Cleanliness of the City

Transport Infrastructure and Environment Committee
18 June 2012

1 Purpose of report

1.1 To update the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee on the quality of the city’s local environment, taking into account external validation surveys such as Cleanliness Index Monitoring Systems (CIMS).

1.2 The report also includes information from the six Neighbourhood Local Environmental Managers on current service delivery and improvement plans within their area.

1.3 This report is backward looking and reflects results from the latest CIMS survey carried out in March 2012.

2 Summary

2.1 In March 2012, Keep Scotland Beautiful (KSB) carried out the latest CIMS survey of Edinburgh’s streets as part of their commission to carry out an independent quarterly assessment. Each survey is a snapshot of the cleanliness of streets during this month. A 50 metre transect is surveyed from a random sample of 10% of the city’s streets. Each transect is graded on the presence of litter on a scale from ‘A’ to ‘D’ as details in the Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse (Scotland 2006). ‘A’ grades indicates no litter present whatsoever whereas ‘D’ grades signify major litter accumulations along the transect. Grade A and B represent an acceptable standard of cleanliness while C and D are noted as unacceptable. The grades are given a points value from 3 points for an ‘A’ down to 0 points for a ‘D’. The transect scores for each area are then aggregated up to give a score out of 100. A score of 67 or above indicates that an area meets the standard for an acceptable level of street cleanliness (i.e. the majority of transects in that area were assessed as A or B).

The same methodology is used for Local Environment Audit Management Systems (LEAMS), the statutory performance indicator for street cleaning. The larger CIMS survey enable the Council to adjust operational activity with greater confidence. Services for Communities believe that the independent monitoring partnership with KSB offers exceptional value for money and provides the framework to deliver improved performance for street cleaning.
2.2 The City of Edinburgh achieved a score of 71 during the March survey with 96% of streets meeting the acceptable standard of cleanliness. Both results show an improvement on the previous December 2011 results of 69 with 90% of streets clean. The percentage of clean streets in the March 2012 assessment is the highest level achieved from any of Edinburgh’s CIMS surveys. In addition to this, every Neighbourhood achieved a score of 94% clean or higher. Out of the 17 wards 11 achieved at least 94% of streets clean and the lowest score in any ward was only 88%. A total of 500 streets were surveyed of which 478 were graded as being clean (i.e. meeting the national standard for acceptable levels of cleanliness). Overall statistics from this survey show a significant improvement from the December 2011 audit and reflect the impact of the additional resources made available during the Edinburgh Spring Clean during March.

2.3 Five out of six Neighbourhoods increased their overall cleanliness index result compared to December 2011, while one Neighbourhood (North) achieved the same result. Again five out of six Neighbourhoods improved on the percentage of clean streets, while North results show a slight decrease of 3%. The most notable improvement can be seen in the City Centre and Leith Neighbourhood which improved significantly in both percentage clean results and in the overall cleanliness score.

2.4 Individual ward results have also improved, 12 out of 17 wards achieved a percentage clean result of 95 or above with four wards reaching 100% (details can be viewed in Appendix 5, Cleanliness by ward). During December 2011 only two out of 17 wards achieved this result.

2.5 Although the 96% of streets clean result represents a significant improvement in performance it still fell just short of the CIMS target of 72. This was mainly because most (86%) of streets were assessed as a B grade and only 10% achieved an A grade. In previous surveys where the CIMS target has been achieved or exceeded the percentage of streets clean has been slightly lower but the prevalence of A grades has been higher. For example, in the September 2010 survey when a CIMS score of 74 was achieved, 94% of streets were assessed as meeting an acceptable level of cleanliness but 21% achieved an A grade. A street or transect has to be completely litter free to achieve an A grade and it requires only the smallest item such as a matchstick or cigarette end to change it to a B.

2.6 Residents are also being encouraged to participate in keeping Edinburgh a clean and beautiful city by organising or taking part in community clean ups and other similar events. This is an initiative that was part of the Edinburgh Spring Clean but was continued in partnership with the Keep Scotland Beautiful National Spring Clean from April 1 to May 31, and will continue to run throughout the year.

