

THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

MEETING 3

26 JUNE 2003

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION NO. 1

By Councillor Berry to be answered by the Executive Member for Environmental Services at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

Question (1) What date will Powderhall Waste Station re-open for the treatment of waste?

Answer (1) Powderhall will re-open on 23 June 2003.

Question (2) What will the total cost be of diverting and processing all waste away from Powderhall Waste Station during the period of closure?

Answer (2) £1,832,448, ie:

2002/03	-	£1,330,036
2003/04	-	£ 502,412

Question (3) How will the total cost of the above be met and what budget will this be paid from up to 31 March 2003?

Answer (3) This matter will be the subject of consideration by the Council. In particular the Council will be requested to consider what proportion of this overspending should be met from reserves. The actual departmental overspend for 2002/03 was £1,119,000. This could be partially offset by increased contributions from relevant DSOs of £516,000.

Question (4) What will the total costs be for the current financial year for the above and how will this cost be met?

Answer (4) The current projected overspend to 23 June 2003 is £502,412. The expectation is that this overspend will be met from the Department of Environmental and Consumer Services budget for 2003/4.

Question (5) What is the present cost of having all asbestos removed from Powderhall Waste Station?

What will the total estimated cost be before Powderhall re-opens?

Which budget will meet these costs?

Answer (5) The cost of removing the asbestos from Powderhall was £80,448. The money to pay for the work was met from the Capital budget by substitution from the Containerisation budget and savings from other budget headings (see below). Expenditure was also incurred on retaining wall and refurbishment of crane controls at Powderhall. This amounted to £60,490 and £74,447 respectively, for which budget provision of £97,000 and £100,000 had been made.

QUESTION NO. 2

By Councillor Berry to be answered by the Executive Member for Environmental Services at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

Question (1) What is the estimated cost of the vandalism at the public toilets at Bath Street, Portobello?

Answer (1) £2,545 was the cost of repairs due to vandalism during the financial year April 2002/March 2003.

Question (2) When will these public Toilets be re-opened to the public?

Answer (2) The toilets were not closed due to vandalism. The toilets were closed from 14 May to 5 June 2003 to allow upgrading and refurbishment work to be undertaken. The cost of upgrading work was in excess of £11,000.

Question (3) What are the arrangements for staffing at these toilets to help prevent further closures and costs?

Answer (3) The toilets are maintained by mobile toilet attendants. In an attempt to reduce vandalism following refurbishment work we have increased the frequency of visits by the mobile attendants to four visits per day.

QUESTION NO. 3

**By Councillor Berry to be
answered by the Executive
Member for Environmental
Services at a meeting of the
Council to be held on 26 June
2003**

Question (1) What is the department's target for recycling in this financial year?

Answer (1) 15%.

Question (2) How confident is the new Executive Member for the Environment of achieving this target?

Answer (2) An application has been submitted to the Scottish Executive's Strategic Waste Fund. Subject to the funds requested being made available, I am confident that the target can be achieved.

QUESTION NO. 4

By Councillor Paisley to be answered by the Executive Member for Health and Social Work at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

Question (1) Can you please give an update on numbers of clients waiting to be assessed for residential care?

Answer (1) There are currently approximately 824 assessments awaiting allocation. This may include those for whom the outcome of the assessment is care home admission. At the time of referral the outcome of the assessment will not be known. To provide a context for this figure, an average of 245 community care assessments are completed each week.

Question (2) Average waiting time for assessment?

Answer (2) The Department operates assessment standards whereby new referrals are screened and allocated for assessment on the basis of the perceived priority and risk. The average figure for the completion of all assessments is 6.4 weeks. For those admitted to a care home, the average figure for the completion of the assessment is 3.6 weeks.

Question (3) What is the current availability of accommodation in:

- a) Council Homes
- b) Voluntary Sector
- c) Private Sector

Answer	(3)	Capacity*	Vacancies**
	(a) Private Sector	1891	57
	(b) Voluntary Sector	448	12
	(c) Council Homes	590	6

* The capacity figure is operational capacity and includes respite

** Vacancies include shared rooms and those requiring top-up payments

- Question** (4) What is the position on the newly leased ex-private sector premises?
- a) How many beds are available?
 - b) Are any adaptations required?
 - c) Have any maintenance costs now been assessed?
 - d) Has a comparative cost analysis been made, by comparing existing units, voluntary sector and private sector beds?

