

Item no 10.1

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Munro for answer by the Chair of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) When will the EHSCP provide fully costed plans that detail how the care services proposed to replace the loss of residential beds in Edinburgh are workable and affordable?

Answer (1) The business case that we provide to the EIJB sets this out in the financial and workforce planning elements. The financial model includes an allowance for reinvestment in community services and enhancement of current staffing models in our remaining care homes. If the proposals are approved, they will be implemented in a phased approach with set evaluation points to ensure there are no unintended consequences. The bed based care project is one project in a wide scale Transformation programme that aims to revolutionise the way health and social care is provided in Edinburgh in a system wide approach. A number of different projects are underway, contributing to a system wide redesign that will enable the EIJB to shift the balance of care from acute settings into the community, increase community capacity and support people to remain at home.

Question (2) Will these plans include local provision within a city wide context?

Answer (2) Yes, as detailed above there are a number of change projects underway that will, where possible, deliver health and social care services in, or as close to people's homes as possible. The proposals presented to the EIJB will increase intermediate care capacity with facilities located in the north and south of the city. Ultimately it will reduce our HBCCC capacity to be delivered in one facility in the north of the city and will reduce the number of care home beds across the city but, our managed care homes will be in both the north and south of the city. Through delivery of more community based services people will only need to access bed based services when there is no alternative.

Question (3) Will these alternate services replicate the 24 hour care currently provided by staff within Council Care Home provision and can we expect to see an increase in the use of external providers?

Answer (3) The plan sets out that the Bed Based Review is to ensure a modernisation of care provision and that we have the right kind of bed based services. Currently there are too many residential beds and not enough facilities in which to deliver more intensive support and nursing care. In terms of an increase in external care home provision, the balance of this won't change.

As before, there are a range of change activities underway that will increase community capacity, enabling us to deliver health and social care as close to people's homes as possible. Through our modernisation and system wide redesign of services we can provide care, support and choice to our citizens in the most appropriate environment to meet their needs and improve their outcomes.

Item no 10.2

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Munro for answer by
the Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

Question

Before any closures or changeovers are implemented will there be a meaningful public consultation, with comments invited from all interested parties, but particularly from residents and their families and those others that are impacted?

Answer

In the progress report submitted for the August EIJB meeting, details on the public consultation process have been provided. Consultation activity will be focussed on the wider bed based strategy and a new model of care to meet the needs of the city's residents. We are currently seeking advice on how to approach the public consultation, once received we will progress as advised.

Item no 10.3

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Munro for answer by
the Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

Question (1) As it was known as far back as 2009 that Clovenstone, Ferrylee, Ford's Road and Jewel House had been deemed not fit for purpose by the Care Inspectorate why was the £15m set aside for the building of a 60 bed care home cut from the budget in February 2021?

Answer (1) The four older care homes mentioned above are approaching their life expectancy, do not conform to design standards advised by the Care Inspectorate and are not deemed suitable to provide the kind of care required to meet future demand. Capital investment was allocated to the construction of a new facility. However, due to the current fiscal position this amount was reduced by the Council to £2m.

Question (2) The deletion of the replacement £15m for a 60 bed care home from the Capital budget strategy refers to a requirement to develop a business case "to identify a partially self-funding model to deliver this new facility, requiring a balance of £2 million". Where is this proposal, is it still to be actioned and can detail be provided?

Answer (2) The EIJB's Chief Officer and management team are working closely with officers from the Council and NHS Lothian in respect of future capital requirements.

Item no 10.4

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Munro for answer by
the Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

Question (1) Can improvements be carried out in the Care Homes which would satisfy the report recommendations to make them fit for purpose?

Answer (1) No, from the property assessment completed in 2019 and from previous assessments it was determined that it would not be value for money to refurbish, alter or extend these older properties to meet current minimum standards.

Question (2) What is the cost or estimated cost involved?

Answer (2) Further to the answer provided above, the property assessment suggested it would be even more costly to meet the City of Edinburgh Council's own design and quality criteria and therefore would not be viable.

Item no 10.5

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Munro for answer by the Chair of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) If City of Edinburgh Council intend on closing 4 care homes, where is the sense in handing over a fully functioning 60 bed residential care home for a different use by another organisation when demand for placements says otherwise?