Litter picking equipment, refuse sacks, gloves, bins and refuse uplifts are being provided free of charge by the Council to any community group, individuals, schools or businesses willing to organise an event in their area.
3 Main report

3.1 Services for Communities have a service target for street cleanliness as measured by CIMS. The target is to achieve an overall CIMS score of 72 with 70% of residents “fairly” satisfied or “very” satisfied with street cleaning in their local area.

City Centre and Leith Neighbourhood

3.2 CIMS 67

The City Centre and Leith Neighbourhood received an overall CIMS score of 67. This is a significant improvement from the previous result of 62. Further improvement can be seen in the percentage of streets clean result of 95% compared to 86% clean in the December 2011 assessment. A total of 86 transects were surveyed.

All three wards (11, 12, and 13) improved on the percentage clean and overall CIMS score from this assessment. Ward 11 (City Centre) increased from 90% to 98% of the streets assessed as being clean. Ward 12 (Leith Walk) again improved from 90% to 95% and ward 13 (Leith) improved from 76% clean to 92% clean. Only one D grade was noted during this assessment in Dalmeny Street where litter had accumulated under parked vehicles. The previous assessment noted three D grades due to overflowing domestic and business waste.

Task Force street cleaning teams are continuing to trial five walk-behind mechanical street cleaners to keep pavements clean and manage smoking related litter. Due to the tram construction works and subsequent closure of Princes Street and Haymarket corridor and associated problems with access additional street cleaning staff have been assigned to manage and maintain this area.

The ‘Hot Spot’ crew created in Autumn 2011 continues to target identified problem areas on both a scheduled and reactive basis. A new route scheduling system for all streets in the City Centre and Leith Neighbourhood is being set up to provide a robust frequency based programme of cleaning. Summer International Festival planning has now started to define, cost and arrange resources over the very busy August and September period.

Environmental Wardens have been targeting licensed and commercial premises with smokers litter issues throughout the Neighbourhood. A number of Street Litter Control Notices and Fixed Penalty Notices have been issued over the last three month period (138 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued between January 2012 to March 2012).

North Neighbourhood

3.3 CIMS 69

The North Neighbourhood received a score of 69 which is the same result as the previous assessment. Results show a slight decrease of 3% in percentage
of clean streets in this Neighbourhood. A total of 70 transects were surveyed of which 93% were noted as clean.

Both wards (four and five) achieved the national standard of cleanliness target (67 or above) with ward 4 (Forth) achieving 90% of streets clean and ward 5 (Inverleith) reaching 95%.

Three grade C’s were noted in ward 4 at Westshore Road, Royston Mains Street and Crewe Grove. Large items of litter were found on West Shore Road, which were consistent with spillage from a skip. Two further transects along West Shore Road were noted as being of an acceptable standard. Two C grades in ward 5 at Bedford Street Street and Goldenacre Terrace were caused by cigarette litter in the channels. This location will be monitored by Environmental Wardens who will liaise directly with the Task Force.

While additional resources were deployed in advance of this assessment, activities centred on covering an overall high cleanliness standard throughout both Wards. This resulted in changes from the last assessment in the spread of the scores. Acceptable grades increased from the previous survey, however the C grades increased by one which resulted in the overall score of 69.

The Royston Mains area will receive some additional cleaning work over the next few weeks. This will be supported by additional patrols by the Environmental Wardens to focus on dog fouling. A dog fouling initiative will be carried out during the summer months that will be similar to the successful campaign completed last year.

**East Neighbourhood**

3.4 CIMS 70

The East Neighbourhood result of 70 is an increase on the score from the previous result of 68. The percentage of streets assessed as clean also increased from 89% to 95% in this survey. A total of 57 streets were surveyed during March.

Ward 14 (Craigentinny & Duddingston) scored 65 (a decrease of 3 points from the previous result) with 88% of streets assessed as clean. Ward 17 (Portobello & Craigmillar) increased its result from 69 to 73 with an impressive 100% of streets assessed as clean.

Cleanliness standards continue to be monitored regularly by the East Neighbourhood team. A variety of East Neighbourhood staff have each been monitoring six streets as part of their daily duties and have been working closely with our Task Force team to report unacceptable transects. In addition, regular monitoring of a 2% random sample of streets continues to take place during a four day period by the Task Force team to ensure cleanliness standards are being met; this surveying exercise also highlights specific locations requiring increased cleaning attention.