- Answer** (4)
- a)

The Grange, Edinburgh	42 beds in operation
Greenfield Park, Musselburgh	25 beds opening June 2003
Trefoil Gogarburn	26 beds due to open October 2003
 - b) **The Grange:** Work was required to upgrade the property, which had suffered from a lack of capital investment and maintenance, by the previous occupiers.

Greenfield Park and Trefoil: Capital work was required to meet registration requirements. These costs were reported to the Executive of the Council in January 2003. NHS Lothian has agreed to contribute half the capital requirement.
 - c) The capital investment in each of the units will mean that no planned maintenance will be required for the duration of the contracts. Any unplanned / emergency maintenance will be met from existing budgets held for that purpose.
 - d) Comparative cost analyses were undertaken utilising information on the costs of operating the Department's own units and the work undertaken by COSLA and the Scottish Executive in establishing national benchmark fee rates.

- Question** (5) What if any emergency plans are being formulated in the event of Church of Scotland Homes in the City being closed?

Answer

- (5) Meetings are planned with representatives of the Church of Scotland to discuss the future of the three care homes that they operate in Edinburgh. We have been advised by the Church of Scotland that none of the three care homes in Edinburgh is threatened with closure at this time.

QUESTION NO. 5

By Councillor Paisley to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Public Realm at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

Question

- (1) What is the overall cost of the cycle lane currently being installed on Wester Hailes Road?

Answer

- (1) The cycle lane on Wester Hailes Road forms part of the scheme being implemented to create a cycle route avoiding the A720 City Bypass.

The scheme, which will cost £35,000 approximately, is being funded by the Scottish Executive and implemented by the City of Edinburgh Council. The cost of the cycle lane in Wester Hailes Road has not been costed separately.

The purpose of the scheme is to provide a route avoiding the A720 City Bypass in response to Police concerns over cyclists using the Bypass. Traffic orders are in progress to formalise the prohibition.

QUESTION NO. 6

By Councillor Paisley to be answered by the Executive Member for Environmental Services at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

It is noted that 10,509 hours of overtime were worked between April/October 2002 by ground maintenance staff.

- Question** (1) How does this figure relate to:
- a) Year 2000?
 - b) Year 2001?
- Answer** (1) a) 15,185 hours of overtime worked between April/October 2000.
- b) 12,196 hours of overtime worked between April/October 2001.
- Question** (2) What was the cost of this overtime to the Council?
- Answer** (2) 10,509 hours of overtime in 2002 cost £92,710 (or) an average of £8.82 per hour.
- Question** (3) Could this figure have been reduced by a change in shift pattern or additional full-time staff, or seasonal staff?
- Answer** (3) The grounds maintenance section has already made significant progress in the reduction of overtime since the year 2000, in line with a Value for Money Review of Overtime carried out with all the Council's DSOs and DLOs by the Internal Audit Section of the Department of Finance.

Overtime costs could be further reduced by the employment of additional seasonal staff, however due to the buoyant economy within Edinburgh, recruitment and retention of additional seasonal staff has proved to be extremely difficult.

It is considered that changing shift patterns or employing additional staff would not assist the situation at that time.

Generally, overtime falls into two categories in grounds maintenance terms, eg planned overtime such as work on highways, central reservations, and work on recreation grounds during weekends and evenings. The second category of overtime is reactive and unplanned, generally dealing with emergency situations or with Client requests for urgent work.

QUESTION NO. 7

By Councillor Whyte to be answered by the Executive Member for Business and Property Management at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

Question (1) Why is the demolition work at the main reception area only commencing on 14 July and not in the previous two weeks in which the fewest number of meetings are held?

Answer (1) Tender documents for the new City Chambers entrance and reception area have been returned, however, Historic Scotland require to be consulted and should they wish to comment, a response is due by 1 July 2003. The contractor requires a further 2 weeks to mobilise.

Question (2) If the answer to Question 1 is "because of the Edinburgh Trades Fortnight", what attempts were made to negotiate work during that period?

