

Item no 5.1

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question

Can the Convener list the road safety projects in which the design, tendering or implementation has been delayed as a result of officer resource being diverted to Spaces for People projects?

Answer

The Council has prioritised resources towards the delivery of the Spaces for People programme, to ensure that people can walk, wheel and cycle safely during the global COVID-19 pandemic. This includes improvements to road safety to the city's 140 or so schools.

A report is being prepared for the Transport & Environment Committee on 28 January 2021 on the prioritisation and delivery of the road safety programme. This report will include further information on planned projects.

Item no 5.2

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Further to the answer provided in response to question 5.5 at the 15 October 2020 meeting of the Council:

Question (1) Has the Convener been able to obtain an installation date for the speed table?

Answer (1) The final design and delivery of this feature will now be included and budgeted in the Queensferry High Street Town Centre project. Installation will be programmed with proposed early enabling works expected to commence Spring/Summer 2021.

Question (2) Has the Convener been able to obtain an explanation for the delays to the installation timetable?

Answer (2) Following the Transport Service restructure many staff have been deployed on a temporary basis to other critical teams or the Spaces for People pandemic recovery programme. Unfortunately, this situation has created the recent delay.

Item no 5.3

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

- Question** (1) Can the Convener confirm the criteria currently being used to determine whether a repair in a Council tenant property is considered an emergency?
- Answer** (1) Emergency repairs include un-containable leaks, blocked toilets, loss of heating and or hot water, loss of electricity, smashed window or property unsecure and smoke alarm repairs. The service aims to carry out emergency repairs within 4 hours of them being reported.
- Question** (2) In light of the ongoing COVID-19 restrictions, what is the current position with respect to addressing non-emergency repairs which have been reported by Council housing tenants?
- Answer** (2) From 5 October 2020 the service has been taking appointments for non-emergency repairs.
- This includes all repairs with the exception of two person visits to avoid close contact with our operatives whilst carrying out repairs within our tenant's home. The Council's website will be updated when the service is able to offer this appointment.
- Questions** (3) How many non-emergency Council housing repairs are currently outstanding and how does this compare to pre-COVID levels?
- Answer** (3) There are a number of non-emergency repairs that are scheduled to take place in the coming days/weeks. Each of these have an agreed booked appointment slot with the tenant. Our current schedule does not exceed 4 weeks as per our recovery+ plan. This does exceed pre COVID timescales as non-emergency appointments were generally achieved within 10 days.

Item no 5.4

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Staniforth for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Residents of both Craigentenny and Duddingston ward and Portobello and Craigmillar ward have raised the issue of vehicles parking in front of the shared cycle/walking route at the Seafield end of Portobello promenade thus blocking access.

Question (1) Are there any plans to address this issue?

Answer (1) Yes. Officers are aware of this issue and are currently working on a design to improve the access to the Promenade at Seafield Road East, using bollards to restrict regular vehicle parking whilst maintaining emergency and planned vehicle access.

Question (2) If 'yes', when can we expect to see those measures introduced?

Answer (2) We are planning to deliver these measures early in 2021.

Item no 5.5

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Howie for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question (1) What is the current criteria for the allocation of sheltered housing?

Answer (1) The Council letting policy sets out that that preference is given to households over 55 or where a member of the household has a need for this type of accommodation such as a younger person who has a life-long or progressive medical condition or who needs more accessible housing due to restricted mobility.

Sheltered housing is therefore targeted towards people who have been awarded a Gold priority for bidding for homes through a Choice based letting system, who have mobility needs that can be met in this type of accommodation.

Where no households meet the criteria and have made a bid for the property or the properties but do not meet the needs of people with gold priority the homes will be offered to older households or households where there is a current or future need for this accommodation.

Question (2) How many sheltered housing tenancies have been allocated to applicants who require partially or fully adapted accommodation in the last 5 years?

Answer

- (2) The terms “partially” or “fully adapted” housing are not used in the description and letting of Council homes. Prospective tenants are advised if a home has a wet floor shower or if the homes is fully wheelchair accessible.

In the last 5 years there have been 705 new lets in Council Sheltered Accommodation. Of these lets 314 went to households awarded a gold priority due to mobility reasons. This included 176 homes which were fully wheelchair accessible.

When a tenant is allocated a home an assessment of any requirement for adaptation is made and adaptations carried out in line with the tenants needs. Where a sitting tenants’ needs change and there is an assessed need for further adaptations those adaptations will be made. For example 28 major adaptations in sheltered housing were carried out in 2018/19.

Questions

- (3) How many sheltered housing tenancies have been allocated to applicants who do not require partially or fully adapted accommodation in the last 5 years?

Answer

- (3) The remaining 391 new lets in Council Sheltered Accommodation not allocated to households with a gold priority are as shown in the table below.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Silver Priority applicants – This priority is awarded based on housing need and includes homeless households and households downsizing to smaller accommodation | 210 |
| Waiting time – this will mainly be older households with long waiting time who have a need for this type of accommodation | 181 |

Item no 5.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Spaces for People Proposals for Lanark Road/Inglis Green Road

Can the Convener confirm

Question (1) How many comments were received in total regarding the scheme?

Answer (1) During the notification period a total of 343 comments were received.

Question (2) How many comments were:

(a) from individuals and

(b) from organisations

Answer (2) a) 329 responses were received from individuals.

b) 14 responses were received from organisations (including those responses received from elected members).

Questions (3) How many were:

(a) for/supportive of the proposals;

(b) against/objections to the proposals;

(c) neutral

Answer (3) Of the responses from individuals, 19 were supportive, 300 were against the proposals, and 10 were neutral.