Both of the Neighbourhood Partnership’s Environmental sub groups in East have been identifying littering and fly tipping hot spots to ensure that these local problems are attended to and monitored by the Task Force team.
Smoking related litter continues to be highlighted and as a result a joint working programme, involving Environmental Wardens and Licensing Standards Officers has been identified to address cigarette litter around licensed premises in the East Neighbourhood. This will include the issuing of street litter control notices where appropriate.

A particular focus is also being given to tackle dog fouling, with improved communication between Environmental Wardens and Task Force. Hot-spot areas for dog fouling are being regularly targeted using a variety of methods including patrols, local poster campaigns and an out of hour’s staff presence.

The East team has identified a local performance measure to improve neighbourhood cleanliness by strengthening the collaborative working between teams to deal with environmental offences. Front line operational staff will be trained to identify and report on evidence to support enforcement against environmental offences such as littering, fly tipping and dog fouling. A training programme is being developed to support this new initiative due to be trialled in June 2012. Further updates in this will be provided in future reports.

Following the successful pilot of the East Neighbourhood’s ‘Neighbourhood Pride’ initiative last year, a second tranche of this programme was launched at Portobello Promenade on the 26 March 2012. This initiative aims to carry out ‘deep cleaning’ of targeted streets to remove litter, detritus, weeds and dog fouling. Temporary parking suspensions are used, particularly in areas where cleaning is restricted due to parked vehicles. Works are carefully planned with other maintenance teams, for example gulley cleaning and road repairs to optimise service delivery during parking suspensions. The current programme is available on the East Neighbourhood’s website page.

South West Neighbourhood

3.5 CIMS 73

The March results for this Neighbourhood show an increase from the previous score of 71. The percentage of clean streets surveyed also increased from 92% to an impressive 98% clean. During this assessment a total of 110 streets were surveyed.

Two out of the four wards (ward 8, Colinton/Fairmilehead and ward 9 Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart) achieved a percentage clean result of 100% while ward 7 (Sighthill/Gorgie) achieved a 96% clean, this is the highest percentage of clean streets ever noted in this ward. Ward 2 (Pentland Hills) achieved 97% clean; see Appendix 5 ‘Cleanliness by ward’ for details.

Three out of four wards exceeded the Services for Communities target of 72. Ward 2 and 9 received an impressive result of 75 while ward 8 received a very high score of 79. Although ward 7 achieved the same overall cleanliness score as the previous survey (65), the percentage of clean streets increased by 7%. The overall number of grade A results in the South West Neighbourhood more than doubled from the previous assessment which is a result of a more thorough cleaning programme.
There was no grade C’s noted in the South West although two grade D’s were noted. Both grade D’s were a result of refuse spillage and were noted in Clovenstone Gardens and Hailesland Grove. Keep Scotland Beautiful auditors made reference to the Task Force cleaning crews arriving to clean Clovenstone Gardens just after it had been surveyed. A monitoring programme of locations where communal refuse bins are used is underway to ensure a quick response to any spillage. Further steps to minimise unnecessary litter as a result of spillage is to include patrols from Environmental Wardens and improved communication with Waste Services.

Prior to the March assessment the South West Task Force team trialled a mechanical walk-behind sweeper to target litter and dog fouling in local areas. A scheduled route was introduced for staff who also reported on other adverse environmental quality indicators such as vandalism and graffiti.

The South West Neighbourhood introduced a monitoring exercise using the same methodology as CIMS and LEAMS. A random sample of 2% of streets within all four wards is being carried out every four days by Task Force staff. Data from the results is being analysed to allow for more structured operational activities such as weed spraying, litter removal and dealing with dog fouling in areas where this has been highlighted as an issue. Results are being looked at to allow for the removal of any incidents of graffiti and fly tipping more quickly. This exercise provides a more measured approach to cleaning while recommending the best use of either mechanical or manual cleaning.