Question (3) What was the capital cost of the recent work to improve disabled access to 249 High Street?

Answer (3) The cost was £38,236 plus fees at £6,161.

Question (4) Why is the entrance to 249 High Street now closed?

Answer (4) The entrance at 249 High Street will re-open on 14 July 2003 following completion of refurbishment of the East Wing of the City Chambers and will form the main entrance and reception during the period of the works to the main entrance at City Chambers.

Question (5) If the answer to Question 4 is that there is no money in the revenue budget for staffing the entrance at 249 High Street, what would be the revenue cost of this?

QUESTION NO. 8

By Councillor Paisley to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Public Realm at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

- Question** (1) I note that a Traffic Survey was being carried out on June 3rd at the Gillespie Crossroads. Could I please be advised of how many cycles passed through the junction and cycled down the Wester Hailes Road whilst this survey was being carried out?
- Answer** (1) The survey to which you refer is one of several being carried out by the consultants Halcrows, on behalf of Transport Initiatives Edinburgh. The survey data have not yet been analysed and returned to **tie**. I will arrange for this to be sent to you as soon as it is available.

QUESTION NO. 9

**By Councillor Paisley to be
answered by the Leader of the
Council at a meeting of the
Council to be held on 26 June
2003**

As I am unable to ask questions of the Planning Convener can you please answer these questions on behalf of your Administration:-

- Question** (1) How many local people or groups have requested the opportunity to address the Development Quality Sub-Committee on the application to develop the Kinleith Mill site?
- Question** (2) Why was this information not made available to the Currie Community Council who are after all a statutory consultee in planning matters?
- Question** (3) Why has consent been refused for local groups to address the Development Quality Sub-Committee?
- Question** (4) Why is the Planning Department bringing forward this application recommended for consent when it breaches so many of our own planning guidelines?
- Question** (5) Why is the Transportation Department accepting the traffic assessment by the developers consultants which is at variance with the views held by this Council in 1985 and 1991 about volumes of traffic and the Lanark Road and why are we not having a confirmation report by an independent traffic consultant?
- Question** (6) Why is the development being brought forward with consent recommendation which would if granted allow 150 units in a cul-de-sac with limited access for emergency vehicles?

- Question** (7) Why are the transport guidelines on this application being over-ruled on the following points:
- (a) there is no access for public transport
 - (b) there are no verges provided at some parts of the development
 - (c) some of the footpaths are below the minimum requirements
 - (d) access to the site is too narrow to allow more than 50 dwellings if it is to comply with the City's own transportation guidelines
 - (e) why is a 9 metre turning circle being used to determine the turning circles rather than the 10 metres as recommended
 - (f) will the access onto Lanark Road meet the visibility splay for such a development

Answer I have been provided with the following information by the Director of City Development:

Answer (1) 24

Answer (2) The Chief Executive wrote to Currie Community Council whose opinion, as statutory consultees, was incorporated in the report to Committee by the City Development Department. The number of requests to address a meeting is not normally automatically supplied to all the statutory consultees. Nor is it a criteria in isolation for holding a Hearing.

Answer (3) Both Councillor Paisley and Currie Community Council have been advised of the reasons for not holding a Hearing whereby third parties could address the Development Quality Sub Committee. The recently adopted Hearings system is not intended to apply retrospectively ie to applications which have already been considered by the Development Quality Sub Committee. This application was considered earlier by the Development Quality Sub Committee and continued for certain specific matters to be addressed. The procedures are as agreed by the Planning Committee.

Answer

- (4)- This is a live application and it would be wholly
(7) inappropriate for this Council to discuss the matter
and could prejudice its position as planning
authority.

QUESTION NO. 10

By Councillor Wheeler to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Public Realm at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

Question (1) How satisfied are you with the validity of the "Tram Time" consultation exercise?

Answer (1) Satisfied.

Question (2) In particular, how many leaflets were distributed, in which wards, and when?