Answer (1) The IJB is commissioning care differently and the focus of the Bed Based Review is having the right sort of care and support in the right place to meet the needs of citizens' and improve outcomes. We have too many residential care home beds, the current demand indicates that those who need care home placements have greater needs than we can provide in residential accommodation. We do not have enough intermediate care capacity and we also need to reduce and consolidate the number of HBCCC beds we have across the city. The Bed Based strategy sets out why the IJB is proposing the use of Drumbrae in this way and also why we are strengthening the model of care and support we are commissioning in the remaining care homes. The purpose of Integration is that the resources delegated to the IJB are utilised in an integrated way and it's important that the plans are seen, not as being NHS or Council but as the right integrated approach to meet the population's needs.

Question (2) When City of Edinburgh Council has paid the NHS £16 million for the purchase of Liberton Hospital, why is there no similar financial recompense from the NHS to the Council for the proposed handover over of Drumbrae?

Answer (2) See Answer 1.

Question (3) If money has changed hands, why is not being used for the build of a replacement care home?

Answer (3) Not for the IJB to answer, this question would have to be directed to NHS Lothian.

Question

(4) When did referrals to Drumbrae halt and where, when and who took this decision taken?

Answer

(4) From December 2019, Drumbrae Care Home has been subject to an Improvement notice from the Care Inspectorate which halted all admissions until progress was made to meet the improvements. This initially ran to February 2020 and then was extended until July 2020. The large scale investigation process continued throughout 2020 to ensure improvements were maintained. Also, due to the pandemic situation, care homes were closed to admissions if there were any positive cases. Throughout 2020/21, the Bed Based Review was ongoing and we deemed it morally unacceptable to admit into the care homes where the future of the home is under discussion.

Item no 10.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) What is the current status of the review of the city's bus network, as set out on page 26 of the approved City Mobility Plan?

Answer (1) The review of the city's bus network is currently at a very early stage and will need to take account of some key priorities including understanding the scale of patronage recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic; the introduction of the Bus Partnership Fund; and planned growth across the city region. This is also a key priority of the proposals for transport arms length organisation reform.

Question (2) What is the timetable for the completion of the review and subsequent report to committee?

Answer (2) There is no fixed timetable for completion of the review and reporting to Committee. This is because it is currently uncertain, particularly because it is not possible to predict how long it will be before the scale of patronage recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic is known.

Question (3) What opportunities exist for bus users, community councils and other stakeholders to contribute to the review?

Answer (3) Stakeholder engagement will be a key part of the review and, once an engagement plan has been developed, this will be shared with stakeholders.

Item no 10.7

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) How much Scottish Government funding does he expect the Council will receive as a result of the SNP's manifesto pledge to spend £60 million to refurbish all play parks?

Answer (1) City of Edinburgh Council will receive an initial allocation of £414,000 in 2021/22 (of £5m which is being released by Scottish Government in the current financial year). The funding profile for future years has not yet been confirmed.

Question (2) Will this share of funding cover all the anticipated costs of refurbishing play parks maintained by the Council?

Answer (2) The Scottish Government funding so far allocated for play parks will not be sufficient to refurbish all of the Council's play parks. However, the funding will be aligned to the Council's Parks infrastructure investment programme, alongside any thirdparty funding secured, to implement improvements in the Council's play parks in 2021/22.

Question (3) When does he expect to receive the first allocation of funding from the Scottish Government?

Answer (3) It is expected that the initial funding allocated will be received in September 2021.

Question (4) How will the first allocation of funding be prioritised?

Answer (4) As set out above, the funding will be aligned with the priorities set out in the Parks infrastructure investment programme which was presented to Culture and Communities Committee in [June 2021](#).

Item no 10.8

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) How many road gullies are on the “sensitive” list?

Answer (1) 1,402

Question (2) Where are they (broken down by ward)?

Answer (2) Please find below a table summarising the number of sensitive gullies, broken down by ward.

Ward	Number
1	95
2	49
3	12
4	19
5	86
6	95
7	40
8	128
9	86
10	193
11	65
12	81
13	19
14	65
15	133
16	86
17	150
	1,402

Question (3) What criteria are applied to meet sensitive status?

Answer (3) Sensitive gullies have been selected using historic information and, in general, are based on: areas of known flooding history; generally affect property; are generally at lower lying (double gully) areas; and/or are possibly prone to excessive silting where routine cleansing will help to alleviate flooding or the frequency of it. The decision to add sensitive gullies will be taken following investigation into the surrounding factors by the gully team, often in consultation with the flood prevention team and, on occasion, Scottish Water.

