

Item no 10.1

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

In the CEC news release of 22nd February for the recent consultation around retaining Spaces for People measures, the Transport and Environment Convener said: "*We've had encouragement from the Scottish Government to consider turning the most useful of these schemes into permanent infrastructure to help further support walking, wheeling and cycling.*"

Question (1) In what ways and to what extent has the Scottish Government directly encouraged CEC to retain the Spaces for People measures in the way they have been implemented in Edinburgh?

Answer (1) Early in the Spaces for People rollout it became clear that new active travel infrastructure delivered through SfP could potentially benefit the longer term achievement of sustainable transport and net zero carbon goals, shared by many local authorities across Scotland.

In July 2020 the Cabinet Secretary for Transport, Infrastructure and Connectivity said: "The steps local authorities have taken in our towns and cities have been ambitious and widely welcomed – and I'm confident will re-energise demand for permanent active travel infrastructure as we think collectively about Scotland's green recovery. To support this, we will continue to provide funding through our Places for Everyone initiative for high quality permanent infrastructure and place-making".

Retention of such schemes is reflected in the Scottish Government's Strategic Transport Projects Review 2, which states that making successful Spaces for People schemes permanent is the next key step in creating a change to the way road space is allocated and supporting active travel.

Question (2) How is the Scottish Government defining what should be classed as a successful or useful scheme and therefore potentially eligible for funding for permanency?

Answer

- (2)** In the Route Map to Permanence, published as a guide to local authorities who have implemented SfP, there are several points suggested on what would make a temporary scheme suitable for retention. These include the impact, positive or negative, on walking, wheeling, cycling, business, public transport, disabled persons; the evidence base; levels of public and political support; the related TRO and funding positions; and does it form part of a coherent and/or strategic network to support walking, wheeling and cycling.

There is a report scheduled for the June Transport and Environment Committee which will provide a detailed response on these and other considerations, before any decision is made about retention of temporary schemes.

Officers will work with the Places for Everyone funding requirements, where required.

Item no 10.2

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 29 April 2021**

Question

- (1) In Financial year 2019/20:
- (a) What income came into CEC via or from Sustrans and what was that for?
 - (b) What was the total CEC paid to Sustrans and what services was that for? eg design of schemes, Commonplace tool, procurement support, research, infrastructure etc?

Answer

- (1) (a) 2019/20 Sustrans Income by Project

| | |
|---|-----------|
| A8 Glasgow Road - Proposed 40mph speed limit | 122,576 |
| Arboretum Place | 15,696 |
| Calton Road | 11,992 |
| CCWEL | 308,476 |
| Davidson Mains Park - Walking and Cycling Improvements | 157,108 |
| Dropped kerb programme and active travel crossing improvements | 11,258 |
| Edinburgh City Centre Transformation | 1,079,057 |
| Edinburgh Street Design Guidance | 45,368 |
| Edinburgh SUDS Design Guidance | 53,000 |
| Leith Walk to Ocean Terminal | 31,753 |
| Maybury Road and junctions Feasibility Study | 15,000 |
| Meadows to Canal | 53,496 |
| Meadows to George Street | 241,704 |
| Newcraighall/QMU Lighting Project | 3,000 |
| Niddrie Burn Footbridge and Cycle Path Construction | 86,474 |
| Online active travel cycle/pedestrian data counter database and analysis tool | 26,090 |
| Quiet Route 13 - Lower Granton Road Shared Path | 645,246 |
| Quiet Route 5 - Holyrood Park | 4,014 |
| Quiet Route 61 - Niddrie to Gilmerton | 7,751 |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Quiet Route 8 - Balgreen Crossing improvements and path upgrades | 19,500 |
| Quiet Route 8 - Balgreen Road, Roseburn Park and Stenhouse Drive | 67,620 |
| Quiet Route 9 - Corstorphine to The Gyle | 7,115 |
| Ratho Canal Bridge Project | 119,580 |
| Roseburn to Union Canal cycle and walking Link | 60,655 |
| Saughton Park - Installation of people and bike counters | 18,902 |
| St Leonards to Holyrood Drive and Canongate | 15,321 |
| The West Edinburgh Active Travel Network | 236,012 |
| Quiet Route 6 | 9,673 |
| On-Street Secure Cycle Parking, Storage and Racks | 57,640 |
| Total | 3,531,077 |

(b) Total Paid to Sustrans 2019/20

| Project | Amount |
|---|---------------|
| Bike Life 2019 | 15,000 |
| Equipment - (inc. Bikes and Trailers Support to Businesses) | 508 |
| Staff Costs | 47,470 |
| Grand Total | 62,978 |

Question

(2) In Financial year 2020/21:

- (a) What income came into CEC via or from Sustrans and what was that for?
- (b) What was the total CEC paid to Sustrans and what services was that for? eg design of schemes, Commonplace tool procurement support, research, infrastructure etc?
- (c) Specifically, how much was Sustrans paid to design
 - i) the scheme for Slateford, Longstone, Murrayburn and Lanark Roads and
 - ii) the proposals for Braid Road?

