

THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

MEETING 16

29 APRIL 2004

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Whyte to be answered by the Executive Member for Sustainability and Finance at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2004

Question (1) What are the likely full costs to the Council, **tie**, the Scottish Executive, and any other publicly-funded body (broken down by each organisation) of the Public Inquiry on congestion charging?

Answer (1) The cost to Transport Initiatives Edinburgh Ltd (**tie**) of the planning and preparatory work for the Public Inquiry has been £345,000.

In addition, during the 2004/2005 financial year, it is estimated that **tie** will expend £570,000 on the Public Inquiry itself.

The Scottish Executive and the City of Edinburgh Council will each meet 50% of these costs.

Question (2) What are the likely costs of representation at the Public Inquiry for the other participants who have indicated they will attend and be legally represented?

Answer (2) It is not necessary for participants to have any legal representation.

It is difficult to estimate a realistic cost, due to variations in the type of legal representation that may be utilised by participants and variations in the length of time that the representation is required. Objectors will be allocated specific times by the Programme Officer to present their case. Combined with the inquisitorial procedure being adopted at this inquiry these approaches should minimise the need for objectors to attend and be legally represented.

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Gilchrist to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Public Realm at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2004

- Question** (1) What is the current estimate of income from the proposed congestion charging scheme?
- Answer** (1) The current estimate of the value, in 2002 prices, of projects funded from congestion charging revenue over the full period of operation of the congestion charging scheme from 2006 to 2026, in the preferred scenario is approximately £761m. This provides probably the best picture of the effective net real income from the scheme. Estimates of total income in nominal and real terms, and of operating costs, interest charges etc, are given in the Preliminary Business Case Financial Modelling Refresh (City of Edinburgh Council supporting document T102) which is available for downloading from the 'ititime' website.
- Question** (2) What would be the impact of removal of the outer cordon from the scheme in cost terms?
- Answer** (2) The best available information suggests that the removal of the outer cordon would result in a reduction of around £181m in the value, in 2002 prices, of projects which could be funded from congestion charging revenue over the full period of operation of the congestion charging scheme.
- This estimate derives from the difference between the current projected value of projects funded from congestion charging of £761m and an estimate of £580M for a scheme with a central cordon operating all day. (This estimate was in **tie's** report of 15 January 2004 entitled 'Edinburgh Congestion Charging Scheme: Report on Consultation and Programme for 2004' which formed Appendix A to the report to Council on 22 January 2004 entitled 'Edinburgh Congestion Charging Scheme – Draft Order'.)

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Gilchrist to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Public Realm at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2004

Question (1) In the CEC area, for each of the three years ending 2003 what were:-

- 1) the total number of people killed or seriously injured in road accidents?
- 2) the total number of children killed or seriously injured?
- 3) the total number of slight casualties?

Answer (1) For the CEC Area, for each of the three years ending in 2003;

- 1) In 2001 262 people were killed or seriously injured in road accidents;

In 2002 220 people were killed or seriously injured in road accidents;

In 2003 172 people were killed or seriously injured in road accidents.

- 2) In 2001 38 children (aged under 16) were killed or seriously injured in road accidents;

In 2002 33 children (aged under 16) were killed or seriously injured in road accidents;

In 2003 24 children (aged under 16) were killed or seriously injured in road accidents.

3) In 2001 1848 casualties received slight injuries in road accidents;

In 2002 1760 casualties received slight injuries in road accidents;

In 2003 1568 casualties received slight injuries in road accidents.

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Gilchrist to be answered by the Executive Member for Sustainability and Finance at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2004

Question (1) What was the sum realised from disposal of land and property in the financial year 2002/03?

Answer	(1) Asset Sales 2002/03	£'000
	General Services	10,357
	Office Accommodation	344
	Housing Revenue Account	15,730
		<hr/>
		26,431

Question (2) What is the estimated sum being raised from disposal of land and property in the financial year 2003/04?

Answer	(2) Asset Sales 2003/04	£'000
	General Services	13,495
	Office Accommodation	810
	Housing Revenue Account	20,746
		<hr/>
		35,051

Question (3) In terms of the above disposals how much affordable housing was contingent on subsequent development of properties or land being sold?