Question (4) What resourcing and prioritisation is applied to gullies on the sensitive list compared to other gullies not on the list?

Answer (4) Sensitive gullies are cleansed twice a year ahead of historic bad weather windows and leaf fall seasons (June/July and November).

Question (5) Is the sensitive list the highest priority list?

Answer (5) In terms of routine maintenance, there are only two levels of priority: standard and sensitive, sensitive is the highest priority.

Question (6) - if not - What is?

Answer (6) N/A

Question (7) Please can the questions 1,2,3,4, be applied to 6 if applicable

Answer (7) N/A

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 26 August 2021

Question

What instruction is given to waste operatives when returning empty householder bins so that the bins do not obstruct the pavement?

Answer

A toolbox talk and presentation film are used in training waste operatives on how they should return bins after emptying them. The talk and film were developed in conjunction with the Royal National Institute of the Blind and Guide Dogs Scotland.

When returning bins, operatives are encouraged to consider other pavement users, especially more vulnerable pedestrians, and to place the bins back properly at the collection points ensuring there is a clear pathway and that they are not blocking access. They are also instructed to report any presentation point issues to their Driver Crew Leader or Supervisor.

Item no 10.10

QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

'The 2021-31 Sustainable Capital Budget Strategy – Outturn 2021/21 and Revised Budget 2011/22 report, which was presented to the Finance and Resources Committee on 12th of August, states that as regards Trams to Newhaven there has been out-turn slippage of £6.577m. This slippage is partially attributed to 'utilities diversions being more onerous than forecasted'.

Question

Can the Convener advise

- Which utility diversions are proving more onerous than forecasted?
- What problems have been encountered?
- Whether she remains confident that the Trams to Newhaven project will complete, on budget, by May 2023?

Answer

The report to Finance and Resources committee reported a £6.577m underspend in year 2020/21 for the Trams to Newhaven project. This was the result of programme slippage, partially as a result of utility diversions taking longer than programmed. The most significant additional work was required to the following utilities:

- Diversion of a gas main at Jane Street, which had been diverted by the previous tram project but, when uncovered, was found to be insufficiently deep and therefore further work was required; and
- Discovery of a Victorian sewer at Constitution Street, which required a complete replacement.

From the previous tram construction project, a key lesson learned was the risk of utilities taking longer than programmed and that the potential for associated cost increases. Therefore, a significant risk allowance has been made in the current Trams to Newhaven project to ensure

that any additional costs from utilities can be accommodated within the project budget. In addition, the construction strategy, which utilises large worksites so that work can continue in different locations while difficult utility diversions are completed, has proved effective in these instances.

The project remains within budget and is working towards 'Open for Revenue' service in Spring 2023.

Item no 10.11

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

The Council's Management Rules for Public Parks and Greenspace state, amongst other things, the following:

"BBQs, Fire and Camping The following acts are prohibited:

6.1 Lighting barbecues outwith designated barbecue sites, where these are provided, or in areas or in a manner likely to burn or scorch the ground or cause danger or nuisance to other Park users or neighbouring residents.

6.2 Failing to remove litter associated with BBQs and picnics"

Despite this, a number of parks have recently been provided with barbecue disposal bins.

Can the Convener answer the following:

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Question | (1) How much did these bins cost and from which budget were they provided? |
| Answer | (1) Barbecue disposal bins have been purchased following the complete 'burn out' of a number of litter bin housing units where barbecues had been disposed of unsafely. In total, 30 bins have been purchased at a cost of £8,640. This cost has been met from the Waste and Cleansing budget. |
| Question | (2) Using the example of Leith Links what locations within the park exist where it is permitted to light a barbecue whilst remaining compliant with Rule 6.1? |
| Answer | (2) There are no dedicated barbecue locations at Leith Links. In total, there are 25 barbecue slabs on the Meadows and Bruntsfield Links and five slabs in Roseburn Park. The slab in Roseburn Park was funded by the Friends of Roseburn Park. |

Question (3) How is it envisaged that Rule 6.1 is enforced and how many times has this been undertaken in 2020 and 2021 by Council staff?

Answer (3) Park Rangers monitor, provide advice, and enforce as appropriate in line with the relevant sections of the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982. Park Rangers do not log each interaction so although incidents have been managed over the last couple of years, officers do not hold a record of these interactions.