Answer

(2) (a) 2020/21 Sustrans Income by Project

| Project | Total |
|--|------------------|
| CCWEL | 818,407 |
| Creating Safe Walking and Cycling Spaces in Edinburgh | 822,170 |
| Davidson Mains Park - Walking and Cycling Improvements | 48,135 |
| Dropped kerb programme and active travel crossing improvements | 30,096 |
| Edinburgh City Centre Transformation | 396,384 |
| Edinburgh Street Design Guidance | 49,024 |
| Follow On From Braidburn Terrace | 32,740 |
| Follow On From Dundee Street / Fountainbridge | 8,804 |
| Follow On From Gogarstone Road to Middle Norton | 17,580 |
| Follow On From Innocent Path Lighting | 562 |
| Follow On From Maybury Road and junctions Feasibility Study | 44,725 |
| Follow On From Morrison Street | 43,082 |
| Follow On From one way streets, exemptions for cyclists | 31,228 |
| Follow On From Pennywell and Muirhouse Regeneration Key Cycle Link | 48,229 |
| Follow On From St Leonards to Holyrood Drive and Canongate | 43,616 |
| George Street & First New Town and Leith Connections | 106,249 |
| Meadows to Canal | 80,151 |
| Meadows to George Street | 680,614 |
| Niddrie Burn Footbridge and Cycle Path Construction | 29,623 |
| Open Streets Edinburgh (Follow on from Edinburgh City Centre Transformation) | 170,694 |
| Powderhall Railway Line | 3,405 |
| Quiet Route 13 - Lower Granton Road Shared Path | 28,429 |
| Quiet Route 30 -Follow On From Holyrood Park Road to Ratcliffe Terrace | 30,100 |
| Quiet Route 5 - Holyrood Park | 34,128 |
| Quiet Route 61 - Niddrie to Gilmerton | 64,843 |
| Quiet Route 8 - Balgreen Road, Roseburn Park and Stenhouse Drive | 38,105 |
| Quiet Route 8 - Follow On From Cultins Road Cycleway | 142 |
| Quiet Route 9 - Follow On From Corstorphine to The Gyle | 56,631 |
| Ratho Canal Bridge Project | 49,970 |
| Roseburn to Union Canal cycle and walking Link | 464,195 |
| The West Edinburgh Active Travel Network | 388,454 |
| Edinburgh City Centre Transformation | 84,111 |
| Davidsons Mains Park - Walking and Cycling Improvements Phase 2 | 42,592 |
| Quiet Route 6 | 83,407 |
| On-Street Secure Cycle Parking, Storage and Racks | 312,422 |
| Grand Total | 5,183,047 |

In addition to the above, a further £2.688m for Spaces for People and £3.524m for Places for Everyone Active Travel projects accrued in 2020/21 Accounts, with funding anticipated by June 2021.

(b)

| Project | Amount |
|---|----------------|
| Cycling Initiatives in Schools | 21,000 |
| Equipment - (inc. Bikes and Trailers Support to Businesses) | 10,205 |
| Staff Costs (for 2019/20) | 53,980 |
| Officers time on route signage | 7,500 |
| Grand Total | £92,685 |

(c) (i) £nil paid to Sustrans for this work

(ii) £nil paid to Sustrans for this work

Question

(3) In Financial year 2021/2022:

- (a) What is the projected income for CEC via or from Sustrans?
- (b) What is the projected expenditure by CEC to Sustrans, including detail of any contracted projects?

Answer

(3) (a) 2021/22 Projected Income (including 20/21 accruals)

| Project | Projected Claim |
|--|------------------------|
| City Centre West to East Link | £5,961,004 |
| West Edinburgh Link | £1,180,048 |
| Roseburn Path – Union Canal | £108,000 |
| Meadows to George Street | £508,452 |
| Rest of Active Travel Investment Programme | £4,879,454 |
| Spaces for People | £2,688,638 |
| Total Income | £15,325,596 |

At present we expect the cost of two embedded officers and 60 days of signage support costing £59,500 to CEC in 2021/22, although this is subject to final confirmation.

Item no 10.3

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Across the city temporary measures to aid social distancing in response to the public health emergency were installed without substantive consultation resulting in poor awareness until there local installation.

Question (1) Which schemes have subsequently had retrospective safety audits completed?

Answer (1) Table 1 provides a summary of Roads Safety Audits - completed, in progress and planned for Spaces for People schemes.