Of the responses from organisations, four were supportive, seven were against and three were neutral.

Item no 5.7

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Can the Convener confirm

- Question** (1) Following the announcement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in respect of the extension of the scheme to end March what discussions have taken place regarding placing of CEC employees on furlough?
- Answer** (1) Council service areas that had previously furloughed employees/workers were asked to consider whether they had any categories of employees/workers who remained eligible to be furloughed under the extended Scheme. Meetings have been held between Finance, HR and officers from the respective service areas to discuss current service requirements and assess if any further furlough application should be considered.
- Question** (2) How many CEC employees are currently furloughed?
- Answer** (2) 36 Council employees are currently furloughed, all of whom work in the Council's Outdoor Education facilities.
- Questions** (3) What sum has been received from UK Treasury in furlough payments?
- Answer** (3) The Council has received £0.449m income in respect of claims to 31st August 2020 under the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme. It is anticipated that further payments totalling c. £0.160m will be received in respect of claims for the period 1st September to 31st October.
- Questions** (4) Is it CEC's intention to furlough further employees?
- Answer** (4) As stated in response to question 1, this is still under active consideration by service areas, Finance and HR. Any further furlough application will be reported to the Finance and Resources Committee as a part of the Revenue Budget Monitoring Report.

Questions (5) How many CEC staff are currently redeployed in areas of work, which is not their usual area of work and what teams are involved?

Answer (5) This information is not held corporately by the Council, because the redeployment of staff is managed at a local level in service areas.

Item no 5.8

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

A number of Spaces for People (SfP) schools measures have been implemented or are in plan for primary schools.

Question

(1) Please provide information on what these measures are and whether they are live or pending etc. as follows:

(a) (live) schools which have SfP measures already in place and a brief explanation of the measures (e.g. pavement widening) as well as the date it was implemented

(b) (agreed) schools which have agreed SfP measures which are not yet installed, with a brief description of what the measure is, and the date for implementation

(c) (pending) schools which have proposed SfP measures which are not yet out for ward councillor consultation, with a brief description of what the proposed measure is likely to be, and a proposed date if known

(d) (outstanding) schools which require SfP measures but they have not been designed yet.

(e) (none) schools which do not require any SfP measures

This can be provided as 4 lists, or one consolidated list showing the category, description, date.

Answer

- (1) (a) The implementation date is not readily available. All schools in the list below have been assessed as part of SfP and even the one-way systems have been marked out using vinyl arrows. However, we have only noted those with physical Traffic Management as being live, and those that had a 'light touch' with no notification as none.
- (b) Noted below.
- (c) This is a work in progress and will continue to be communicated as the assessments are progressed.
- (d) This is a work in progress and will continue to be communicated as the assessments are progressed.
- (e) This is as noted above.

| School | Proposal | Status |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Murrayburn Primary School | Road Closure and Footpath Widening with Double Yellow Lines (DYLs) at junctions | Live |
| Gylemuir Primary School | One-way school gate system to be arranged with school, as well as a park smart campaign. Temporary path installed. | Live |
| Carrick Knowe Primary School | Letter drop residents to cut back all vegetation on Lampacre Road. Close roads at school frontage. | Agreed, install by 30/11 |
| Broomhouse Primary School | One way school gate system to be arranged with school and liaise with St David's Church to use as Park and Stride. | None |
| Forrester High School | Segregated Cycle Lanes (linking in with Meadow Place Road) | Spaces for People – Travelling Safely team progressing this. |
| Trinity Primary School | One way school gate system to be arranged with school. | None |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---------|
| Wardie Primary School | Arrange opening other gates with school for one way system at pick up and drop off time. Close access lane to traffic. | None |
| Victoria Primary School | Run a Park Smart campaign, ensure both gates are open for access into school, implement footpath widening and close road to traffic. | Live |
| Trinity Academy | No measures as permanent 20mph on Craighall Road is at TRO stage | None |
| Bruntsfield Primary School | Road closures. | Live |
| Buckstone Primary School | Run a Park Smart campaign, ensure both gates are open for access into school and agree a one way system at the gates. | Pending |
| South Morningside Primary School | Liaise with school to set up a walking bus, encourage Waitrose for use as a Park and Stride site. Road closure on Canaan Lane. | Live |
| Boroughmuir High School | Proposing to extend NE footway of Viewforth | Live |
| Sciennes Primary | Footway widening at gates. Will also arrange for diversion signs to be relocated from footways. Road closure installed along frontage. | Live |
| Tollcross Primary | Liaise with school on making gates one way and utilise car park gate also, restricting entry times for teachers. Permanent scheme delivering footpath widening here. | None |

| | | |
|--|---|------|
| Preston Street Primary | Liaise with school on one way gate system, lane closure on Dalkeith Road and widen footways. | Live |
| James Gillespie's Primary and High Schools | Liaise with schools on creating in/out gate system. Implement pavement widening temporarily. | Live |
| Royal Mile Primary School | No measures possible due to surrounding infrastructure | None |
| Taobh na Pairce | Encourage parents to use side gate as more space | None |
| Canal View Primary | Use Westside Plaza as a Park and Stride site, have teachers at the vehicle access to stop vehicles entering the school car park at the start and end of the day to ensure social distancing, restrict entry times for teachers. | None |
| Clovenstone Primary | Arrange one way gates with school | None |
| Sighthill Primary | Ensure paths surrounding the school are clear of vegetation. Liaise with school to open main gate to create a one way in/out system that will be delineated with cones/ barriers. | None |
| Wester Hailes Education Centre | Run 'paths for all' campaign | None |
| Corstorphine Primary School | Road closures and footway build out | Live |
| East Craig's Primary School | Arrange one way gates with school. | None |
| Fox Covert Primary School/ St Andrews | Arrange a one way gate system with school, organise park and stride from Drum Brae Hub | None |