Item no 10.12

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

Question (1) What sum has been received from UK Treasury in furlough payments in financial years 2020-21 and 2021 to date?

Answer (1) £0.986m relating to the financial year 2020-21 and £0.238m relating to 2021-22 for period to June 21. Sums stated relate to Council employees with separate claims being made through the Council's ALEOs.

Question (2) How many employees remain furloughed, both flexibly and in full?

Answer (2) 31 employees are currently furloughed, comprising 11 employees who are fully furloughed and 20 employees who are flexibly furloughed. The use of furlough has reduced significantly during August to facilitate the resumption of Cultural Services and residential services at the Lagganlia Outdoor Centre. Further significant reductions are anticipated in early September as staff prepare for the resumption of services at the Benmore Outdoor Centre on 1 October.

Item no 10.13

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Where there are proposals for interventions in relation to pedestrians (such as the subsequently refused pedestrian crossing on Lanark Road) data is gathered. In relation to the installation, adjustment and retention of cycle lanes what data gathering on cycling is planned and please can you provide details of

- (a) location and
- (b) dates of this data gathering and
- (c) which organisation(s) is/are undertaking this?

Answer

The report to the Council in June 2021 on the potential retention of Spaces for People measures indicated that the monitoring of measures will be reported to Transport and Environment Committee prior to the implementation of the associated Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs).

Item no 10.14

QUESTION NO 14

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) Can the Convener please arrange for this table from November 2020 to be updated, including any new schemes since then, showing the breakdown of Spaces for People expenditure (incurred and scheduled), broken down by project.

Answer (1) The table below is currently being updated and will be shared with Councillors as soon as possible.

Question (2) Now all the Spaces for People schemes have been completed, please also add the estimate for removing each of the schemes and carrying out any extra road repairs for any damage caused by burning the road surface and attaching bollards etc.

Answer (2) A breakdown of the cost for removing each scheme has not been prepared. However, a budget of £450,000 has been set aside for the removal of measures, if required.

Question (3) Please confirm that funding is still ringfenced and available for this as required.

Answer (3) As stated in the answer to Question 2, a budget has been set aside for the removal of measures.

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

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
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	
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	
Buccleuch 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	

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
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	
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	

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
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 & Evaluation			£175,000.00	£86,410.00	
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 10.15

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Lord Provost at a
meeting of the Council on 26 August
2021**

Standing Order 22.3 required motions and amendments to be provided to the clerk no later than 2pm on the working day before Council. In the case of June Council, motions and amendments were not published so that Members and the public could view them until after 7pm at night.

Question (1) Could the Lord Provost provide an explanation for this protracted delay?

Answer (1) 35 motions and amendments were submitted for June Council, which is much more than usual, all of which needed to be checked for competency. 27 were received the day before Council with over half after 12 noon. Following the competency check, a number required to be amended involving engagement with the relevant elected members and group business managers. Further reformatting, adding to templates and the creation of PDF files, both individually and collectively, as well as sorting the bookmarks etc. was required. That is clearly a time-consuming process and the Committee Services staff managed this as quickly as possible, whilst working remotely.

Question (2) Would the Lord Provost remind Council that Standing Orders applies to all Members?

Answer (2) Standing Orders apply to all Elected Members.

Question (3) Would it be in order for the Clerk to set out a timetable for the publishing of Motions and Amendments, and routinely include an explanation of any deviation from such a timetable?

Answer (3) Motions and Amendments are published as soon as each has been deemed competent and administrative tasks are complete. Therefore, the additional workload this question proposes being placed upon the Clerk and Committee Services is not supported.

Item no 10.16

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

The Convener will be aware of recent localised flooding events in Edinburgh.

- Question** (1) Between 1 July and 17 August, how many requests have been made to clear individual gullies on the roads of Edinburgh?
- Answer** (1) There have been 2,597 requested received to clear individual gullies.
- Question** (2) What was the average time between the request being made, and the first physical attendance to the gully?
- Answer** (2) This information is not recorded. However, the average time from Enquiry Opened to Enquiry Closed for completed enquiries was 8.05 days in the time period 1 July to 17 August.
- Question** (3) How many reports resulted in attendance to a gully that was not blocked or partially blocked?
- Answer** (3) This information is not recorded.