Answer (3) See attached appendix.

Appendix

Area	RSL/ Developer	Nil Value/ Receipt	No. of Units	Tenure	Year
East					
Niddrie Marischal Ph2	Canmore	£130,000	39	Rent	Autumn 2002
Niddrie Marischal Ph3	Canmore	£775,000	23	Rent	Summer 2004
			21	LCHO Sale	
Niddrie Mains 2a	Castle Rock	Nil value	106	Rent	Autumn 2002
Niddrie Mains 2b	Castle Rock	Nil value	31	Rent	Summer 2004
Craigmillar Castle	Bield	Nil value	12	Rent	Autumn 2002
				(Sheltered)	
Craigmillar Castle Ph3	Kintry	Nil value	56	Rent	Autumn 2002
			45	LCHO Sale	
Craigmillar Castle Ph4	Kintry	Nil value	23	Rent	Summer 2004
			44	LCHO Sale	
South					
Moredun Park Gardens	Dunedin	Nil value	19	Rent	
Gracemount	Dunedin	£244,000	71	Rent	2002/03
Southhouse	Home in Scotland	£789,000	112	Rent	2003/04
North/West					
Dumbeg	Prospect	£70,591	18	Rent	2003/04
Duff Street	Dunedin	£437,500	47	Rent	
West Pilton	Capital City Homes	Nil value	171	Rent	
			728	Rent	
			110	LCHO Sale	

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Gilchrist to be answered by the Executive Member for Human and Corporate Resources at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2004

In the leaflet circulated with Council Tax Notices it states there has been an increase as at December in the last financial year of 559 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members.

Question (1) Council Staff

Please show the increase or decrease in the total numbers of Council staff in each of the last six years:

Answer	(1) Year	Increase/Decrease	Total Staff (FTE)
	2003/04	+ 559	16,180
	2002/03	+234	15,621
	2001/02	-15	15,387
	2000/01	+209	15,402
	1999/00	+169	15,193
	1998/99	-70.63	15,024

Question (2) What is the distribution of the FTE between the Council departments?

Answer (2) See attached appendix.

Appendix

Department	2002/3 Dec 02	2003/4 Dec 03	FTE Difference	Difference Excluding Major Internal Transfers	Explanation
City Development	1005.18	1008.68	3.50	3.5	
Corporate Services	471.78	590.58	118.80	21.24	91.56 FTE transferred in from Social Work & Education into the Corporate Transport Unit. (Internal Transfer) 6 FTE transferred from Finance into ICT Division (Internal Transfer) 21.24 FTE due to recruitment to Civil Marriage Celebrants posts, continuing recruitment following Legal Services Review, continuing recruitment to CCTV posts and e-government posts
Catering/Cleaning	756.07	739.00	-17.07	-17.07	Reduction due to PPP
Education	5933.00	6100.30	167.30	187.3	Changes mainly due to McCrone report - Business Managers were recruited for each school to relieve teachers of some of the admin duties. Breakfast Club Assistants and Learning Assistants appointed 20 FTE transferred to Corporate Services – Corporate Transport Unit (Internal Transfer)
Environmental & Consumer Services	1115.00	1204.50	89.50	89.5	Recruitment of Environmental Wardens and Environmental Health Officers
Finance	517.44	519.57	2.13	8.13	6 FTE transferred to Corporate Services - ICT Division (Internal Transfer)
Housing	1270.31	1346.73	76.42	76.42	Scottish Executive initiative such as recruiting Community Safety concierge and Supporting People
Culture & Leisure	636.63	601.09	-35.54	-35.54	Changes in number of seasonal contracts

Department	2002/3 Dec 02	2003/4 Dec 03	FTE Difference	Difference Excluding Major Internal Transfers	Explanation
Social Work	3916.00	4069.90	153.90	225.46	Recruitment to new Trainee Social Worker posts to encourage people into the profession. Also Social Work took over 3 Care Homes and their employees. Recruitment drive in domiciliary care 71.56 FTE transferred to Corporate Services - Corporate Transport Unit. (Internal Transfer)
TOTAL	15621.41	16180.35	558.94	558.94	

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Gilchrist to be answered by the Leader at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2004

Question (1) As part of the planning consent for the development at Gogar, what planning gain is flowing to the Council from this multi-million pound development?