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Hillwood Primary School | Arrange one way gate system | None |
| Roseburn Primary School | Arrange one way gate with school. | None |
| Craigmount High School | Measures to be proposed as part of East Craigs Spaces for People programme | None |
| Dean Park Primary | Liase with school on gate management system at entry/ exit times. | None |
| Ratho Primary School | Liase with Bridge Inn as a Park and Stride site, arrange pick up/ drop off with the school recommending parents leave their children before they get to the school gate, if this is not possible, the vehicle access should be utilised as an exit point for parents, this would restrict entry times for teachers. | Agreed – Dates TBC as still to go to CIMT |
| Balerno High School | TTRO for DYL's to prevent drop off happening in cycle lane on Bridge Road along school frontage. | Agreed – Dates TBC as still to go to CIMT |
| Queensferry Primary School | Arrange one way gate system with the school, TTRO at school frontage to prevent parking | Live |
| Kirkliston Primary School | One way gate system, restrict teachers access times to car park. Encourage Park and Stride. Temporary Path installed | Live |
| Echline Primary School | One way gate system, restrict teachers access times to car park, TTRO at school frontage to prevent parking. | Live |
| Dalmeny Primary | Liase with the school on setting up a walking bus to reduce number of parents at the school. | None |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Queensferry High School | Permanent measure already in the pipeline. Lining work complete in school grounds to mark a temporary path. | None |
| Blackhall Primary School | Arrange vegetation to be cut back on approach to school. Mark 2m spacing on footpath at school gates. Investigate segregating cycle lanes on Craigmock Road. | Outstanding |
| Clermiston Primary School | Mark 2m spacing at school gates, remove guardrail in Parkgrove Place. | None |
| Davidsons Mains Primary School | No waiting TTRO between the school and the Turtle Dove café to keep cycleway clear and maximise footway width. Arrange park and stride with school, continue to promote the cycle train and WOW. Install prohibition of vehicles and footway widening. | Agreed – Dates TBC as still to go to CIMT |
| Cramond Primary School | Mark 2m spacing at the school gate | None |
| The Royal High School | Liaise with school on one way system. Widen footway by 2m on south side of Barnton Avenue. | Live |
| Balgreen Primary School | Liaise with school on one way system. Have requested additional DYL's. | None |
| Craiglockhart Primary School | Liaise with school on one way system. Widen footways around school and remove guardrail. Introduce parking restrictions to clear towpath entrance. | None – measures were installed but removed at request of head teacher. |
| Dalry Primary School | Liaise with school on one way system. Widen footways around school. | Live |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Stenhouse Primary School | Liaise with school on one way system. Close Saughton Mains Drive at frontage of school to create more space for pedestrians. | None |
| Tynecastle High School | Liaise with school on one way system. | None |
| Craigour Park School | Encourage Park and Stride. They are having issues. They would like pavement widening and removal of parking or road closure to enable this. | None |
| Gilmerton Primary School | Additional enforcement from Police Scotland to enforce school streets. | None |
| Liberton Primary School | Road closure at school frontage, investigate new temporary footway to rear of school. | Pending |
| Prestonfield Primary School | Widen footway along frontage of school, introduce TTRO to prevent parking opposite school. Liaise with school on one way gate system. Close road along school frontage. | Agreed, install by 30/11 |
| Liberton High School | Remove guardrail at Mount Vernon entrance. | Live |
| Leith Primary School | Liaise with school on one way system and marking out footway. Request enforcement from Police Scotland on School Streets. | None |
| Craigtinny Primary School | Liaise with school on one way system and marking out footway. Widen footway along frontage and revoke parking. | Widening is live, one way agreed, install one way by 30/11 |
| Hermitage Park Primary | Widen footway at front of school, remove guardrail. Liaise with school on walking and cycling promotion | Live |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Lorne Primary School | Liase with school on one way system and marking out footway. Contact School with regards to a park smart campaign as soon as possible. Build out footway and revoke parking at frontage | Live |
| Leith Academy | Contact school to ensure all access gates are being used. | None |
| Towerbank Primary School | Contact school to see if they require arrows. Request additional School Streets enforcement with Police Scotland. | None |
| Duddingston Primary | Request additional School Streets enforcement with Police Scotland, communicate Park and Stride with Parents. Spaces for People installing segregated cycle facilities on Duddingston Road | None |
| Brunstane Primary School | Liase with school on Park and Stride at The Range. Contact Head Teacher with regards to removing railings in school Close Magdalene Gardens and Magdalene Drive along frontage of the school. | Closure in place. TTRO for DYL's is live. Plans to introduce closure on the bend outside the school is pending. |
| Parsons Green Primary School | Liase will school for requirement of footway arrows and implementation of Walk Once a Week. Closure on Paisley Drive. | Live |
| Royal High Primary School | Liase with school on any additional support/ arrows they need. | None |
| Portobello High School | Stanley Street closed under Spaces for People for active travel/ physical distancing. Mark to contact head over concerns in the car park. | None |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Craigroyston Primary School | Liaise with school on one way gates and to see if closure of Muirhouse Place West would be beneficial. | Pending |
| Pirniehall Primary School | | Outstanding |
| Forthview Primary School | | Outstanding |
| Craigroyston Primary School | Liaise with school on one way gates | Outstanding |
| St Josephs RC Primary School | Liaise with school on one way gates | None |
| Castleview Primary School | Extend Footway by 1 metre along school frontage, remove guardrail and introduce DYL's from Greendykes Road along the school frontage. | Outstanding |
| Newcraighall Primary School | Liaise with school on Park and Stride. | None |
| Castlebrae Community High School | Introduce parking restrictions to keep junction clear. | Agreed, install by 30/11 |
| St John Vianney's RC School | Close road along frontage of school, maintain access for residents and waste | Agreed, install by 30/11 |
| St Catherine's RC Primary School | Close road along frontage of school, maintain access for residents and waste | Agreed, install by 30/11 |
| St Marys RC Primary School | Mark out footprints etc around school and in playground | None |