Item no 10.17

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

June Council's expression of unanimous dismay at the slur against Lothian Buses by SNP MSP James Dornan

Question (1) Can the leader copy the text of what he wrote to SNP MSP James Dornan following the instructions of June Council, agreed under item 8.10 (with addendum) by way of answer to this question?

Answer (1) James Dornan MSP

30th June 2021

Dear James,

I note you recently passed on an apology to Edinburgh's Transport Convenor after contacting you following the comments made in relation to action Lothian Buses took following serious violent behaviour against their employees.

These comments were also raised at our Council meeting on June 24th.

A motion was passed expressing dismay at the comments and having engaged with our bus company since, I feel a direct and public apology to the company is still merited to draw a line under this issue. I very much hope you can echo the sincere apology you issued to the Transport Convenor to the Chair of Lothian Buses.

Question (2) Can the leader copy any and all responses received as a result of him writing as instructed?

Answer

(2) On 15 Jun 2021, at 16:01, Dornan J (James), MSP
<James.Dornan.msp@parliament.scot> wrote:

Dear Mr McFarlane, I've acknowledged my comments were poorly made and that there was no intention by Lothian Buses to target Irish or Catholics, I never considered there was. Of course I regret the misunderstanding, of my own making admittedly, but the point I was intending to make, and did in other parts of my speech was the lack of attention to a significant cultural day for Irish, which would not have been the case for other culturally significant days. This is in no way only the case at Lothian Buses but throughout Scottish business as a whole.

James Dornan MSP

Sent from my iPhone

Item no 10.18

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Many vulnerable / elderly residents across the city either have no on-line access, do not feel comfortable making card payments over the phone or sadly have no relatives or neighbours who can assist with doing so.

Question (1) I understand a Working Group was set up to look the removal of cash and other options for residents for the future. What are the findings of this working group?

Answer (1) The assessment completed by officers considered all Council services for payment options and the frequency with which payments needed to be made. This assessment reaffirmed the need for a range of payment options to support individual circumstances. These options vary depending on the nature and scale of the service and currently can include online payment, direct debit, standing order, BACs, automated payment lines, payment via a Contact agent or cash payments for Council Tax/Housing. In addition, when the current Council Resilience Centres revert to locality office service provision, individuals will be assisted by Council staff to make card payments via the Council's easy to use self-help machines.

Question (2) As the Council no longer accept cash payments in our Local Offices, where can residents make cash payments if they don't have online access?

Answer (2) There is currently no cash payment option for the service. The Garden Waste service has been an online or phone registration service since February 2020. This has proved successful with over 90% signing and paying online, with the remainder registered over the phone. This phone registration process is supported by a dedicated contact team who can support people through the registration and payment process. Further payment options will continue to be explored by the service.

Item no 10.19

QUESTION NO 19

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Please could the convener confirm the number of injuries recorded by members of staff in each Ward, where applicable, over the course of the last five years whilst emptying:

- a) Grey bins
- b) Green bins
- c) Brown bins
- d) Blue boxes
- e) Red boxes
- f) Food caddies
- g) Gull proof sacks

Answer

The SHE portal is the Council's incidents/accidents reporting system and the categories used are from the Health and Safety Executive's grouping for incident causations (e.g. manual handling, slips trips and falls etc). Therefore, as the information requested is not recorded, it is not possible to provide the breakdown requested. However, the table below provides a summary of the number of incidents recorded on the SHE portal relating to doorstep collection of recycling (including gull proof sacks).

Year	Incidents from GP sacks /Doorstep collection of recycling
2016	2
2017	7
2018	4
2019	3
2020	2

Item no 10.20

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

- Question** (1) Who created the brand name "Spaces for People"
- Answer** (1) In response to the outbreak of COVID-19, the Scottish Government announced funding to enable physical distancing and to improve conditions for walking, cycling and wheeling in April 2020. This funding was titled 'Spaces for People'.
- Question** (2) Who designed the adverts for the retaining Spaces for People consultation (used on lampposts and digital formats) for Council to approve and implement?
- Answer** (2) These were designed internally within the Council.
- Question** (3) Why is the programme, largely consisting of the same schemes, being rebranded as "Travelling Safely"?
- Answer** (3) As set out in Question 1, the Spaces for People initiative was specifically to enable physical distancing and to improve conditions for walking, cycling and wheeling in response to COVID-19. These measures were introduced using Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTRO).
- In June 2021, the Council agreed to introduce Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETRO) in some areas where measures which are currently in place under TTRO have the potential support the Council's objectives in the longer term.
- This is a new approach rather than a rebranding of the programme.
- Question** (4) When there have been so many accidents relating to existing Spaces for People schemes, with a number of personal injury claims, could the Council be accused of misrepresentation by rebranding the programme "Travelling Safely"?