Answer (1) All planning gain issues were contained in the report to Planning Committee at the time the development was approved.

Benefits provided within conditions and legal agreement provisions approved by Committee:

a) Western Tram Route:

Make available to the Council the land and property on the north side of the A8, within the Bank's ownership, which may be required for the proposed tramway and tram stops.

Fund the provision of a tram stop to serve the development, if required.

b) Improvements to traffic management arrangements to the approaches to Gogar interchange and Maybury junction.

c) Traffic management measures on Gogar Station Road and at its junction with A8.

d) Closure of central reserve crossing points between Gogar interchange and Eastfield Road.

e) Amendments to traffic management measures at Newbridge interchange.

The development was treated as a major inward investment and remains possibly the most significant planning consent granted by this Council in the last 20 years.

QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Mackintosh to
be answered by the Executive
Member for Transport and
Public Realm at a meeting of
the Council on 29 April 2004**

Question (1) What was the total spent by the Council on maintenance of roads, footways and street lighting in each financial year since 1996?

Answer	(1)	Year	Revenue £000's	Capital £000's	Total £000's
		1998/99	16,910	465	17,375
		1999/00	16,206	1,547	17,753
		2000/01	15,744	2,098	17,842
		2001/02	13,869	3,456	17,325
		2002/03	17,421	5,173	22,594

Question (2) What was the GAE assessment for the Council for the maintenance of roads, footways and street lighting in each financial year since 1996?

Answer	(2)	Year	£000's
		1998/99	14,634
		1999/00	14,496
		2000/01	14,795
		2001/02	15,544
		2002/03	18,419

Question (3) What was the total revenue collected by the Council from on-street parking, pay and display, residents parking permits and parking fines (net of collection costs) for the Council in each year from 1996?

Answer	(3)	Year	£000's
		1998/99	(6,784)
		1999/00	(9,603)
		2000/01	(8,820)
		2001/02	(10,750)
		2002/03	(11,115)

Local Financial Returns (LFR) figures have not been calculated for 2003/4 as the council is in process of completing close of accounts for 2003/4 and figures are not yet available

Comparable information is not available for 1996/7 and 1997/8

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Mackintosh to
be answered by the Executive
Member for Transport and
Public Realm at a meeting of
the Council on 29 April 2004**

Question (1) In financial years 2002/03, 2003/04 how much was spent by the City of Edinburgh Council in replacing traffic cones, temporary diversion signs, other temporary traffic street signage and street furniture that were lost or stolen from road works in the city?

Answer (1) Traffic cones, roadworks signs and pedestrian barriers are replaced on an annual basis owing to a number of reasons including loss, theft and fair wear and tear.

Although no record is maintained of the reason units are replaced, in 2002/03 £54,564 was spent on the purchase of cones, roadworks signs and barriers. Of this, some £19,000 was spent on items that are most susceptible to loss and theft.

In 2003/04, £38,768 was spent on the purchase of cones, roadworks signs and barriers, with £14,000 of this spent on items that are most susceptible to loss and theft.

As temporary diversion signs are fixed to poles etc, loss or theft does not appear to be a major issue.

Question (2) In financial years 2002/03, 2003/04 how much was spent by the City of Edinburgh Council in leasing or purchasing traffic cones, temporary diversion signs, other temporary traffic street signage or street furniture?

Answer

(2) In 2002/03, £54, 564 was spent on the purchase of cones, signs and barriers. A further £7,700 was spent on the manufacture of temporary road signs and £56,988 was spent on the hire of traffic management equipment.

In 2003/04, £38,768 was spent on the purchase of cones, signs and barriers. A further £7,700 was spent on the manufacture of temporary road signs and £63,319 was spent on the hire of traffic management equipment.

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Mackintosh to
be answered by the Executive
Member for Transport and
Public Realm at a meeting of
the Council on 29 April 2004**

Question

- (1) In the interest of fairness and openness in the process of the Public Inquiry into the Edinburgh Congestion Charging Scheme will you:
- a) explain how the Reporters and the Council can properly consider objections to the Scheme whilst those objections remain secret and anonymous;
 - b) explain how Objectors can properly represent their objections to the Reporters whilst they are unaware of the details and identities of other objectors; and
 - c) publish in full all the objections to the Scheme that will be considered by the Reporters.