Item no 5.9

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question

- (1) Ward councillors have appreciated the timely updates on new covid cases in schools and whether this has resulted in individual or full class isolations. Mindful of the concerns around remote learning and digital engagement can the Convenor please advise the following:
- (a) If an individual pupil is off school, after how many days would they be offered remote learning?
 - (b) Pupils offered remote learning – will this always be possible digitally or have there been circumstances where this has not been possible and what has been made available instead?
 - (c) If a full class is required to isolate, is remote learning available from the first day of isolation, and if not, how soon after?
 - (d) Classes receiving remote learning – is this provided digitally and it is ‘real time viewing a teacher’ or pre-recorded or written assignments only (or other)?

Answer

(1) (a) At present, this will vary across the school estate. The QICS has issued a Digital/Remote learning survey to all schools with a completion date of 18th November. The purpose of this is to allow us to gather information about the extent to which schools are able to accommodate digital needs of learners within their current digital estate in the event of pupils requiring to self-isolate or the event of periods of home learning or blended (connected) learning (remote learning). Schools who evaluate as having low confidence levels in (a) continuity of learning provision and (b) the engagement of pupils in remote learning tasks set will be provided with proportionate support from the Quality Improvement Service and Digital Officers within the Closing the Gap workforce.

(b) Schools have gathered data, during school closures, and since pupils returned to school in August to identify young people who are not currently able to access remote learning digitally. Schools are committed to ensuring that these young people are provided with alternative resources e.g. learning packs which provide textbooks, reading materials, paper versions of tasks set, in line with learning set digitally to other members of the class. Schools work hard to ensure that these packs reach young people timeously and try to ensure that assessment arrangements are in place to provide feedback to young people about their progress in learning. This would usually take place over the 'phone speaking directly with young people and their parents/carers.

(c) As stated above, this will vary across the school estate. However, initial consultations with Primary Head Teachers has indicated that this is implemented from the first day of self-isolation where young people are able to access their learning digitally and with greater independence. This would be done through Teams, school websites or other digital platforms, accessing locally and nationally produced resources e.g. Edinburgh Learns Learning grids, which have been produced for all sectors. and National resources such as Clickview. This is more likely to be consistent across P5-7 year groups. Where digital access is not enabled school staff, such as home link officers, are delivering learning packs to young people.

Arrangements are in place to ensure regular Health & Wellbeing check-ins between teachers, and the young people in their classes, together with planned opportunities to share assessment information, including specific feedback to support young people to continue to progress with their learning, despite Covid-related absences.

(d) In June, 2020, a pilot was undertaken to enable the “two-way video” facility to facilitate synchronous digital learning. This included 2 Primary Schools, 1 Secondary School, Special Schools, and individual young people, with complex additional needs, within mainstream settings. This was done in full consultation with Head Teachers and the Teachers’ Panel members (EIS) and colleagues working within Child Protection, to fully risk assess the process to ensure the safety, and protection, of pupils and staff. A Responsible User Protocol, Staff Guidance and Quick Start Guides for learners, parents & carers have been created. Senior leaders have been asked to share these protocols with their communities, to inform their decisions about readiness to enable this aspect of their Digital strategy to support remote learning. Engagement is being tracked by the Digital Team and the Digital Technologies QIEO.

Pupils may also access asynchronous digital learning where schools are providing access to recorded learning sessions and tasks and, as stated in the responses above, are setting learners tasks for completion and submission to / discussion with their teachers to provide ongoing assessment and feedback.

Question (2) From these early examples over the last couple of months, have any lessons been learned that will change how remote learning is provided?

Answer (2) Initial consultation with Head Teachers has provided examples of effective practice already developed:-

Clarity for staff needed regarding the learning to be set to ensure equity of provision for all learners e.g. Literacy, Numeracy, Health & Wellbeing tasks set each day, with learning differentiated. Learning should provide continuity, and context, clearly connected to in-school learning, whilst acknowledging that some pedagogical approaches have been impacted by infection control measures e.g. play-based approaches. Policy detailing the arrangements for assessment of learners' progress, and provision of feedback, which is clearly understood by learners, parents & carers.

Head Teachers also report examples of the impact of school closures on learners, which has informed their ongoing contingency planning for remote learning:-

Assessments in Literacy and Numeracy, for the most part, indicate that younger learners (particularly P1/2) have more gaps in their learning. Health & Wellbeing Assessments also evidence that developmental aspects of learning are impacted more significantly for younger groups of learners e.g. the ability to share, cooperate and collaborate in learning, potentially due to reduced social interaction.

Older pupils have less gaps in learning as they are able to access learning more independently and accessing digital platforms more confidently. In a few cases, some of these learners are exceeding expected levels of attainment.

Where pupils have experienced curricular pathways which provide opportunities for consolidation (overlearning) there is evidence of greater retention and progress. This is most prevalent in older pupils.

Pupils' engagement in learning has evidenced challenges in equity of Digital provision. It is also essential that, where access to Digital Devices is in place, pupils are taught the skills of using these devices effectively whilst in school so they can use these confidently if learning at home.