Table 2 provides details of the position for each scheme. There are four recorded as Not Applicable (N/A) - these relate to schemes which are road closures and therefore a Road Safety Audit is not required.

Question (2) Where can the public access these reports?

Answer (2) Individual Road Safety Audits are not currently publicly available. Due to limited resource availability and project pace limited technical documents are due to be made publicly available (completion drawings in progress).

Question (3) Who was contracted to carry out the Safety Audits?

Answer (3) To date Aecom Ltd have undertaken most of the Road Safety Audits.

Table 1

| | City Centre | Town Centre | Travelling Safely | Spaces for Exercise | Common place | Schools | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|-------|
| Completed | 7 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 37 |
| In Progress | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| Planned | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

Table 2

| Scheme Name | Roads Safety Audits |
|--|---|
| CITY CENTRE (CC) | |
| Cockburn Street | Completed by Aecom |
| Forest Road | Completed by Aecom |
| George IV Bridge | Completed by Aecom |
| The Mound | Completed by Aecom |
| Princes Street East End | Completed by Aecom |
| Victoria Street | Completed by Aecom |
| Waverley Bridge | Completed by Aecom |
| | |
| TOWN CENTRES (TC) | |
| Bruntsfield | Completed by Aecom |
| Corstorphine | Completed by Aecom |
| Gorgie / Dalry Road | Completed by Aecom |
| Morningside | Completed by Aecom |
| Portobello | Completed by Aecom |
| Queensferry High Street | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits |
| Stockbridge | Completed by Aecom |
| Tollcross | Completed by Aecom |
| | |
| TRAVELLING SAFELY (TS) | |
| A1 Corridor | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits |
| A90 Queensferry Road | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits |
| Buccleuch St | Completed by Aecom |
| Causewayside | Completed by Aecom |
| Comiston Road | Completed by Aecom |
| Corstorphine High Street | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Craigmillar Park corridor | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Crewe Road South (Initial) | Completed by Council Officers |
| Crewe Road South (revised scheme with segregation units) | Completed by Aecom |
| Drum Brae and Craigs Road | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Duddingston Road | Completed by Aecom |
| Ferry Road | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Fountainbridge Dundee St | Completed by Aecom |
| Gilmerton Road | Completed by Aecom |
| Lanark/Inglis Green /Longstone Road | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits |
| Mayfield Road | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Meadowplace Road | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits |
| Old Dalkeith Road (Initial) | Completed by Council officers |

| | |
|---|--|
| Old Dalkeith Road (revised scheme with segregation units) | Completed by Aecom |
| Comely Bank Roundabout | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Pennywell Road & Silverknowes Parkway | Completed by Aecom |
| Quiet Corridor - Meadows / Greenbank | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits |
| Slateford Road (A70) | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits |
| | |
| SPACES FOR EXERCISE (SfE) | |
| Arboretum Place | Completed by Aecom |
| Braidburn Terrace | N/A – Road Closure |
| Braid Road | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Cammo Walk | N/A – Road Closure |
| Kings Place | Completed by Aecom |
| Links Gardens | N/A – Road Closure |
| Maybury Road | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits (Revision planned following engagement from Police Scotland) |
| Seafield Street | Completed by Aecom |
| Silverknowes Road (North section) | Completed by Aecom |
| Silverknowes Road (South section) | Completed by Aecom |
| Stanley Street/ Hope Lane | N/A |
| West Shore Road | Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits by Sweco |
| | |
| Public Proposals – Commonplace (CP) | |
| Broughton Street | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Duddingston Road West | Road Safety Audit in progress |
| Fillyside Road | Not installed yet |
| Restalrig Road South (Smoky Brae) | Scheme on hold |
| Starbank Road | Not installed yet |
| | |
| Schools (Schs) | |
| Preston Street Primary | Completed by Aecom |
| Prestonfield Primary | Completed by Aecom |
| Victoria Primary | Completed by Aecom |
| South Morningside Primary | Completed by Aecom |
| Corstorphine Primary | Completed by Aecom |
| Craiglockhart Primary | Completed by Aecom |
| Murrayburn Primary | Completed by Aecom |

Item no 10.4

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question (1) Since the installation of the various temporary Spaces for People schemes across the city intended to aid with social distancing during the Covid 19 Pandemic how many personal injury or accident claims have been made against the Council?

- a) In total.
- b) By scheme.

Answer (1) a) There have been five claims in total
b) There has been one each from the following schemes: Dalry Road, Buckstone Terrace, Princes Street, Morningside Road and Pennywell Road.

Question (2) What has been the outcome of these claims?

- a) Number of successful claims.
- b) Total Payments / Compensation if applicable.

Answer (2) All of the claims are still open at present.