Answer

- (1) a) The objections have been processed properly in accordance with the Road User Charging Regulations. Copies of all of the objections have been submitted to the Reporters to allow them to read the objections and use them to prepare for the Public Inquiry. Any participant to the inquiry may ask the Reporters for copies of the letters of objections. It is for the Reporters to decide whether or not to provide copies. Any such requests should be made through the Programme Officer.
- b) Each objector has his or her own objection and the Council's Statement of Case. There is no apparent need for every objector to see every other objection in order to present his case, especially in an inquisitorial inquiry where the onus is on the Reporters to test the Council's case.
- c) The Council does not intend to publish the letters of objection because there is no legal requirement or other justification to do so.

QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Mackintosh to
be answered by the Executive
Member for Transport and
Public Realm at a meeting of
the Council on 29 April 2004**

Question (1) Paragraph 7.27 of the Council's Statement of Case for the Congestion Charging Inquiry states that in the event of higher costs for congestion charging equipment and lower congestion charging revenues, the value of projects funded from congestion charging revenues would reduce from £761m to £509m. Which of the proposals in the Additional Investment Package would not be implemented by the Council in the event that such a reduction occurred?

Answer (1) The case being referred to in the question reflects a contingency test examined for the business case for congestion charging. This contingency test examined the effect of a reduction in revenues of 25% combined with an increase (of an amount in line with Treasury Green Book Guidance) in the capital cost of congestion charging scheme equipment. In order to accommodate the resulting significant reduction in net revenue the investment programme would have to be commensurately reduced. The indicative reduced investment programme is set out in table 12 of the Preliminary Business Case Financial Modelling Refresh published on 16 March 2004. The programme shown in this table shows cuts across a wide range of projects, though a particular effort has been made to maintain spend on bus services, air pollution reduction measures and road maintenance improvement.

QUESTION NO 11

**By Councillor Mackintosh to
be answered by the Executive
Member for Social Inclusion
and Economic Development
at a meeting of the Council on
29 April 2004**

- Question** (1) How many meetings of the Board of Waterfront Edinburgh Limited were attended by each of the Directors of the company appointed by the Council in –
- a) 2000
 - b) 2001
 - c) 2002
 - d) 2003

- Question** (2) How many meetings of the Board of Waterfront Edinburgh Limited have occurred in each of the years above?

- Question** (3) On how many occasions in each of the above years have Directors of Waterfront Edinburgh Limited appointed by the Council appointed Alternate Directors in accordance with Articles 36 to 40 of the Articles of Association of the Company.

Answers From 2000 to May 2003 the Councillors on the Board of Waterfront Edinburgh Limited were:

Councillor L Cameron
Councillor W Fitzpatrick
Councillor L Hinds

In 2000 Board attendance was as follows:

Councillor L Cameron	=	4 out of 5
Councillor W Fitzpatrick	=	4 out of 5
Councillor L Hinds	=	5 out of 5

In 2001 Board attendance was as follows:

Councillor Cameron = 7 out of 9
Councillor Fitzpatrick = 7 out of 9
Councillor Hinds = 7 out of 9
During this period, Councillor Maginnis attended 1 Board as Alternate.

In 2002 Board attendance was as follows:

Councillor Cameron = 7 out of 8
Councillor Fitzpatrick = 5 out of 8
Councillor Hinds = 6 out of 8
During this period Councillor Maginnis attended 1 Board as Alternate.

In the period January to May 2003 attendance was as follows:

Councillor Cameron = 3 out of 3
Councillor Fitzpatrick = 2 out of 3
Councillor Hinds = 3 out of 3
During this period Councillor Maginnis attended 1 Board as Alternate

From May 2003 onwards the Councillors on the Board of Waterfront Edinburgh Limited were:

Councillor E Maginnis
Councillor W Fitzpatrick
Councillor I Perry

In the period from May 2003 to December 2003 attendance was as follows:

Councillor Maginnis = 7 out of 7
Councillor Fitzpatrick = 6 out of 7
Councillor Perry = 3 out of 7

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Grubb to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Public Realm at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2004

Question (1) What measures have been taken to safeguard access to South Queensferry and to stop rat-running through the Burgh during repairs to the Forth Road Bridge?