Answer (2) **Initial Delivery**

102,000 leaflets were delivered as follows:

Wednesday 14-Friday 16 May	Lorne Leith Links Calton Broughton Harbour Meadowbank (part) Restalrig (part) Trinity Newhaven 34,555
Monday 19-Tuesday 20 May	Stenhouse Moat Sighthill SE Corstorphine Gyle Dalmeny/ Kirkliston Murrayfield – both 24,991
Wednesday 21 May	New Town Tollcross (part) Holyrood (part) Stockbridge 15,196

Thursday 22-Friday 23 May

Pilton
Granton
Craigleith
Dean
Muirhouse/Drylaw
(part)
Dalry
Shandon
26,591

In addition:

- ❑ 2,000 leaflets (1,000 of each type) were distributed through the central library's distribution service to libraries, community centres and public buildings.
- ❑ Major businesses, third party groups and all businesses in the city centre (which face directly onto the proposed line – both options) were mailed a leaflet.
- ❑ 5,000 leaflets were held back for distribution through the exhibitions, most of which have been used and which are still ongoing.
- ❑ All public meetings and exhibitions were advertised in a prominent position (page three) in the Evening News during the first week of the consultation.
- ❑ Radio advertising also supported the public meetings, with different scripts giving notice of individual meetings (ads ran between 19/05 – 07/06).

Question

- (3) What is the minimum acceptable notice period between delivery of a leaflet and the local consultation meeting?

Answer

- (3) 1 week from date of advertising in the press. The delivery of the leaflet is a supporting piece of information, the important notification being the press advert.

QUESTION NO. 11

By Councillor Tritton to be answered by the Executive Member for Sustainability and Finance at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

Question (1) For how many properties which received a common repair grant are there still outstanding bills to be settled?

Answer (1) There are outstanding bills for 88 properties which received a common repair grant. 8 of these are interim bills where the final invoice has yet to be issued.

Question (2) Please detail the properties involved and for each property list

- a) the date of repair;
- b) the date the Council issued the accounts;
- c) the number of affected owners in each property; and
- d) the total sum involved for each property.

Answer (2) See attached list, Appendix A.

- a) The date of repair is deemed to be the date of completion of the repair. Because of the age of some projects the repair date was unavailable.
- b) See Appendix A. The date the final account was received from the appointed agent is also shown.
- c) See Appendix A.

- d) See Appendix A, amount outstanding, total £298,112.65. Also shown is the total sum due for all properties, £4,641,326 and the original invoiced amount £431,831.54 relating to the amount outstanding. Where the amount outstanding is less than the original invoice amount the debtor will be paying by instalments. This is the case for 50 of the 88 outstanding bills.

Note: Attached at Appendix B are the common repair schemes still to be completed.