Item no 10.5

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question

The Convener will be aware of the significant issues many residents face with regard to the lack of provision of public toilet facilities in some of our most popular parks and green spaces, including, but not limited to, Leith Links, Inverleith Park and the Meadows. Already, as Covid restrictions ease, these areas have seen large numbers of people gathering to eat and drink outdoors and this is likely to increase as we enter the summer months.

Given the Council does not have the resources to construct and open public toilets in these areas would the Convener consider putting out to tender the license of the commercial provision on temporary toilet facilities, operating on a commercial basis, in these most popular and thus problematic, outdoor areas?

Answer

As agreed at the Transport and Environment Committee on 22 April, an additional £450,000 will be allocated, subject to approval by Full Council or by the Chief Executive under urgency powers, towards providing additional toilets in key locations this summer. The Council will seek to hire additional facilities where required.

Item no 10.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question

Elected members face questions from constituents about *Spaces for People* schemes in respect of their own wards, but also other parts of the city in which constituents work or visit. There are around 120 schemes presenting a burden on both council officers and councillors in responding to individual queries. While some information is currently available on the Council website, can the Convener commit to investigating the provision of additional information for each *Spaces for People* scheme including all key documents, for example:

- final plans,
- integrated impact assessments,
- design risk assessments,
- completed safety audit

in order to allow easy access by councillors, their support staff and members of the public with a view to improving transparency, increasing efficiency and reducing workloads for all?

Answer

Due to the urgent and temporary nature of the current Spaces for People Programme it has not been possible to create a public facing data platform which includes all of the requested information. The Spaces for People section of the Council Website includes a number of published scheme plans and others will be added when available. Individual technical documents can also be provided if requested.

The overall Programme Integrated Impact Assessment is currently on the Council [website](#).

Item no 10.7

QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 29 April 2021**

The Council is responsible for maintaining thousands of gullies across the city. In March this year the Council had only two gulley cleaning vehicles with three new vehicles on order.

Question (1) How many gully issues are currently shown as outstanding on the Council's online reporting system per ward?

Answer (1) These figures are provided in Table 1 below, which clearly indicate that only 3% of the almost 60,000 gullies in Edinburgh are currently the subject of outstanding enquiries.

As is also made clear in the notes to the table there may be some instances of double counting when reports are not specific to an individual gully.

Question (2) How many of those gully issues have been outstanding for more than one month, more than three months and more than six months analysed per ward?

Answer (2) Table 1 provides this information.

Question (3) When might it be reasonable to expect that the backlog will be eliminated and all the outstanding issues identified at 2) above cleared?

Answer (3) The lifecycle of a gully issue can vary greatly in terms of complexity and timescale and depends on the cause of the issue. There is no standard time to fix an enquiry - some can be fixed in a day and some can take months to resolve. It should also be noted that on some occasions it is not the responsibility of the Council to do so, depending on the nature of the problem.

The Road Operations team prioritise gully issues which are affecting property and/or creating road safety issues first.

They also attempt to co-ordinate these enquiries with our cyclical maintenance programme.

There will always be work in progress because as current enquiries are completed new ones arise and the overall figure fluctuates in line with the weather and available resources. It is therefore not realistic to reference 'eliminating a backlog' but recognition is necessary of the ongoing nature of this work and Council responsibility.

For reference, on average in the seven months prior to the onset of the severe winter weather (Jun 2020 – Dec 2020 inclusive), 762 enquiries per month were closed.

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Question | (4) What are the operational performance targets for gully cleaning? |
| Answer | (4) The operational target is to undertake a fully cyclical maintenance of the city's gullies on a two-year cycle. |

Table 1 – Outstanding Gully Enquiries

| Ward | Less than 1 month | 1month - 3month | 3 month - 6 month | > 6month | Total No. Enquiries Outstanding | % of total gullies |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Ward 1 | 31 | 64 | 45 | 24 | 164 | 0.28% |
| Ward 2 | 10 | 32 | 19 | 31 | 92 | 0.15% |
| Ward 3 | 11 | 23 | 41 | 15 | 90 | 0.15% |
| Ward 4 | 6 | 13 | 23 | 14 | 56 | 0.09% |
| Ward 5 | 18 | 32 | 39 | 30 | 119 | 0.20% |
| Ward 6 | 5 | 42 | 33 | 32 | 112 | 0.19% |
| Ward 7 | 7 | 41 | 30 | 13 | 91 | 0.15% |
| Ward 8 | 11 | 24 | 13 | 15 | 63 | 0.11% |
| Ward 9 | 13 | 37 | 22 | 31 | 103 | 0.17% |
| Ward 10 | 25 | 103 | 95 | 79 | 302 | 0.51% |
| Ward 11 | 24 | 25 | 37 | 15 | 101 | 0.17% |
| Ward 12 | 4 | 24 | 15 | 28 | 71 | 0.12% |
| Ward 13 | 5 | 33 | 22 | 15 | 75 | 0.13% |
| Ward 14 | 10 | 13 | 33 | 14 | 70 | 0.12% |
| Ward 15 | 21 | 67 | 66 | 36 | 190 | 0.32% |
| Ward 16 | 10 | 69 | 45 | 14 | 138 | 0.23% |
| Ward 17 | 7 | 26 | 30 | 12 | 75 | 0.13% |
| Total | | | | | 1,912 | |
| Total Gullies in Edinburgh | | | | | 59,413 | |
| % of Total | | | | | 3% | |