The data gathered from the aforementioned Digital/Remote Learning survey will be analysed to support schools where there are gaps in their remote learning provision, inclusion a deficit in the provision of digital devices.

Blended (connected) Learning guidance is being reviewed, informed by this survey and by ongoing consultation with Head Teachers. This will provide practical solutions to schools to support the wide range of scenarios which necessitates remote learning, and provide greater consistency about the expectation across all schools regarding their remote learning provision e.g. how quickly should learners be provided with remote learning following as a result of the need to self-isolate, curricular range and frequency of tasks set, arrangements for assessment of learning including the provision of feedback.

Question

- (3)** Do all pupils now have access to a digital device (either their own or CEC-provided) and if not, when will this be resolved?

Answer

- (3)** Devices have been allocated based on SIMD 1/2 data, with deployment primarily on specific secondary schools where that allocation would be broadly sufficient to deliver a 1:1 approach to a school's S3 cohort, making adjustments to ensure coverage where necessary. Where the SIMD profile leans more to the upper deciles, schools will receive a proportionately smaller allocation of devices that they can use to supplement their own device stock and use as appropriate. In total this accounts for around 2100 devices. We are currently taking this forward with 10 secondary schools. The device framework supplier has been instructed to deploy devices directly to those schools first, as they begin preparing staff, pupils and parents for a 1:1 deployment to the designated cohort, with our support. The Digital/Remote Learning survey data will be used to deploy the remaining 500 devices to support schools with this and any other unexpected COVID-related circumstances. Funding has also been reserved to pay for connectivity as that need arises. Schools continue to invest in digital devices making use of their DSM budget and Pupil Equity Funding.

In summary, the rollout has started in identified secondary schools, and should be complete within the next 2/3 weeks. The reserved devices are available for any school to requisition should they have any contingency issue. When the need to reserve centrally passes, the remaining devices will be issued on the basis of the current stocks held by schools. No learner who needs a device for contingency learning will be deprived of a device unless the whole city goes into lockdown

Item no 5.10

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

PE in schools

Question (1) Are primary schools allowed to hold PE classes indoors as it stands today? If not, when is guidance expected to change (or is it related to the Tier system)?

Answer (1) Yes. Local CEC guidance fully reflects and is aligned with national guidance. Local guidance includes national advice below as regards the Tier system.

The key national document is here:

<https://education.gov.scot/media/ohyofihd/pe-guidelines-02-11-20.pdf>. There have been 7 versions of this guidance released between August- November 2020, with the latest on 2nd November which stated:

“From 2 November 2020, if staff complete risk assessments that reflect the most current advice (all risk assessments should be proportionate to the relevant protection level of the local area), and mitigations are in place, physical education can take place both indoors and outdoors as follows:

Levels 0-3 Primary Indoors: Children can participate in contact and non-contact activities. Primary Outdoors: Children can participate in contact and non-contact activities.

Levels 0-3 Secondary Indoors: Young people can participate in contact and non-contact activities. Secondary Outdoors: Young people can participate in contact and non-contact activities.

Level 4 – Children and young people within school settings can only participate in activities that are non-contact and outdoors.

Question (2) If the weather is such that children should not be outdoors, what is the guidance to schools on providing an alternative indoor option?

Answer (2) A working group of senior officers and practitioners, including PE specialists from primary and secondary sectors, Health and Safety and Facilities Management, has produced a local CEC PE Guidance document. This is updated in line with national guidance (currently V4) and has been made available to all schools on the SORT portal and via weekly Risk Matters bulletin. It will continue to be updated in line with any national guidance. Advice is provided on groupings, face coverings, mitigation of risk, ventilation, equipment use, cleaning and infection control. Two exemplar risk assessment templates have also been provided, one for PE overall (including indoor PE) and one for Changing Room use.

Item no 5.11

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Extracurricular activities

Prior to the October break, councillors and parents were assured that outdoors sports would start being reintroduced after the holiday.

Question (1) How many schools are offering their facilities to community-led or privately-run sports groups and when this start?

Answer (1) Community access to sports facilities at all secondary schools has been in place from w/b 16th November 2020. Phase I restart began from w/b 2nd November across 7 schools including Queensferry HS, Balerno HS, Forrester HS, St Augustine's HS, Broughton HS, Portobello HS and Leith Academy due to their historically higher footfall. Community access at Castlebrae HS, Drummond HS and Trinity Academy has not re-commenced due to low demand for use post-lockdown.

Question (2) How many community-led and privately-run sports groups have asked for access to school outdoor facilities but this has not yet been granted?

Answer (2) All community access requests have been facilitated where possible and no lets have been refused. Customers who have not been able to get their first choice day/time eg: because of new staggered timing; spaces closed due to maintenance works or classroom usage have been offered alternative spaces and/or times. We have no way of tracking every instance of this, but ultimately we accommodate every customer somewhere/sometime.

Question (3) Where access is still not yet permitted, what are the reasons for the delay and when will access resume?

Answer

- (3)** Reasons for denying requests include – sport spaces being over-subscribed, used for other purposes e.g. class rooms, non-compliance e.g. ventilation or out of action due to maintenance/repair reasons.

Item no 5.12

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Rose for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Non-Disclosure Agreements

Question (1) Can the Convener advise of the total number and spend on Non-disclosure or settlement agreements of any type, from May 2013 to the present?

Answer (1) The request relates to non-disclosure or settlement agreements of any kind, which includes a very wide scope of information across the Council.

Examples of non-disclosure or settlement agreements include: commercial settlements; employment-related settlements; settlements relating to allegations of abuse; personal injury settlements. The Council also settles some insured claims (primarily in relation to roads defects) which fall within its insurance excess cap.