Answer (1) The surfacing works on the Forth Road Bridge are programmed to be carried out during 10 weekends from April to mid June. Works will cease during July and August and recommence in September for a further period of 8 weekends.

The signing strategy has been agreed with the police and is aimed at informing drivers in advance of potential delays at the Bridge. Scotrail are providing additional carriages on the trains between Fife and Edinburgh and Stagecoach are running regular shuttle buses between the park and ride and the city centre.

At present there are no specific measures to prevent traffic from driving through South Queensferry. However, it should be noted that the police have indicated that there was no increase in traffic using this route during the first weekend when restrictions were in place. Indeed they have reported that the traffic appeared to be less than normal.

Nonetheless, the traffic flows in the area will be monitored during the course of the work and if there is a significant increase in traffic, which is considered to constitute a problem, then steps will be taken to reduce the impact and ensure road safety is not compromised.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Lowrie to be answered by the Executive Member for Youth Strategy and Education at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2004

Question (1) In school year 2002/3 how many P1/P2 composite classes are there in Primary 1 and 2 in Edinburgh?

Question (2) In school year 2003/4 how many P1/P2 composite classes are there in Primary 1 and 2 in Edinburgh?

Question (3) For school year 2004/5 how many composite classes are there expected to be in Primary 1 and 2 in Edinburgh?

Answers (1), (2) and (3)

	Rolls (census/ projected)	Total number of classes	Total number of composite classes	P1/2 composites	Total schools with composite classes
2002/03 102 schools	27471	1099	136 (13%)	14	60 (59%)
2003/04 98 schools	26932	1072	121 (11%)	9	59 (60%)
2004/05 97 schools	26634	1038 (projected)	126 (12%) (projected)	22 (projected)	57(58%) (projected)

Question (4) Which primary schools have or will suffer a reduction in numbers of teaching posts due to reduction in school roll during school year 2003/4 and 2004/5 and by how many staff will this reduction be?

Answer (4) The total primary school teaching staff allocation for session 2003/04 is 1417 fte (full time equivalent) and the total projected teaching staff for 2004/05 is 1470 fte (including teachers to deliver the reduction in contact time for primary pupils); therefore, thanks to the continued increased investment in education by this administration, the number of teachers will increase not decrease across the city. Where an individual school staff complement falls, that is because the roll has fallen, not because of any reduction in expenditure in education.

It is anticipated that around 34 schools will have a reduced number of classes in August 2004. The anticipated reduction in the primary school roll is around 300 pupils. The outcome of the placing requests process, including appeals, is not yet finalised and therefore it is not yet possible to list the schools that will have fewer classes.

Question (5) What is the cost saving to the Council of the reduction in numbers of teaching posts detailed in the answer to Question 4?

Answer (5) Due to falling school rolls and the impact of these on Grant Aided Expenditure for the Council, there is no cost saving to the Council as a result of this reduction in classes. As was noted in the above answer, we will be spending more money on more teachers, investing in education and constantly improving the opportunities for our young people to fulfil their potential.

Additional information

Our policy, consistent with placing request legislation, is to accommodate wherever possible all district pupils and a number of non-district placing requests where these can be accommodated without the formation of an additional class. Where it is possible to accommodate placing requests through the formation of a composite class, we are requested by legislation to facilitate this. This may constrain our ability to keep class sizes below the maximum. No class will be above the maximum.

Composite classes follow the same 5-14 curriculum as single stage classes. Within both single stream and composite classes children are taught at their own level and therefore in this sense all classes may be regarded as composites. Furthermore, within a composite class, the ages of the pupils may be closer than within a single stage class.

Research indicates that 37% of all classes in Scottish primary schools are composites
– the Edinburgh figure is lower at 12 %

Research indicates that 78% of all Scottish primary schools have composite classes
– the Edinburgh figure is lower at 58 %

For 2002/03 (the latest information published by Audit Scotland) the percentage of composite classes is as follows:

Glasgow City:	23%
Dundee City:	12%
Aberdeen City:	19%
North Lanarkshire:	26%