Please note – the actual numbers are expected to be less than noted above. This is because there will be instances of double counting where customers have not selected specific gullies to report against. It is not possible to automatically identify the number which are double counted as the customer has not specified an asset that the system can identify as unique.

Item no 10.8

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 29 April 2021

- Question** (1) How much has the Council received, net of costs, from the sale of public conveniences over the past ten years?
- Answer** (1) Total net receipts are £1,334,717
- Question** (2) How much has the Council spent on the modernisation or refurbishment of public conveniences over the past ten years?
- Answer** (2) £678,242
- Question** (3) How much does the Council intend to spend in total on the modernisation or refurbishment of public conveniences over the current year 2021/22 and, in particular, on the facilities at Bruntsfield Links, Meadows (East) and Middle Meadow Walk?
- Answer** (3) There are currently no funded plans to refurbish these toilets. However, the [Future Provision of Public Conveniences](#) was considered at 22 April 2021 Transport and Environment Committee

Item no 10.9

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

On Friday 9th April the guardrails at the Blackhall Dip were removed with no warning, this was not part of the consulted A90 Spaces for People scheme but done by the team charged with “decluttering”.

Question (1) If the guardrail needed to be removed why was their removal not considered as part of the original scheme and removed instead with no consultation?

Answer (1) The Spaces for People programme includes a workstream dedicated to the removal of street clutter which is being progressed in consultation with Living Streets. Due to the urgent nature of the programme full consideration to the removal of street clutter could not always be provided. However, the programme has enabled a review of measures to improve pedestrian movement in line with the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance.

Question (2) In many schemes guardrail removal was considered as part of the Spaces for People Schemes. Who decides on whether this is considered or not?

Answer (2) The lead officer for the measures should consider street clutter removal as part of the process but as mentioned above, this was not always possible.

Question (3) How is such a decision made?

Answer (3) The process follows the protocol adopted in 2012 and is in line with the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance. As part of guidance, the decluttering of streets should be considered when carrying out work on the network.

Item no 10.10

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question (1) Are holders of an NHS Scotland Face Coverings Exemption card exempt from wearing face coverings in all Council settings?

Answer (1) Schools and Lifelong Learning follow Scottish Government and Health Protection advice. In-line with this, all holders of an NHS Scotland Face Coverings Exemption card would be exempt from wearing face coverings in all Council settings.

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-public-use-of-face-coverings/pages/face-covering-exemptions/>

Question (2) Following an enquiry from a constituent in early March, I understand the Children and Families were reminded that if a student is exempt then they need not wear a mask. Would the Convener agree?

Answer (2) Schools and Lifelong Learning follow Scottish Government and Health Protection advice with regards to the response to managing Covid-19 in schools.

Where required face coverings should be worn, if staff or pupils are exempt, they do not need to wear a face covering.

The link to guidance is provided below.

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-on-reducing-the-risks-in-schools/>

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-public-use-of-face-coverings/pages/face-covering-exemptions/>

- Question** (3) Despite this, a story appeared in Scotland on Sunday on 3 April alleging several exempt students had been excluded from a City of Edinburgh school classroom for failing to wear a face covering. Can the Convener comment on the accuracy of this media report? If true, has an apology been given to any students wrongly excluded from class?
- Answer** (3) Parents, pupils and Head Teachers have resolved this.
- Questions** (4) Has it been made clear to all Head Teachers that students exempt from wearing face coverings must not be discriminated against?
- Answer** (4) Head Teachers were made aware of this on 08.03.2021 and 29.03.2021. A Bite size training was also provided to all staff on face masks / face coverings.

Item no 10.11

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question (1) What are the normal office locations of those responsible for designing Edinburgh Spaces for People schemes?

Answer (1) The lead officers for all of the Spaces for People schemes are based in Edinburgh. All except three schemes were designed in Edinburgh.

Question (2) Are press reports accurate that some schemes were designed by London based individuals?

Answer (2) All the Spaces for People measures have a Council officer with responsibility for developing schemes in line with agreed objectives, providing a design brief to the designers so plans can be produced using computer-aided design and drafting software (AutoCAD). Only three schemes out of 54 had plans produced on AutoCAD by London based designers. These designs were then subject to detailed consideration by Council officers.