There is no single source for officers to interrogate and therefore unfortunately we are unable to provide the detailed information requested. To answer the question would require a solicitor to assess not less than 6,300 files in Legal Services alone in the period between May 2013 and present day, November 2020, which may, or may not, contain information relevant to the question raised. The cost to the Council of officers locating, retrieving and providing the information would be substantial, involving hundreds of hours of work to collate. The request is also likely to extend to Insurance Services and to all other Directorates who may directly hold contract engagement details on behalf of their own service.

Non-disclosure or settlement agreements are generally entered into by the Council in the interests of protecting the public purse. Given the breadth and nature of its services, the Council is litigated against on a regular basis. It is often in the Council's best financial interest that a matter is settled out of court and that such settlements would also be subject to the agreement of the individual who may raise such a claim, where they will often have the benefit of independent legal advice, prior to agreeing any such resolution.

Any non-disclosure or settlement agreements of a sensitive or high value nature are subject to appropriate professional legal advice in relation to the terms of settlement, including the appropriate level of financial settlement. Advice is also taken in relation to related non-disclosure agreements, which might form part of certain types of settlement agreement and are often confidential both ways to protect both the Council and any claimant. Settlement agreements in the context of employment matters require the employee to take independent legal advice and such agreements cannot prevent employees from making protected disclosures regardless of any confidentiality provisions.

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 19 November 2020**

Spaces for People Adaption Work

Recently, the plastic batons segregating the cycle way on Ferry Road have been replaced by “segregation units.”

- Question** (1) What are the reasons for replacing the batons with segregation units?
- Answer** (1) The ‘batons’ were always a temporary intervention in lieu of the segregation units being available to replace them. This was set out in the notification on the project.
- Question** (2) Why were segregation units not installed in the first place?
- Answer** (2) There was quite a long lead in time for production and delivery of the segregation units from the supplier. This was due to the considerable nationwide demands for equipment of this kind, a fact which has been notified before at Full Council. The batons allowed for the project to be implemented, as part of the Council’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic, much sooner than would otherwise have been possible.
- Question** (3) How many Spaces for People schemes have been subject to adaption work such as this since the initial installation?
- Answer** (3) Both pre and post implementation the majority of the measures will have some form of adaptation throughout their existence to take on board feedback received, reviews and government guidance.
- Question** (4) What is the total cost of adaption work?
- Answer** (4) The total cost of installing and removing all ‘batons’ (Orange cylinders) on the travelling safely schemes was: £31,699.70.

Item no 5.14

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Depute Leader of the
Council at a meeting of the Council
on 19 November 2020**

Coronavirus Measures and Powers

In proposing an amendment to a Conservative Emergency Motion on Public Health Measures last Council, the Leader made clear his view that Local Government should limit itself to following the Coronavirus measures and advice put in place by National Government.

“ . . . if you're looking for the information to help you explain these measures of guidance . . . that comes from listening to what the Government is saying, and I think, meeting our obligations and responsibility as local people to not undermine those, and try and explain those and echo some of those messages from the Government . . . there's one singer and one song when it comes to this . . . ”

[Cllr McVey, 7:29:30 on the webcast]

Question

Would the Depute Leader agree that Local Government in the UK should simply follow the advice and measures of National Governments?

Answer

Local government are required to follow the legislation as set out below. Decisions from this legislation should of course take account of the Public Health Advice, and the impact on the economy of the city in arriving at any response to our governments decisions.

The applicable legislation is **The Health Protection (Coronavirus) (Restrictions and Requirements) (Local Levels) (Scotland) Regulations 2020**, (“the Regulations”), [here](#).

These Regulations came into force on 2 November 2020. The Scottish Ministers made the Regulations in exercise of the power conferred by paragraph 1(1) of Schedule 19 of the Coronavirus Act 2020, that is:

1)The Scottish Ministers may by regulations make provision for the purpose of preventing, protecting against, controlling or providing a public health response to the incidence or spread of infection or contamination in Scotland (whether from risks originating there or elsewhere).

Item no 5.15

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Spaces for People Expenditure to date

Question (1) Can a full breakdown of Spaces for People expenditure (incurred and scheduled) be provided please, broken down by project.

Answer (1) See table below

The current forecast programme expenditure sits at £5.5M, including contingency and a substantial allowance for scheme maintenance and removal. The project team have successfully gained additional 'Spaces for People' and 'Places for Everyone' funding from Sustrans to increase the overall project budget by £1.95m, taking the total budget to £6.95m. This increased budget will fully fund the proposed scheme list, allow us to make enhancements to schemes where possible, broaden the scope of surfacing improvements and further increase the removal of street clutter.

If changes to the budget or programme are required, then this would be reverted to the Transport and Environment Committee in January for approval.

Question (2) Can a breakdown of expenditure (incurred and scheduled) be provided, showing the expenditure with a view to making improvements to benefit:

(a) Pedestrians

(b) Cyclists

(c) Safe Travel to Schools

- Answer** (2) (a) (b) It is not possible to give a clear breakdown of these costs as all interventions have been designed to make it easier and safer for people to move around our streets, These changes to our pavements, pathways and roads create space for everyone, whether they are
- walking
 - cycling
 - using a wheelchair or other mobility equipment
 - using a pram.
- (c) £150,000 has been allocated to interventions specifically relating to schools. £20,625.49 has been spent up to this point.
- Question** (3) How much has been spent implementing floating bus stops and implementing disabled parking bays?
- Answer** (3) Floating bus stops - £16k.
Disabled bays - £74.80 which includes removal.
- Question** (4) Given the supply line for the Cycle Lane Defenders meant they could not be installed initially at Comiston Road for example, as the supplier ran out, and more had to be produced to meet demand, what additional costs were incurred in material and time by the temporary cones and other measures prior to the further “temporary” measures?

