

**THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL**

**MEETING 4**

**23 AUGUST 2018**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

## Item no 5.1

### QUESTION NO 1

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the  
Convener of the Planning Committee  
at a meeting of the Council on 23  
August 2018**

#### Question

Can you publish a table showing:

1. All the major housing developments in the North West Locality which have been approved in the last 15 years and where the Council has entered into a legal agreement with a developer with respect to Section 75 contributions.
2. The individual projects as covered by the legal agreement for each individual housing development and the agreed financial contribution for each project.
3. The current status of each project where the S75 contribution has been paid.
4. The projects where the S75 contribution is still to be paid and what, if any, trigger points exist for payment.

#### Answer

1. The attached table displays the 22 major housing sites for which 32 planning applications are relevant to the question.
2. Details of the projects and associated financial contributions including Section 75 contributions are shown by type (by column).
3. The current status of delivery of projects is not held on the Planning database and therefore this data needs to be collated. It will be provided to members in advance of the Council meeting on 20 September 2018.
4. Contributions still to be paid are colour coded on the attached table and relate to only 6 of the 22 major housing developments. Where applicable, the legal agreements includes details of the trigger points for payment. This information is not included on the table but specific information can be provided on individual applications if requested.

REFERENCE	SITE ADDRESS	DATE GRANTED	T'PORT	TRAM	PREALM	AFFHO	EDUC
<b>ALMOND - A01</b>							
01/01855/FUL	Land adjacent to Newliston Road, Kirkliston	26-Feb-07	£59,500.00				£50,984.00
03/00399/FUL	Stirling Road, Kirkliston	17-Sep-04	£90,000.00			14 units	£175,684.00
04/04627/FUL	Echline Avenue, South Queensferry	12-Sep-07	£15,000.00		£94,865.00		
05/02336/FUL	562 Queensferry Road (Barnton Hotel)	13-Oct-06	£42,500.00			£87,870.00	
12/01941/FUL	562 Queensferry Road (Barnton Hotel)	12-Nov-12	£9,000.00				
06/05149/OUT	Land adjacent to Queensferry Road, Kirkliston	07-May-09	£391,500.00		£280,000.00	25%	£4,952,236.00
11/01857/FUL	Land adjacent to Queensferry Road, Kirkliston	23-Apr-12	£15,000.00			£143,129.00	£30,000.00
14/01283/PPP	Land adjacent to Queensferry Road, Kirkliston	08-May-15				£180,467.00	£79,383.15
07/04646/OUT	1A Old Liston Road, Newbridge	08-Sep-14	£329,000.00	£690,000.00	£112,500.00	17%	£1,780,000.00
14/01509/PPP	Site North of Ferrymuir Gait, South Queensferry	08-Oct-15	£27,500.00			25%	£660,000.00
14/04172/FUL	Site to West of 4 Ferrymuir, South Queensferry	01-Dec-15				25%	£334,215.28
<b>DRUM BRAE/GYLE - A03</b>							
04/03378/FUL	36 Clerwood Terrace	03-Feb-06	Links				
09/01933/FUL	36 Clerwood Terrace	17-Feb-10	£110,000.00			25%	£154,104.00
12/03114/FUL	36 Clerwood Terrace [11 additional units]	20-Mar-13	£5,000.00				£28,237.00
13/04209/FUL	Site to West of 34 Clerwood Terrace [+5 units]	09-Apr-14					£12,835.00
08/02880/FUL	1-5 Bughtlin Market	10-Jun-09	£32,005.63			25%	£59,773.88
13/05183/FUL	Land to East of 20 South Gyle Wynd	05-Dec-14				25%	£543,815.92
<b>FORTH - A04</b>							
02/03635/FUL	Land adjacent to Lower Granton Road	20-Oct-03					£166,212.46
04/03604/REM	Granton Harbour (Plot 28)	16-Mar-06					£116,300.00
05/01925/FUL	West Pilton Street	11-Jul-12		£200,000.00		100%	
07/03980/OUT	67, 67B Muirhouse Avenue	15-Jun-12					£138,563.00
11/00387/FUL	Site NW of 4 South Trinity Road (Trinity Park House)	24-Mar-15	Works			£777,500.00	£187,181.43
13/00604/FUL	Land to Rear of 500 Ferry Road	27-Sep-13	£2,500.00			25%	£74,745.47
13/01954/PPP	Regeneration Masterplan Pennywell/Muirhouse	18-Sep-13					£9,498.00
13/04479/FUL	Site at former 347A Pilton Avenue	27-Mar-14	£2,000.00				
16/00155/FUL	Land to West of 14 Kingsburgh Crescent	30-Mar-17	£4,000.00				£136,600.00
<b>INVERLEITH - A05</b>							
<b>CORSTORPHINE/MURRAYFIELD - A06</b>							
12/01683/FUL	33 Ellersly Road	29-Jan-13	£34,000.00			£325,000.00	£69,492.00
15/03780/FUL	1B West Coates, Donaldsons College	23-Jun-16	£105,500.00	£261,233.00		£1,243,750.00	£101,768.00
04/03624/FUL	1B West Coates, Donaldsons College	24-Jul-07		£160,000.00		25%	£81,223.00