Question (3) Did any individuals involved in designing an Edinburgh Spaces for People schemes that were not based within this Council boundary, make site visits to the scheme they were responsible for designing? Please list these schemes.

Answer (3) The designers for the three schemes who are not based in Edinburgh were provided with a design brief including concept design and purpose and did not make site visits to the scheme. However, the lead officer for each scheme is based in Edinburgh and therefore could and did make site visits and remained in constant communication with the designer. The three schemes were: Slateford Road, Greenbank to Meadows and Lanark Road/Inglis Green Road and Longstone Road.

Questions (4) Which Spaces for People schemes were designed without the designers making any site visits?

Answer

- (4)** See answer 3. However, it is important to stress that the lead officer for the scheme and other officers know these sites well, visited them on many occasions and liaised closely with the designers.

Item no 10.12

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question (1) What percentage of Edinburgh's public path network has path lighting?

Answer (1) Within the Council's GIS System, the footpath network is measured in kilometres and the street lights are recorded as data points. It is therefore not possible to identify the length of footpath that is lit, without individually checking each section of footpath, which would take some time and would be highly resource intensive.

Question (2) What plans exist to increase this percentage?

Answer (2) Under Section 35 of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, a local roads authority shall provide and maintain lighting for roads, or proposed roads, which are, or will be, maintainable by them and which in their opinion ought to be lit. This includes the provision and maintenance of lighting on footpaths.

There are no plans to increase the existing lighting coverage by installing street lighting on roads that are currently adopted by the Council and are unlit. This is in line with one of the three priorities in the Council's Business Plan "becoming sustainable and net zero city".

Item no 10.13

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

On Thursday 11th March a question was submitted about the feedback and responses from residents and stakeholders to the Queensferry Road/A90 scheme.

The response to part four of the question said “It is hoped that the summary of feedback will [be] circulated by the end of the week.”

Over five weeks later, and having enquired about this with the Convener and officials on 29th March, could the Convener please confirm:

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Question | (1) Why this information has not yet been forthcoming? |
| Answer | (1) Due to competing priorities there has been a delay in finalising the assessment feedback form. |
| Question | (2) When the feedback on the scheme will be circulated to councillors, transport spokespeople, and stakeholders? |
| Answer | (2) Officers have committed that the Assessment Feedback Form will be circulated ahead of Full Council on 29 April 2021. |

Item no 10.14

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Louise Young for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 29 April 2021**

With regard to the number of registrations for a garden waste permit can the following numbers be provided for the last 3 registration periods:

Question (1) What quantity and % of eligible households have registered for a garden waste permit?

Answer (1) At the introduction of the charge in 2018, the garden waste service opened to all residents within Edinburgh. However, before the charge was introduced approximately 124,000 households received a garden waste collection service.

The business case for the introduction of the charge predicted that 46% of these 124,000 households (with an assumption of 1 bin each) would opt-in to the chargeable service.

In 2018/19 (year 1) there were 68,841 households registered for 74,879 bins (60% of original bins).

In 2019/20 (year 2) this rose to 72,133 households registered for 79,496 bins (64% of original bins; and 6% increase from previous year).

In 2020/21 (year 3) this increased further to 74,539 households registered for 82,355 bins (66% of original bins; and 4% increase from previous year).

Question (2) Of that total registrations, how many were renewals and how many were new households?

Answer

(2) Of the properties registered for the garden waste service since the charge was introduced:

4% were for year 1 only

3% were for year 2 only

9% were for year 3 only

5% were for year 1 and 2 but not year 3

6% were for year 1 and 3 but not year 2

9% were for year 2 and 3 but not year 1

65% were for all years - 1, 2 and 3

In total, this means around 89% of properties that have registered for the service since the charge was introduced are current year 3 customers.

These figures relate to the property that was registered and not the person registering as it could be a different person in the household (or friend/family member) doing this each year. This means that these figures will not factor in where someone has registered for multiple years but moved to a new house; these would appear as two separate properties.

Question

(3) How many / what % of permit holders did not renew?

Answer

(3) See response to question 2. On this basis, around 11-12% of properties that have registered for the service since the charge was introduced are not currently registered for the service in year 3.

Question

(4) How many complaints have been received from residents who had a permit but missed the renewal period and are now not covered by the service?

Answer

- (4) Unfortunately, due to processes and the way in which enquiries, requests and complaints are categorised, it is not possible to provide this information.

If a customer has an enquiry that the Council's Contact Centre is able to answer at the first contact, this is done without the enquiry being logged and sent to the service.