COMMON REPAIRS SCHEME										APPENDIX A
AMOUNTS OUTSTANDING AS AT 18 JUNE 2003										
No	Repair Address	Notice Code	Repair Date	Final Account received from Agent	Invoice Date	No's of owners	Original Invoice	Amount Outstanding	Total sum due	
91545	11-17 Annandale Street	175	19/09/1991	28/02/1992	18/07/1996	9	£6,589.33	£5,741.28	£ 62,004.00	
72305	7 (2F1) Lower Granton Road	364	30/11/1995	20/03/1996	31/03/1997	12	£2,402.48	£1,919.92	£ 33,227.00	
40729	135-139 Easter Road/51-53 Brunswick Road	855			21/04/1992	12	£5,465.84	£5,694.67	£ 37,265.00	
31752	60-64 Leamington Terrace	955			19/10/1993	7	£2,754.72	£2,754.72	£ 18,268.00	
60937	91-97 Lauriston Place	A70			17/12/1996	13	£11,720.28	£11,720.28	£ 62,894.00	
4650	38-40 Ashley Terrace	A88			26/03/1996	11	£3,340.60	£3,340.60	£ 16,674.00	
49642	99-107 Causewayside	C0007	26/10/1996	12/12/1997	28/05/1998	30	£1,138.94	£774.20	£ 43,129.00	
54273	16-24 Henderson Row	C0015	31/01/1992	05/06/1998	18/02/1999	14	£827.49	£224.49	£ 43,162.00	
670773	65-71 Cornhill Terrace	C0019			20/02/2003	4	£1,947.41	£1,947.41	£ 13,134.00	
680258	3 Castle Wynd North	C0021		26/06/1992	13/03/2003	8	£1,796.54	£1,796.54	£ 11,163.00	
680255	3 Castle Wynd North	C0021		26/06/1992	13/03/2003	see above	£454.63	£454.63	see above	
282626	102-16 Duke Street	C0029	27/11/1992	08/03/2000	22/06/2000	14	£2,858.75	£1,046.85	£ 68,392.00	
89632	1-5 Gayfield Place/33 Gayfield Square	C0030	05/07/1993	30/10/1997	22/04/1999	17	£11,030.84	£7,535.46	£ 224,413.00	
43922	35-39 Sandport Street	C0031	23/03/1993	15/12/1996	11/03/1999	19	£1,956.80	£50.48	£ 34,368.00	
43948	68 Lorne Street	C0031	20/09/1996	01/04/1998	04/06/1998	as above	£1,755.49	£1,115.49	as above	
92960	35-39 Sandport Street	C0031	23/03/1993	15/12/1996	05/11/1998	as above	£1,023.51	£1,131.57	as above	
481435	65-71 Broughton Street	C0033	09/07/1993	16/02/2001	01/11/2001	13	£2,266.21	£845.24	£ 110,957.00	
18757	25 Castle Terrace/17 Cornwall Street	C0034	10/02/1995	25/09/1996	26/06/1997	8	£46,654.72	£2,801.16	£ 17,351.00	
309379	15-19 Clarence Street	C0037	24/06/1992	01/01/1995	24/08/2000	13	£4,600.96	£3,109.52	£ 79,886.00	
206581	53 Cockburn Street	C0044	17/02/1994	18/03/1997	17/09/1999	18	£3,171.38	£3,171.38	£ 93,257.00	
4221	47-53 Broughton Street, 2 Forth Street	C0063	30/08/1996	18/02/1998	29/10/1998	13	£3,126.45	£674.73	£ 82,222.00	
49973	1-11 Lower Granton Road	C0070	27/09/1995	22/10/1997	19/03/1998	35	£618.10	£151.58	£ 129,369.00	
233334	24-28 Lauriston Gardens	C0075	12/03/1996	23/09/1996	10/02/2000	9	£4,364.81	£4,203.21	£ 57,055.00	
227601	24-28 Lauriston Gardens	C0075	12/03/1996	23/09/1996	04/02/2000	see above	£641.36	£641.36	see above	
24061	11-15 Thorntree Street/ 13-15 Halmyre Street	C0109	10/11/1995	24/03/1997	11/12/1997	4	£1,430.00	£1,330.64	£ 15,393.00	
201296	43-49 Great Junction Street	C0112	12/07/1996		09/07/1999	9	£3,248.05	£3,248.05	£ 68,121.00	
39244	24 Calton Hill	C0118	29/07/1996	30/10/1997	11/06/1998	4	£3,248.30	£3,290.45	£ 24,468.00	
56777	27 Halmyre Street	C0128	26/04/1996	06/08/1997	05/11/1998	16	£1,716.85	£1,007.70	£ 44,058.00	
85621	121-125 Lochend Road Flat 123 (2f1)	C0140	14/02/1996	24/06/1997	14/08/1997	11	£4,225.96	£1,894.99	£ 23,513.00	
52220	30-33 South Bridge/45-51 Niddry Street	C0150	17/12/1997	30/09/2000	12/06/1997	8	£7,091.00	£5,025.26	not finalised	
210504	17 Thorntree Street	C0156	11/04/1997	19/05/1999	28/10/1999	12	£3,223.42	£2,259.12	£ 76,934.00	
210493	17 Thorntree Street	C0156	11/04/1997	19/05/1999	28/10/1999	see above	£2,030.46	£346.99	see above	
210501	17 Thorntree Street	C0156	11/04/1997	19/05/1999	28/10/1999	see above	£1,614.69	£1,637.16	see above	
367901	14-16 Moncrieff Terrace	C0157	23/05/1997	03/03/1999	18/01/2001	24	£687.86	£59.92	£ 77,236.00	
367918	14-16 Moncrieff Terrace	C0157	23/05/1997	03/03/1999	18/01/2001	24	£1,708.89	£560.69	£ 77,236.00	
81999	2-4 Tarvit Street	C0159	10/12/1997	15/01/1999	25/02/1999	17	£1,533.61	£673.92	£ 111,788.00	