Answer

- (4) The Creating Safe Spaces for Walking and Cycling report that was approved by the Policy and Sustainability Committee in May refers to the implementation of SfP measures that were dependent on funding and/or availability of materials and contractors. Due to the current circumstances there has been a high demand for the materials being used to create spaces nationwide. This includes the segregation units and as a result of the urgent nature of the measures, when required, a three-phase approach was taken. The three phases were 1) traffic cones then 2) traffic cylinders and finally 3) segregation units. There were no additional costs as these were planned costs to mitigate supply issues. The majority of the measures will have some form of adaptation through their existence to take on board feedback received, reviews and government guidance.

| Scheme | Status On / Off | Cost Projection | Maintenance Projection | Actual Cost to Date | Status |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| South Bridge | Awaiting decision | £117,683.55 | £12,033.17 | £1,369.75 | Underway |
| Waverley Bridge | On | £13,305.46 | £371.80 | £7,585.46 | Underway |
| Forest Road | On | £52,695.78 | £3,839.33 | £33,863.78 | Underway |
| George IV Bridge | On | £138,179.63 | £5,687.06 | £118,389.63 | Installed |
| The Mound | On | £148,331.72 | £2,669.17 | £148,088.37 | Installed |
| Princes Street East End | On | £100,375.96 | £2,469.90 | £95,282.23 | Underway |
| Victoria Street | On | £18,501.01 | £371.80 | £16,781.01 | Installed |
| Cockburn Street | On | £13,638.45 | £371.80 | £12,716.00 | Installed |
| Chamber St / George IV | On | £136,000.00 | £5,032.00 | £1,493.45 | Underway |
| Non-allocated Expenditure | On | £6,729.45 | £0.00 | £6,402.17 | |
| City Centre Phase 1 | | £745,441.01 | £32,846.03 | £441,971.85 | |
| Queensferry High St | On | £30,000.00 | £1,024.55 | £0.00 | |
| Great Junction St | On | £14,957.64 | £307.51 | £2,840.50 | Underway |
| Stockbridge | On | £48,494.40 | £3,784.70 | £3,126.50 | Underway |
| Portobello High Street | On | £30,132.72 | £1,965.44 | £2,598.50 | Underway |
| Newington | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Gorgie / Dalry Road | On | £43,812.35 | £3,433.65 | £42,721.29 | Installed |
| Corstorphine | On | £43,060.40 | £2,953.17 | £3,243.50 | Underway |
| Bruntsfield | On | £31,983.48 | £2,389.81 | £29,998.69 | Installed |
| Tolcross | On | £31,761.69 | £1,652.80 | £29,898.08 | Installed |
| Morningside | On | £63,081.17 | £4,229.95 | £56,188.81 | Installed |
| Haymarket Terrace | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Easter Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Shopping Streets | | £337,283.85 | £21,741.58 | £170,615.87 | |

| Scheme | Status On / Off | Cost Projection | Maintenance Projection | Actual Cost to Date | Status |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Telford Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Carrington Road | On | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Fountainbridge Dundee | On | £61,858.64 | £4,980.14 | £0.00 | |
| Ferry Road | On | £106,284.88 | £8,168.73 | £100,146.32 | Installed |
| Melville Drive | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Teviot Pl / Potterrow | On | £6,952.32 | £257.24 | £0.00 | |
| Bucleuch St / Causewayside | On | £46,185.52 | £3,537.28 | £37,378.44 | Underway |
| Crewe Toll Roundabout | On | £28,995.00 | £1,880.20 | £0.00 | |
| Meadowplace Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Duddingston Road | On | £48,320.48 | £3,805.36 | £0.00 | |
| Wester Hailes Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Craigmillar Park / Liberton | On | £110,058.80 | £7,851.87 | £0.00 | |
| Gilmerton Road | On | £42,695.68 | £3,717.04 | £0.00 | |
| Crewe Road South | On | £88,222.63 | £5,116.01 | £85,216.63 | Installed |
| Old Dalkeith Road | On | £78,008.98 | £3,056.52 | £75,002.98 | Installed |
| Comiston Road | On | £139,839.05 | £10,466.80 | £113,207.61 | Underway |
| Ingils Green Road | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Pennywell Road | On | £119,757.32 | £8,785.73 | £111,788.32 | Installed |
| Mayfield Road | On | £29,715.11 | £2,380.00 | £0.00 | |
| QC - Meadows / Greenbank | On | £43,680.00 | £2,751.46 | £0.00 | |
| Queensferry Road 1a | Awaiting decision | £75,261.00 | £4,965.51 | £0.00 | |
| A1 Corridor | Awaiting decision | £93,692.00 | £6,662.40 | £0.00 | |
| Slateford Road (A70), Lanark Rd, Longstone Rd & Murrayburn Rd | On | £252,774.00 | £19,092.74 | £0.00 | |
| Orchard Brae | On | £13,330.00 | £851.91 | £0.00 | |
| Non-allocated Expenditure | On | £5,992.61 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Phase 1b Bus Lanes | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| West Coates | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Arterial Routes | | £1,391,624.02 | £98,326.94 | £522,740.30 | |
| East Craigs | Awaiting decision | £55,598.00 | £4,878.09 | £0.00 | |
| Drum Brae North | On | £36,419.00 | £2,896.50 | £0.00 | |
| Leith Connections | On | £42,880.00 | £4,087.20 | £0.00 | |
| Non-allocated Expenditure | On | £2,536.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Low Traffic Neighbourhoods | | £137,433.00 | £11,861.79 | £0.00 | |
| Braid Road | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Links Garden | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |

| Scheme | Status On / Off | Cost Projection | Maintenance Projection | Actual Cost to Date | Status |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Cammo Walk | On | £1,700.00 | £0.00 | £1,700.00 | Installed |
| Warriston Road | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Stanley Street/Hope Street | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Braidburn Terrace | On | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Silverknowes Road (South) | On | £33,318.00 | £2,464.65 | £0.00 | |
| Silverknowes Road (North) | On | £27,900.00 | £2,306.09 | £0.00 | |
| Granton Sq / Gypsy Brae | On | £77,463.92 | £5,981.42 | £0.00 | |
| Braid Hills Drive | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Seafield Street | On | £2,174.00 | £78.10 | £1,467.00 | Installed |
| Kings Place | On | £17,177.00 | £929.50 | £877.00 | Underway |
| Arboretum Place | On | £12,431.46 | £729.55 | £1,766.10 | Underway |
| Maybury Rd Temp. Crossing | On | £55,883.63 | £1,950.00 | £22,975.84 | Underway |
| Spaces for Exercise | | £238,048.01 | £14,439.31 | £28,785.94 | |
| Broughton Street | Awaiting decision | £49,428.24 | £4,939.08 | £0.00 | |
| Broughton St Roundabout | Awaiting decision | £50,624.20 | £3,817.03 | £0.00 | |
| Restalrig Rd South - Opt. 2 | On | £6,920.00 | £416.20 | £0.00 | |
| West End of Princes Street | On | £3,763.00 | £316.92 | £0.00 | |
| Musselburgh to Portobello Opt. 1 Edinburgh section | On | £55,399.20 | £5,601.98 | £0.00 | |
| Duddingston Road West | Off | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | |
| Fillyside Road - Crossing | On | £30,000.00 | £1,950.00 | £0.00 | |
| Fillyside Road | On | £4,584.36 | £411.93 | £0.00 | |
| Glenlockhart Drive | On | £2,798.00 | £103.53 | £0.00 | |
| Starbank Road | On | £12,608.40 | £1,128.81 | £0.00 | |
| Commonplace Interventions | | £216,125.40 | £18,685.48 | £0.00 | |
| Schools | | £150,000.00 | | £20,625.49 | |
| Sub-total | | | £3,413,856.42 | £1,184,739.45 | |
| Consultancy Support | | | £300,000.00 | £118,478.78 | |
| Internal Management Costs | | | £750,000.00 | £504,759.07 | |
| Segregation units for maintenance and schemes to be developed | | | £171,292.00 | £0.00 | |
| Monitoring & | | | £175,000.00 | £86,410.00 | |

| Scheme | Status On / Off | Cost Projection | Maintenance Projection | Actual Cost to Date | Status |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Evaluation | | | | | |
| Removal Allowance | | | £450,000.00 | £0.00 | |
| Street Cleaning Over Winter Period 20/21/22 | | | £50,000.00 | £0.00 | |
| Removal of Street Clutter | | | £50,000.00 | £0.00 | |
| Uncertainty - installation, maintenance, removal | | | £196,005.10 | £0.00 | |
| TOTAL PROJECTION | | | £5,556,153.52 | £1,894,387.30 | |

Item no 5.16

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question (1) What assessments have been done of the likely average walking/cycling time for pupils at each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site?

Answer (1) Secondary GME has a city wide catchment area. In line with policy any pupil living more than 3 miles from any secondary GME school would receive transport support, usually in the form of a bus pass. As such it is only expected that those living within 3 miles of any option would walk or cycle to school. No further detailed assessment on walking and cycling has been carried out.

Question (2) How compatible are each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site, with the '15 minute city' agenda?

Answer (2) Secondary school catchment areas in the city are of a scale that they would not be considered as one of the services which should be available within a 15 min or 20 min city concept. In line with policy pupils are expected to walk or cycle up to 3 miles to reach their catchment secondary schools (which takes much longer than 15 mins to walk). Beyond 3 miles travel support is provided.

Question (3) What is the estimated average public transport travel time for the current P1-3 years at Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce to each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site?

Answer (3) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (4) What is the estimated average public transport travel time from a likely city-wide catchment of each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and to the temporary Darroch site?

Answer (4) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (5) What proportion of the current school role at Taobh na Pairce live within the following distances of each of the four options for GME secondary, James Gillespies High School, and the temporary Darroch site, broken down by school year:

(a) less than 1km

(b) between 1km and 3km

(c) greater than 3km

Answer (5) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (6) The current informal consultation on GME secondary states that, in the short term, "Darroch would be the Gaelic Secondary with curriculum support from the surrounding Secondary Schools" (p.17).

(a) Which surrounding schools are being considered for curriculum support?

(b) Would a statutory consultation be required to change the curriculum support away from James Gillespies High School?

(c) What is the anticipated pupil capacity of Darroch during this period?

(d) When does the council expect that Darroch will exceed the capacity outlined in answer to c) above?

Answer

- (6)** (a) Support from surrounding schools will depend on capacity available in different subject areas, if pupils are to join classes physically. Closest schools are Tynecastle, Boroughmuir and St. Thomas'. Boroughmuir already has capacity issues. Use of digital resource and Esgoil will enable ease of access to a wide range of subjects and levels.
- (b) No. Curriculum support means taking subjects in another school if they have availability. This practice already happens.
- (c) The overall capacity of James Gillespie's High School is estimated to be 1850 once the Darroch Annexe is operational although further work on timetabling and use of the facility requires to be completed with the school to finalise
- (d) The current school roll projections suggest this will be exceeded in 2025.