**South Neighbourhood**

3.6 CIMS 70

A score of 70 was achieved in the South Neighbourhood during this assessment which is an improvement from the previous score of 68. The percentage of streets surveyed as being clean also improved from 88% clean to an impressive 98% clean throughout this Neighbourhood. A total of 86 streets were surveyed during this assessment. Only two grade C’s were given which related to dog fouling in one transect and spillage from a refuse container in another transect.

All three wards improved on percentage clean figures with ward 16 (Liberton/Gimerton) achieving a result of 100% clean. Further improvements can be seen in all three wards reaching the national standard for cleanliness with ward 16 achieving a score of 74 details of which can be viewed in Appendix 5 ‘Cleanliness by ward’.

A major campaign of blitz cleaning of areas was undertaken prior to this assessment. This was carried out by providing additional resources and full use of all manual and mechanical cleaning equipment. A new small mechanical sweeper was used prior to this assessment which could mechanically clean footways and pavements and streets where large mechanical sweepers found it difficult to access.

The development of the hand held barrow’s introduced into four areas across the South continue to work well and the Task Force staff are receiving positive feedback from both residential and business customers. Staff who are
deployed as barrow operatives are now reporting on further adverse environmental indicators such as graffiti, vandalism and litter as a result of spillage from refuse containers in order that issues can be dealt with quickly which will improve the overall visual amenity of the local environment.

**West Neighbourhood**

3.7 CIMS 73

During this assessment the West Neighbourhood score increased from 72 to 73. The percentage of clean streets surveyed also increased from 91% to 94% clean. A total of 93 streets were assessed.

All three wards achieved the national standard of cleanliness target with ward 1 (Almond) achieving an overall CIMS score of 77 with 95% of streets clean (see Appendix 5 ‘Cleanliness by ward’ for further information). Although no grade D’s were issued in this assessment, the C grades mainly related to litter under hedges and along back lines of the pavement. As a result, all Task Force staff will be further briefed on cleaning standards and this will be monitored by the Task Force Manager.

Prior to this assessment the West team prioritised specific locations throughout the Neighbourhood using both manual and mechanical cleaning. Environmental Wardens have also been assisting by highlighting litter during their normal patrols in order that a more responsive approach is taken. Additional resources were utilised as a small blitz team deployed in noted priority locations to ensure regular cleaning took place.

A small road sweeping vehicle was used in the run up to this survey. This vehicle was used in areas where the large mechanical sweeper found it difficult to access. Additional cleaning was undertaken in streets where unacceptable scores from previous assessments had been noted and as a result these streets have now been graded internally as being acceptable.

In preparation for the next assessment in June, the Task Force team will be working alongside the Environmental Wardens and Community Safety staff to carry out a high profile exercise in areas which have been highlighted where litter has become an issue around some high schools. An internal LEAMS monitoring exercise is to be introduced in these areas in order that additional cleaning can be factored into regular cleaning schedules. Further patrols and enforcement will take place outwith core working hours to increase Fixed Penalty Notices and assist in improving cleanliness standards.

Environmental Wardens continue to patrol Parkgrove/Clermiston for dog fouling and litter as part of their on-going initiative in this ward. As a result a number of fixed penalty notices have been issued relating to dog fouling and litter. An assembly has also been held at East Craigs Primary School, along with speaking at their ECO group meetings to highlight the problem of dog fouling and littering in the local community. Parents are also being encouraged to report any such offences; this has resulted in a significant increase in the reporting of complaints received as well as encouraging local participation into improving cleanliness standards. This successful initiative is now being rolled out at Clermiston Primary School.
Roseburn Terrace and St John’s Road have been identified as locations where Environmental Wardens issued the most Fixed Penalty Notices. As a result, a joint partnership initiative with the Safer Community Team using CCTV was set up to tackle the problem of littering within this area. The number of Fixed Penalty Notices issued is now much fewer as a result of this overall initiative.

Future Actions

3.8 Street cleaning is one of the service areas that falls within the scope of the Environment Public Sector Comparator (PSC), now known as the imProve it programme. The programme aims to deliver significant savings and service improvements including improvements in performance. As part of this programme an external review of performance and productivity in street cleaning and grounds maintenance was commissioned and has now reported. Although the report commented favourably on the comparatively high levels of cleanliness on the main arterial routes and in the city centre it did identify the potential for further improvements in both productivity and performance in street cleaning through more effective organisation of work and resources (staff, vehicles and equipment).