When an enquiry or complaint is logged, those relating to enquiries or complaints about missing a registration window; wanting to join the service outside of the registration window (for example, recently moved into Edinburgh); issues with registering; questions about registering/the service; changes to contact details etc are categorised together on the system.

Questions

- (5) Of those complaints, how many / what % are from senior residents aged 65 or over (or if DOB data not known, but other data available which would indicate senior age)?

Answer

- (5) The Council does not capture or have access to any data that would indicate someone's age other than if this is stated within the customer's enquiry therefore it is not possible to provide this information.

Item no 10.15

QUESTION NO 15

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question (1) Given we have an SNP led Council Administration can the Convener confirm what plans have been progressed for a standalone GME secondary school in central Edinburgh?

Answer (1) Given we are in the middle of an election we are not in position to clarify if there has been a change in the national strategy. When a new administration is formed in Holyrood we will clarify if there is likely to be a change in the national plan to develop Gaelic which will affect the council's proposal.

Question (2) Does the Convener agree that a central location is necessary?

Answer (2) It should be acknowledged that presently pupils from Taobh na Pairce attend James Gillespies High school which could not be considered to be in 'central Edinburgh'. To my knowledge this has not been seen as a barrier for parents sending their children to Taobh na Pairce. It should also be noted there is a section in the report that outlines how a sustainable travel strategy can be achieved using the Liberton site.

Question (3) Is the Convener aware of the new national strategic approach?

Answer (3) Discussions on the proposed site have taken place over a two-year period. The Scottish Government has been closely involved in these discussions and at no time have they indicated that the plan to site a new dedicated Gaelic secondary school on a shared learning campus at Liberton was against the national strategy for the expansion of Gaelic in Scotland.

Item no 10.16

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question

Could the Leader detail what meetings have been had with members of the Hospitality and Retail industries in the city to develop a plan for their recovery and when any plan developed will be shared with Committees and Councillors?

Answer

There have been extensive meetings and discussions with representatives from the Hospitality and Retail sectors in the city, including Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), Traders Associations (old and new), Scottish Hospitality Group and individual businesses. These discussions have been through the Economic Advisory Panel, ETAG's Strategic Implementation Group (both of which cover representatives across FSB, Chamber of Commerce, Essential Edinburgh and other members from the retail sector) and a host of other direct meetings between local businesses and officers as well as myself as Council Leader, The Deputy Leader and Convenor and Vice Convenor of the Housing Homelessness and Fair Work Committee and others. Discussions have been focused on the support available from the Council and some of the actions already implemented include the commitment to simplify the planning application process for outdoor structures and to suspend charges for tables and chairs as well as forward planning with a specific focus on the City Centre.

Some output has already been to Councillors for approval, information and scrutiny, such as the Council's continuing support for the Forever Edinburgh campaign, which is focused on supporting retail and hospitality as well as tourism. The campaign is encouraging all businesses to sign up and become part of 'team Forever Edinburgh'. A business briefing was well-received on 21 April ahead of the relaunch of the campaign which took place on 22 April.

This engagement has been extremely useful and I'm very grateful to businesses for their engagement.

I note Cllr Mowat still refuses to accept that she made comments at October's Council meeting which falsely attributed comments to me in relation to these meetings. As the convener of the committee responsible for Governance within the Council, and as a longstanding councillor who is well aware of the importance of upholding standards of conduct in public office, it is particularly disappointing that Cllr Mowat is yet to withdraw this false and unsubstantiated allegation or to apologise for making the accusation. I would, again, ask Councillor Mowat to withdraw and apologise.

In addition to meetings with businesses as Council leader I also sit on the Scottish Government's National City Centre Task Force along with other City leaders and the Cabinet Secretary to establish a coordinated approach to support the City centre. This is now actively working across 4 cross-cutting themes to support our City centre and major city centres across Scotland. Actions requiring Council approval from that work will come back to Council/Committee, actions under delegated authority will be progressed with urgency.

The revised Economy Strategy, taking account of the engagement and feedback from businesses and business representatives will go to Policy and Sustainability Committee in June.

Item no 10.17

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

The West End of the City Centre has seen two significant interventions on the road network – the introduction of the tram which led to the closure of Shandwick Place and the current proposals for the introduction of the City Centre West to East Link a significant new cycle route across the City Centre. Promised assessments on changes in traffic routes and volumes have not been carried out, nor has the third tram TRO been brought forward which was to have addressed changes in vehicular traffic patterns caused by changes to the road network. With another change to the road network in this area residents are concerned about further impacts which may displace additional traffic onto streets which are almost exclusively residential, and indeed are becoming more so as more properties are converted from business use into residential use.