No	Repair Address	Notice Code	Repair Date	Final Account received from Agent	Invoice Date	No's of owners	Original Invoice	Amount Outstanding	Total sum due	
276015	8-12 Steels Place	C0164	01/01/1996	01/03/1998	01/06/2000	11	£706.77	£328.80	£ 29,519.00	
51819	1-8 Haddington Place	C0171	08/01/1992	13/06/1997	24/07/1997	24	£2,615.32	£2,615.32	£ 114,196.00	
3224	75 Albert Street	C0175	24/10/1988	28/02/1997	05/02/1998	16	£2,443.99	£1,765.99	£ 45,771.00	
407846	13-15 Melville Terrace	C0177	29/03/1992	09/11/1996	19/04/2001	8	£3,567.82	£3,567.82	£ 32,674.00	
212961	34-36A Howard Place	C0194	11/03/1997	08/02/1999	18/11/1999	7	£6,097.09	£6,097.09	£ 62,369.00	
62156	18-32 Haddington Place	C0209	05/12/1992	10/10/1996	15/05/1997	16	£7,878.02	£551.50	£ 247,484.00	
665643	68-72 Polwarth Gardens	C0212	15/02/1991	24/07/1992	06/02/2003	8	£154.32	£154.32	£ 15,531.00	
665644	68-72 Polwarth Gardens	C0212	15/02/1991	24/07/1992	06/02/2003	see above	£307.95	£307.95	see above	
665647	68-72 Polwarth Gardens	C0212	15/02/1991	24/07/1992	06/02/2003	see above	£80.70	£80.70	see above	
7468	35-39 St. Patrick Square	C05			28/08/1996	11	£3,786.21	£3,786.21	£ 20,761.00	
52538	12-14A Gayfield Square	C46	08/03/1994	08/03/1995	20/03/1997	12	£9,953.54	£6,103.54	£ 159,867.00	
438530	85 Haymarket Terrace	C50	31/03/1998	19/03/2001	12/07/2001	11	£14,750.20	£14,750.20	£ 222,677.00	
438534	79-87 Haymarket Terrace	C50	31/03/1998	19/03/2001	12/07/2001	1	£13,622.73	£13,622.73	see above	
438536	79-87 Haymarket Terrace	C50	31/03/1998	19/03/2001	12/07/2001	1	£13,622.73	£13,622.73	see above	
61272	11 Wardlaw Place	E30			13/12/1993	16	£407.53	£210.18	£ 14,172.00	
71493	9-13 Portland Place F32	F32			24/02/1994	11	£2,187.38	£3,959.95	£ 64,633.00	
45729	6-8 & 10-14 Iona Street	G34	13/12/1995	01/04/1997	28/10/1996	24	£4,130.31	£1,762.51	£ 175,134.00	interim
39880	1-4 Abbey Mount/2-4 Montrose Terrace	G46	31/12/1995	22/09/1997	04/07/1995	15	£5,990.00	£4,766.92	£ 114,918.00	interim
34939	8 Mentone Avenue	H13	31/01/1997	19/08/1998	01/07/1996	8	£2,108.02	£488.02	£ 26,556.00	interim
1109	15 Thorntree Street	H20	11/04/1997	20/03/1999	01/08/1996	12	£3,212.06	£2,343.21	£ 58,209.00	interim
5766	81-85 Dickson Street	T0101	15/08/1996	06/01/1997	04/06/1998	11	£2,153.43	£513.60	£ 38,129.00	
227633	61-67 Dalmeny St/31 Sloan St	T0109	01/10/1997	08/09/1999	04/02/2000	13	£3,191.61	£3,766.02	£ 18,690.00	
374850	46-48 Hawthornvale	T0112	28/11/1997	27/05/1997	02/02/2001	12	£682.54	£556.42	£ 41,129.00	
67066	26-28 Kirk Street	T0123	02/12/1998	30/05/2000	28/08/1997	8	£9,240.79	£4,695.85	£ 61,495.00	interim
363619	87 Pennywell Gardens	T0127	17/02/1999	19/10/2000	11/01/2001	88	£426.86	£125.00	£ 109,742.00	
363756	87 Pennywell Gardens	T0127	17/02/1999	19/10/2000	11/01/2001	see above	£726.86	£881.58	see above	
399394	87 Pennywell Gardens	T0127	17/02/1999	19/10/2000	05/04/2001	see above	£726.86	£777.32	see above	
363592	87 Pennywell Gardens	T0127	17/02/1999	19/10/2000	11/01/2001	see above	£676.86	£669.19	see above	
10335	2-4 Leopold Place	T0202	30/05/1996	14/04/1997	23/07/1998	8	£4,905.74	£628.10	£ 48,846.00	
521844	67-77 Dundas Street	T0207	21/11/1997		07/02/2002	19	£3,367.47	£3,367.47	£ 107,715.00	
605585	112-116 McDonald Road	T0217	19/09/1997	09/09/1998	12/09/2002	11	£444.32	£444.32	£ 37,100.00	
497106	114-116 McDonald Road	T0217	19/09/1997	09/09/1998	13/12/2001	see above	£1,712.70	£444.38	see above	
605582	112-116 McDonald Road	T0217	19/09/1997	09/09/1998	12/09/2002	see above	£132.63	£80.00	see above	
605581	112-116 McDonald Road	T0217	19/09/1997	09/09/1998	12/09/2002	see above	£132.63	£132.63	see above	
635771	112-116 McDonald Road	T0217	19/09/1997	09/09/1998	21/11/2002	see above	£444.32	£444.32	see above	
607225	112-116 McDonald Road	T0217	19/09/1997	09/09/1998	19/09/2002	see above	£107.02	£107.02	see above	
305262	64-68 East Claremont Street	T0225	12/06/1998	23/06/2000	17/08/2000	8	£2,860.18	£2,860.18	£ 56,288.00	
275435	75 (2F1) Montgomery Street	T0227	27/06/1997	23/08/2001	01/06/2000	8	£12,748.09	£7,313.86	£ 108,993.00	interim
598195	20 (2F1) Montrose Terrace	T0229			22/08/2002	9	£2,139.36	£2,139.36	£ 19,254.00	