- Answer** (4) The schemes which have been approved to progress to ETRO and those which are currently being reviewed are all designed to improve connectivity and to link into other schemes, therefore the new programme has been titled Travelling Safely.
- Question** (5) Why is the programme not more clearly being branded in relation to the main aim of supporting the Net Zero target?
- Answer** (5) The aim of supporting the Net Zero target was set out clearly in the consultation and in the reports to Transport and Environment Committee and the Council, alongside the other strategic priorities which the new programme will support moving forward.
- Question** (6) Please can you provide evidence of the exact dangers and number of incidents in the last 5 years in Edinburgh that the "Travelling Safely" programme is aiming to address broken down by each road user group?
- Answer** (6) The Travelling Safely programme is aiming to provide safer, more desirable routes around the city as an alternative to using motorised vehicles. The programme is designed to encourage cycling and walking around the city for people who do not feel safe with the current infrastructure or who do not have access to a motorised vehicle.
- Question** (7) Please can you provide the target of reduced accidents by category of road user group, that the "Travelling Safely" programme is aiming to address, in what timescale, and how that will be measured
- Answer** (7) The priority of the Council is to make travelling around the city as safe as possible, with the ultimate aim of there being no accidents on the city's roads. The Travelling Safely programme does not have specific targets attributed to it.

Item no 10.21

QUESTION NO 21

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

As the cost of providing the service has increased by 40% to £35, can the Convener please pinpoint and specify what is driving such a significant increase?

Answer

The Council introduced a charge for the garden waste collection service to assist in recovering some of the costs associated with this non-statutory service.

Scottish Councils are limited by regulation to only recover costs related to collection, but not disposal. The increase from £25 to £35 enables the service to fully cover the current garden waste collection costs and takes into account overhead costs (e.g. fuel, labour, transportation) which have increased since the charge was first introduced and allows for investment to improve the registration process for customers.

Item no 10.22

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Has the City Council reported to Scottish Government as funder of Spaces for People through Sustrans about the red audit finding and if not, does it intend to do so?

Answer

No, the Council has not reported this to Sustrans as officers do not believe that there is reason to do so.

Item no 10.23

QUESTION NO 23

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Vice-Convenor of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

On 21 January 2020 the Evening News reported that the Vice Convenor of the Transport and Environment Committee, Councillor Doran would be “devastated” if she found out a loved-one's bench had been burned and that “she did not know how the scandal could have happened” and that “the person behind the decision must be held accountable”. The article quotes Councillor Doran directly saying: “I don't know how this would have happened and that is what we need to investigate. We need to find out who made that decision.”

The article also notes the Council Leader as saying a full investigation was underway.

Can the Vice-Convenor answer the following:

Question (1) Has the investigation concluded?

Answer (1) The investigation referred to by the Council Leader was concluded. This found that the person that was allegedly responsible for the burning of the benches is no longer employed by the Council.

However, further evidence has come to light in recent weeks which has caused this finding to be questioned and a new investigation is underway.

Question (2) How did the incident happen?

Answer (2) Given the new investigation that has commenced, it would not be appropriate to answer this question at this point.

Question (3) Who made the decision?

Answer (3) Given the new investigation that has commenced, it would not be appropriate to answer this question at this point.

Question (4) Has anyone been held accountable?

Answer

- (4)** Following the conclusion of the first investigation, no disciplinary action was taken as the individual that was alleged to be responsible had left the employment of the Council.

As stated above, however, further evidence has become available and has led to a new investigation being commenced.

If it is the case that there is evidence that shows that there has been a breach of the Council's Disciplinary Code or Employee Code of Conduct, then the appropriate sanctions will be applied. However, it is not appropriate to pre-judge the outcome of this new investigation to ensure that it remains impartial

Item no 10.24

QUESTION NO 24

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Further to the letter sent to the Education Secretary by the Convenor and Vice-Convenor of Education on 12 August and circulated to GME parents, please could the Convener respond to the following points:

Question (1) The letter mentions a table outlining site options the council has already explored for GME secondary. Will the council publish that table?