- Question** (1) Could the Convener confirm what work was carried out as part of planning for CCWEL on traffic diversions and displacement.
- Answer** (1) As noted in the Council's submission to the Public Hearing on the legal orders for the West End section of CCWEL, extensive traffic modelling of the proposed route has been undertaken. The modelling concluded that "a 'QuietRoutes' compatible cycle route can be created through the city centre with only minor impacts on buses, trams and general traffic".
- Question** (2) What traffic counts have been carried out to enable comparisons to be carried out pre and post CCWEL construction.

Answer

- (2) A number of counts have been carried out to date as part of a package of before and after monitoring looking at a range of impacts of CCWEL. Two separate runs of counts were carried out in 2018. The first focussing on 'The Crescents' between Haymarket Terrace and Palmerston Place at the following junctions:

Magdala Crescent/ Haymarket Terrace
Coates Gardens/ Haymarket Terrace
Roseberry Crescent/ Haymarket Terrace
Grosvenor St/ Haymarket Terrace
Douglas Crescent/ Palmerston Place
Glencairn Crescent/ Palmerston Place
Grosvenor Crescent/ Palmerston Place

The second in order to inform our detailed traffic signals designs at the following locations:

Roseburn Terrace/Russell Road
Haymarket Terrace/Haymarket Yards
Shandwick Place/ Canning St/ Coates Crescent (Atholl Crescent/ Stafford St)
Queensferry Street/ Randolph Place
Charlotte Square/ Rose Street
Charlotte Square/ George Street
Charlotte Square/ Young Street
St Andrew Square/ George Street
Queen Street/ North St David Street
York Place/ North St Andrew Street
St Andrew Square / North St Andrew Street

Finally, in 2020 early autumn counts were carried out at the following locations:

Streets

Ellersley Road
Murrayfield Road
Corstorphine Road
Roseburn Terrace
Coltbridge Terrace
Henderland Road
Roseburn Place
Chester Street

Junctions

Roseburn Street / Russell Road
Magdala Crescent / Haymarket Terrace
Randolph Place / Queensferry Street / Melville Street

Junctions with queue lengths

Murrayfield Avenue / Roseburn Terrace / Corstorphine Road

Roseburn Terrace / Roseburn Street

Haymarket Junction

Charlotte Square / George Street

St Andrew Square / George Street

Question (3) Whether monitoring of traffic displacement has been carried out as part of the planning work.

Answer (3) The counts and modelling that have been carried out will enable an assessment to be made of traffic displacement.

Question (4) Are there plans in place to review the cumulative effects of post tram traffic displacement and CCWEL construction so as to protect the residential environment of the West End – to be taken as the area bounded by Magdala and Douglas Crescent's in the west, Haymarket Terrace to West Maitland Street and Shandwick Place to the south, Queensferry Street to the east and Belford Road from its junction with Douglas Gardens to the north?

Answer (4) During construction of CCWEL there will be a need for localised traffic diversions that may have temporary impacts on residential amenity. As with other construction projects, consideration will be given to any interactions between CCWEL construction and other projects including tram with a view to avoiding excessive impacts.

Item no 10.18

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Barrie for answer by the Convener of the Regulatory Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Council notes the recent announcement that permit fees are being waved for outdoor bars in Edinburgh

<https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/news/article/13144/helping-restaurants-and-cafes-make-the-most-of-outdoor-space-safely-when-restrictions-ease>

Council further notes that Walking Tours are low carbon when compared to motorised sightseeing in the city, are low impact sustainable experiences boosting the wellbeing of visitors, staff teams and residents. Often run by local family business, some are Living Wage employers and CEC rate payers. Council also notes that responsible Walking Tour companies mirror CEC Green City and Fair Work objectives and that their businesses have been just as heavily hit by COVID restrictions as Licensed Premises.

Question (1) What support is being made available by CEC to walking tours to 'get businesses back on their feet' and will their licensing fees be similarly waived or discounted?

Answer (1) The majority of walking tours do not require a licence under the current provisions of the relevant licensing legislation, as either payment is made on-line or the tour is free of charge and relies on tips.

Walking tours are encouraged to engage with and participate in the Forever Edinburgh recovery campaign. They have also had access to similar financial support as other businesses, in particular the discretionary fund in the event that they were ineligible for the Visit Scotland tour guide fund.

If walking tours can evidence income drop as an eligible business, they would also have been eligible for discretionary support funding. We are aware some walking tour guide guides qualified for the tour guide support, which was administered by Visit Scotland, businesses which received this funding would have been ineligible for additional payments through the discretionary support.

Question

(2) Will Council consider favourably allowing walking tours to apply for Outdoor Area Occupation Permits to allow them on street visibility to aid their business recovery?

Answer

(2) While the Council is taking all possible means to support business recovery, Outdoor Area Occupation Permits are specifically for businesses who want to provide tables and chairs on the pavement and therefore could not be used for the purpose of increasing on-street visibility.