No	Repair Address	Notice Code	Repair Date	Final Account received from Agent	Invoice Date	No's of owners	Original Invoice	Amount Outstanding	Total sum due	
74326	26-30 Melville Terrace	T0307	01/02/1999	08/02/2001	02/07/1998	9	£10,639.09	£9,235.37	£ 121,780.00	interim
458434	26-30 Melville Terrace	T0307	01/02/1999	08/02/2001	13/09/2001	see above	£17,532.09	£17,532.09	see above	
56558	5-9 Panmure Place	T0311	29/04/1997	04/09/1998	10/12/1998	11	£11,187.85	£312.80	£ 123,605.00	
12662	5-7 Steels Place	T0312	20/12/1996	13/11/1997	22/04/1999	11	£1,691.42	£1,691.42	£ 31,806.00	
65564	25-33 Brougham St/1-3 Drumdryan St	T0337	27/03/1998	14/09/1999	17/12/1998	18	£10,650.34	£6,625.22	£ 169,690.00	
248408	25-33 Brougham St/1-3 Drumdryan St	T0337	27/03/1998	14/09/1999	23/03/2000	see above	£10,434.43	£5,537.47	see above	
360405	2 Ponton St/97-105 Fountainbridge	T0340	26/04/1999	20/09/2000	04/01/2001	17	£3,292.19	£1,107.70	£ 82,794.00	
204448	1-11 Comiston Road/6 Braid Road	T0405	11/04/1997	17/08/1998	19/08/1999	10	£4,897.52	£866.38	£ 87,121.00	
283842	1-3 Robertson Avenue	T0406	16/07/1996	05/02/1998	22/06/2000	8	£1,101.46	£103.56	£ 30,360.00	
380228	56-60 Comiston Road	T0410	01/02/2001	26/07/2000	15/02/2001	8	£1,451.27	£454.80	£ 70,195.00	
333965	242-252 Gorgie Road	T0412	19/12/1997	21/02/2000	26/10/2000	14	£195.86	£45.86	£ 42,811.00	
372077	27-29 Angle Park Terrace	T0420	24/02/1999	01/08/2000	25/01/2001	10	£5,552.73	£4,337.92	£ 72,375.00	
59790	34-36 South Bridge/53-57 Niddry St/ 212 Cowgate	TC03039	20/03/1998	02/01/2001	20/03/1997	8	£54,495.60	£55,248.09	not finalised	interim
						939	£431,831.54	£298,112.65	£4,641,326.00	