Answer (1) The table is provided below in appendix

Question (2) Have the following sites been considered for GME secondary? If they have been ruled out, what are the grounds for this?

- a) Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion
- b) Old Royal High School
- c) Old Tynecastle High School
- d) Lothian Buses depot, Annandale Street
- e) Russel Road Depot (former)

- Answer** (2) a) Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion
- Not Council Owned. Still Operational and no date for closure. Site too small for a High School
- b) Old Royal High School
- Site too small and building not suitable for a modern High School
- c) Old Tynecastle High School
- Not owned by Council. In the blast zone for the brewery. Site too small.
- d) Lothian Buses depot, Annandale Street
- It's an operational bus depot and no proposals by LRT to relocate.
- e) Russel Road Depot (former)
- See table below.

Question (3) What steps are the council taking to ensure that demand for GME within Edinburgh is met, and that the situation in Glasgow, where parents are being refused places at GME primary, is not repeated in Edinburgh?

Answer (3) The draft statutory consultation paper outlining proposals for the growth of GME in Edinburgh was considered by the Education, Children and Families Committee on 28 May 2021. The proposal includes the intention to establish two new dedicated GME teaching units, one in the south east of the city and one in the west, initially within existing primary schools but with a path for growth to full primary schools identified.

Question (4) Will the council conduct a further informal consultation on options for GME secondary before proceeding to a statutory consultation? If so, when?

Answer (4) No further informal consultation is planned.

Question

(5) Please can the Convenor clarify:

- a) whether the proposed consultation on GME Secondary is a 'discontinue' consultation in terms of paragraph 1 of schedule 1 of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010?
- b) If so, and if the council consults and does not proceed with its proposal, can the council consult again on proposals to discontinue GME education at JGHS within 5 years?

Answer

(5) a) Yes, it is a discontinue consultation.

- b) Yes the 5 year rule would apply unless there was a significant change in the school's circumstances.

Opportunity for development of GME School	Associated School	Barriers to progression	Estimated Site Size (for an 800 capacity secondary school 14 acres required – although not ideal 8 acres for playing fields can be off site).	Timescales	Implications for Statutory Consultation
Bus depot site adjacent to Drummond High School	Drummond High School	Operational Lothian Buses depot. Would be a small site for a high school but might be possible if we reduce some school building standards and use off site playing fields. There is also an efficiency opportunity due to location directly adjacent to Drummond High School.	6 acres	Could take a significant amount of time to relocate the current users as no known plans for this at present.	<p>Consultation could not proceed until site availability confirmed.</p> <p>Secondary GME would remain at JGHS in interim.</p> <p>If consultation proceeded in relation to growth of primary GME only from August 2022 then new secondary school would need to be deliverable by August 2029</p> <p>There would be a significant risk in taking forward growth of GME primary without a confirmed secondary solution, because Darroch annexe will only accommodate current numbers until 2028-29.</p>

Fettes Police Station	Broughton High School	Operational police station. Would require Scottish Government support to provide the site for the school and additional funding.	14 acres	Could take a significant amount of time to relocate the current users as no known plans for this at present.	As above
Royal Victoria Hospital Site	Broughton High School	Site not owned by Council and targeted for housing development. Would require Scottish Government support to provide the site for the school and additional funding.	14.4 acres	Further information required from NHS	As above
Council's depot at Russell Road;	Tynecastle	Still operational. Would be a small site for a high school but might be possible if we reduce some school building standards and use off site playing fields. Council has wider regeneration plans for the site and is anticipating a capital receipt for this site.	6 acres	Longer term option due to ongoing operational use and wider regeneration plans.	As above – except Council has ownership of the site so easier to confirm site available for this option before statutory consultation proceeds.

Item no 10.25

QUESTION NO 25

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Further to his supplementary answer to my question at full council on 24 June 2021, please can the council leader confirm when he met with Gaelic parents to hear their concerns, and what was the outcome of this meeting?

Answer

As stated in the supplementary answer on June 24th to question 21, I'm happy to meet parents to hear their views and appreciate those who have got in touch directly so far. There is continuing dialogue between parents and the Convenor and Vice Convenor of Children and Families, including a meeting with parent council and Comann nam Parent representatives just last week, and I'm happy to attend any meeting I'm invited to. Cllr Booth is aware of recent developments have meant the consultation has yet to be agreed, but I would again reiterate the importance of views being captured through the consultation to ensure a full and accurate picture.