3.9 The imProve it programme has now embarked on an exercise to determine the most effective and appropriate cleaning method for each street in Edinburgh and assess the level of resources required in each Neighbourhood to deliver this methodology. This will support the service to change from one that is predominantly responsive to one where most work is done on a pro-active planned basis using detailed work schedules which are based on established industry standards of performance and productivity. The development of programming and scheduling of street-cleaning activity will be supported by investment in new technology, the introduction of a more robust performance monitoring systems and clarifying and re-focussing the roles of Task Force managers and supervisors. This major overhaul of street-cleaning delivery will, when complete, provide the platform for sustained improvements in performance.

4 Financial Implications

4.1 The allocation of resources for street cleaning is contained within the existing Services for Communities budgets.

5 Equalities Impact

5.1 The content of this report are not relevant to the public sector equality duty of the Equalities Act 2010.

6 Environmental Impact

6.1 The data received on the CIMS score allows us to implement actions that can support the Single Outcome Agreement in particular the Local Outcome that requires that the ‘cleanliness of the city is improved’.
7 Conclusions

7.1 The overall trend for cleanliness is improving in particular the percentage of streets assessed as being clean which at 96% is the highest level achieved in Edinburgh. Local Neighbourhood measures continue to be put in place to deal with identified areas which continue to fall below the acceptable standard.

7.2 At a city wide level as part of a programme of internal improvements, known as imProve it, a major re-organisation of the way street cleaning is planned, monitored and managed is under-way and this provides the basis for sustained improvements in street-cleaning performance.

8 Recommendations

8.1 It is recommended that the Transport Infrastructure and Environment Committee note the contents of this report.

Mark Turley
Director of Services for Communities
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Contact/tel/Email
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All

Single Outcome Agreement
National Outcome (12) – We value and enjoy our built and natural environment and protect it and enhance it for future generations.
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Appendix 1
Edinburgh Street Cleanliness CIMS Score (March 2010 – March 2012)

Appendix 2
Percentage of Streets Clean Score (March 2010 – March 2012)
## Appendix 3
Cleanliness by Neighbourhood Area, CIMS (March 2010 – March 2012)
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### Appendix 4
Cleanliness by Neighbourhood Area (March 2011 – March 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mar-11 CIMS</th>
<th>% Clean</th>
<th>Mar-11 CIMS</th>
<th>% Clean</th>
<th>Dec-11 CIMS</th>
<th>% Clean</th>
<th>Dec-11 CIMS</th>
<th>% Clean</th>
<th>Mar-12 CIMS</th>
<th>% Clean</th>
<th>Mar-12 CIMS</th>
<th>% Clean</th>
<th>Comparison with previous survey</th>
<th>Comparison Year on Year</th>
<th>Acceptable level (&gt;67) (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITYWIDE</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5
Cleanliness by Ward (March 2011 – March 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Mar-11</th>
<th>Mar-11</th>
<th>Dec-11</th>
<th>Dec-11</th>
<th>Mar-12</th>
<th>Mar-12</th>
<th>Comparison with previous survey</th>
<th>Comparison with previous survey</th>
<th>Comparison Year on Year</th>
<th>Comparison Year on Year</th>
<th>Acceptable level (&gt;67) (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIMS % Clean</td>
<td>CIMS % Clean</td>
<td>CIMS % Clean</td>
<td>CIMS % Clean</td>
<td>CIMS % Clean</td>
<td>CIMS % Clean</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Almond</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pentland Hills</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Drum Brae / Gyle</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Forth</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inverleith</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Corstorphine / Murrayfield</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sighthill / Gorgie</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Colinton / Fairmilehead</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fountainbridge / Craiglockhart</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Meadows/ Morningside</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. City Centre</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Leith Walk</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Leith</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Craigentinny / Duddingston</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Southside / Newington</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Liberton / Gilmerton</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Portobello / Craigmillar</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>↑(9/17)</td>
<td>↑(7/17)</td>
<td>↑(16/17)</td>
<td>↑(14/17)</td>
<td>(13/17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>