**COMMON REPAIRS SCHEME
PROJECTS TO BE COMPLETED**

APPENDIX B

No	Repair Address
C0203	2-6 Baltic Street,2-6 Salamander Street
C0229	6,7,8 Hope Park Crescent
TO342	14 St Leonards Bank
T0325	1-2 Hunter Square
C0150	30-33 South Bridge
T0339	34-36 South Bridge
C0145	48-52 South Bridge
T0326	18-22 Nicolson Street

QUESTION NO. 12

By Councillor Tritton to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Public Realm at a meeting of the Council to be held on 26 June 2003

- Question** (1) How often are roads and pavements inspected for problems which could cause an accident (such as potholes or broken slabs):
- a) by an inspector on foot; or
 - b) by an inspector in a vehicle?
- Answer** (1) All carriageway, footways and cycleways in the city are scheduled for a walking inspection at a minimum frequency of once per year. Roads with a high level of pedestrian traffic are inspected more often with Princes Street and the Royal Mile inspected each week day. Mobile inspections from a vehicle are carried out weekly, generally on a Monday, on all arterial and major roads in the city.
- Question** (2) How many defects were identified by these inspections in the year to April 2003? How many of these were classified as needing an "urgent" repair, and how many were left to be dealt with as part of routine maintenance?
- Answer** (2) In the year to 31 March 2003, approximately 31,000 individual defects were repaired by the CLARENCE defect squads. These are generally defects which are considered urgent and identified during inspections although a significant proportion were also reported by the public through the CLARENCE freephone service.
- Question** (3) Does the Council increase its inspections where work is being carried out by utility companies, and how long are such companies given to make good the roadway or pavement affected?

Answer (3) The New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991 determines the amount of inspection given to the work of the utility companies and this is carried out separately from the walking and mobile inspections. Under the agreement 5% of the total utility works in each of four stages is inspected and costs are recovered from the companies. The Council is unable to resource any inspection of utility works beyond this level but inspectors coming across utility operations as part of their general duties may, if a particular concern has arisen, carry out an inspection. Utility companies are required to guarantee the quality of their work for two years following completion. The Council is able to require reinstatement work to be redone at any time during the guarantee period if it can be shown that the work is defective.

Question (4) If there is a nearby construction site which could be expected to lead to an increase in heavy lorry traffic, is there any increase in the level of inspections? Are any repairs charged to the construction company?

Answer (4) Roads Inspectors within Network Services are deployed on the basis of 'beats' which are typically four Council wards. Each inspector is aware of the activities in their area and will give appropriate attention to works affecting the road network. Resources do not permit the routine devotion of increased levels of attention near construction sites but inspectors will make a judgement about the type of activity and try to visit sites accordingly. Any damage that can be proven to be the responsibility of a construction company will be repaired and the costs charged to them. This does however require evidence of the damage caused to be collected, which due to resource constraints is not always possible.

Question (5) How many road/pavement repairs were reported to CLARENCE by citizens in the year to April 2003?

a) How many of these problems required an "urgent!" repair?

b) What was the average response time for dealing with these repairs?

Answer

- (5)** In the year up to 31 March 2003 CLARENCE received a total of 31,389 calls of which 3,620 related to carriageways and 2,121 were footway reports. All of these reports were investigated mostly by visiting the location. Road inspectors determine whether a defect requires urgent attention. Practically all of the reported carriageway and footway defects are treated as urgent in recognition of the fact that the public have concerns and feel the need to report them.

Average response times are not measured although ERS is required to deal with all urgent defect reports within 24 working hours. During 2002/2003, 94% of defects were repaired within that period.