precise question would require modelling not currently in place (as per age bands) and a linking of data in relation to expenditure based on Covid infection that is not being done. The IJB and HSCP are undertaking a detailed log of wider Covid-related costs in relation to its Mobilisation Plan, provider sustainability payments and loss of income and this has been presented to the IJB and is on public record.
- Question** (3) Can the historic expenditure, the projected trends and the impact of any work described in (2) above be highlighted graphically for the age bands for the period 2016 to 2030?
- Answer** (3) As per answer 2.

Item no 5.17

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question (1) With the re-opening of gyms and indoor physical activity, what is the current timeline for reviewing and re-commencing use of gym halls within schools?

Answer (1) 5th October

Question (2) While PE continues to be provided outdoors, as the weather moves into Autumn, what is the current guidance given to primary and secondary schools regarding when it is appropriate to conduct outdoor PE, and when should it be brought into the classroom/cancelled?

Answer (2) We do not provide guidance on learning and teaching in terms of adaptation to the weather but encourage all learning outdoors to be done with appropriate risk assessments which would include reference to keeping warm and dry.

Question (3) What is the current guidance for the use of both school outdoor facilities and public park space, for the provision of outdoor sports training (usually run by volunteers - such as a school football team) for primary and secondary aged children (outwith school hours). If limited use, please explain why, and when this is next due to be reviewed.

Answer (3) At the current time the Council's position is that there is a pause on all extracurricular activity and the engagement of volunteers and any external providers.

The reasons are as follows:

- The need to fully understand the impact of the return to school on the virus situation (each positive case results in dozens of children being sent home to self-isolate)
- The need to reduce the mixing of 'bubbles' which is an inevitable consequence of extracurricular activity

- The need to reduce additional adult interaction with any groups of school pupils
- There is an additional cleaning resource required for many extracurricular activities which is not yet feasible across 110+ schools
- We need to apply a model of consistency across the whole school estate in relation to this decision.

We keep this situation under daily review and will update as per Scottish Government Guidance.

Item no 5.18

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

What guidance has been given to primary schools around the provision of homework - understanding that physical resources are not going to and from school. How is the digital/remote learning used during homeschooling translating into options for homework (e.g. use of Sumdog)?

Answer

Schools have been advised to avoid providing children and young people with textbooks, worksheets etc which go home and are brought back. This is to support the risk assessment schools have in place to ensure infection control. Schools are making use of a range of digital platforms: - Teams, schools websites, twitter etc to set home learning tasks which are differentiated and provide opportunities for teachers to assess pupils' learning and provide feedback, whether face-to-face or through digital means.

Extensive National digital resources are available to support schools: -

- Clickview
- Scholar
- e-sgoil
- Glow
- Digilearn.scot
- Regional Improvement Collaboratives

A task force (Edinburgh Learns Team, QICS officers, HTs and classroom practitioners) are developing a local, centralised resource to support home learning: - "Learning Grids." This approach has been used to support

contingency learning and has been widely used as a primary approach to the provision of homework for several years. This provides children and young people with contextualised learning experiences which are differentiated for individuals/groups, whilst providing challenge, personalisation and choice.

Item no 5.19

QUESTION NO 19

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

A request has been submitted for widening of the pavement at this school (one of the largest in the city) to help ensure safe distancing of P1/P2 parents and easy of pedestrian flow/independent pupil access to school. As this situation continues on a daily basis with around 100 parents, please advise on what date a decision will be taken and if approved, how long it will take to implement (mindful that is it just about repurposing a grass verge area).

Answer

Council officers are undertaking road safety and public health assessments for all of the city's schools.

Officers have made direct contact with Kirkliston Primary School to discuss the most appropriate measures to mitigate overcrowding on this pavement. A one-way system has already been marked and a Park and Stride arrangement has been promoted.

Any further measures identified considered appropriate will be discussed with the school and should be introduced around week commencing 28 September 2020.

Item no 5.20

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

Regarding the decision of Council in February 2020 that a recycling service for deployment inside schools would be developed for introduction in time for the start of this school term (but which has been on hold because of the Covid19 pandemic), can the Convenor advise when this service will be developed and be ready for introduction.

Answer

A joint report from Place Management and Property and Facilities Management will be presented to Policy and Sustainability Committee on 6 October 2020, following the Motion from Councillor Main at Full Council on 6 February 2020.

The report will provide an update on the existing recycling services across the schools' estate, and also make recommendations of the additional requirements considered to deliver further internal infrastructure and support systems at all school premises.

Item no 5.21

QUESTION NO 21

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 September 2020

Question

Of the over 4,100 comments on the Common Space Portal, how many sought closure of Braid Road to vehicles?

Answer

Although Braid Road was closed prior to the Common Place online tool going live, a breakdown of the comments submitted through the portal is attached. There were 27 comments made relating to Braid Road, with 194 agreements. In respect of the road closure, the following is a summary of the comments:

- One comment requested the permanent closure with 30 agreements;
- One comment was made about allowing people coming in and out of the Hermitage to maintain a safe distance between each other whilst walking and/or cycling with 21 agreements;
- One comment made reference to narrow footways at a section with people walking on the road if the road was opened with 19 agreements; and
- One comment requested that it become a dedicated cycle route with nine agreements.

A summary of the comments and agreements made on the Common Place portal relating to Braid Road is attached for information

Question

(2) Of the over 4,100 comments on the Common Space Portal, how many sought part-closure of Braid Road to vehicles?

Answer

(2) One comment made reference to crossing the road and the difficulties if a partial closure is implemented stating pedestrians should have priority over motor vehicles. This received 23 agreements.

Question (3) Who made the decision to close Braid Road to vehicles and are minutes available for the relevant meeting?

Answer (3) The decision to close Braid Road was approved by the Council Incident Management Team on 28 April 2020, in accordance with the arrangements put in place in response to COVID-19. These changes were discussed by the Chief Executive, Leader and Depute Leader and reported to the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 14 May 2020. The action was recorded as follows:

Action D65 - Redesign of **Road space** paper. Take to 4pm call with leader and Deputy Leader. **Approved. 28/04/2020.**

Question (4) What correspondence has there been between the Council and Lothian Buses regarding the impact of the closure of Braid Road and the interventions on Comiston Road on bus journey times?

Answer (4) Council officers have liaised closely with Lothian Buses regarding the impact of the Braid Road closure, and the interventions proposed for Comiston Road and regular updates on the impacts have been provided.

A meeting with Lothian Buses took place on Friday 11 September 2020 as part of the full appraisal of the scheme at these locations to discuss what, if any, on-going impacts will be experienced. The outcome of this discussion will feed into the final outcome of the review.

Question (5) Why is a full-reopening of Braid Road not being considered at this time?

Answer (5) A full appraisal of the Braid Road scheme, including discussions with Lothian Buses, is currently underway. Once this appraisal is complete, the findings and any changes will be shared with local Ward Councillors.