WARD - SITE ADDRESS	REFERENCE	DATE GRANTED	TRANSPORT	TRAM	PUBLIC REALM	AFFORDABLE HOUSING	EDUCATION
<b>ALMOND - A01</b>							
Land adjacent to Newliston Road, Kirkliston	01/01855/FUL	26-Feb-07	Puffin Crossing on Queensferry Road, Kirkliston - £28,000				Accommodation at Kirkliston PS - £50,984
			Signals upgrade on New Liston Road, Kirkliston - £20,000				
			Safer Routes to School programme - £10,000				
			TRO (Road Markings) - £1,500				
Stirling Road, Kirkliston	03/00399/FUL	17-Sep-04	Traffic Signals upgrade at Main Street/Station Road, Kirkliston- £60,000			On site provision of 14 units	Accommodation at Kirkliston PS - £175,684
			Transport Improvements (not specified) - £30,000				
Echline Avenue, South Queensferry	04/04627/FUL	12-Sep-07	Safer Routes to School programme - £15,000		Play Area contribution - £94,865		
562 Queensferry Road (Barnton Hotel)	05/02336/FUL	13-Oct-06	Traffic Calming Measures - £30,000			On site provision 6 Units + £87,870 contribution	
			Real Time Information Units - £10,000				
			TRO - £2,500				
	12/01941/FUL	12-Nov-12	Car Club - £7,5000				
			Junction Box markings - £1,500				
			Bus Stop relocation - to be completed by developer				

WARD - SITE ADDRESS	REFERENCE	DATE GRANTED	TRANSPORT	TRAM	PUBLIC REALM	AFFORDABLE HOUSING	EDUCATION
Land adjacent to Queensferry Road, Kirkliston	06/05149/OUT	07-May-09	Bus contribution £200,000		Towards 'Key Arrival site' improvements - £280,000	On site provision 25%	Accommodation at Kirkliston PS - £4,952,236
			Road Improvements - £161,500				
			Safer Routes to School programme - £30,000				
	11/01857/FUL	23-Apr-12	Local road network improvements - £15,000			Contribution - £143,129	£90,000 towards transport to St Margarets Academy for 6 years; only £30,000 paid
	14/01283/PPP	08-May-15				Contribution - £180,467	For accommodation at Catchment schools - £79,383.15
1A Old Liston Road, Newbridge	07/04646/OUT	08-Sep-14	Newbridge junction - £165,000	Tram contribution - £690,000	Community facility - £100,000	On site provision 17%	Accommodation at Hillwood PS - £1,780,000
			Bus service - £100,000		Streetscape improvements - £12,500		
			Public Transport improvements - £44,000				
			National Cycle Network - £20,000				
Site North of Ferrymuir Gait, South Queensferry	14/01509/PPP	08-Oct-15	Puffin crossing on Kirkliston Road - £25,000			On site provision 25%	Queensferry PS - £135,000
			TRO - £2,500				Queensferry HS + St Augustine's RC HS - £525,000
Site to West of 4 Ferrymuir, South Queensferry	14/04172/FUL	01-Dec-15				On site provision 25%	Education contribution towards accomm within the Contribution Zone - £495,480

WARD - SITE ADDRESS	REFERENCE	DATE GRANTED	TRANSPORT	TRAM	PUBLIC REALM	AFFORDABLE HOUSING	EDUCATION
							£334,215.28 received £247,740(i) outstanding at 90th and 120th occupations
<b>DRUM BRAE/GYLE - A03</b>							
36 Clerwood Terrace	09/01933/FUL	17-Feb-10	Signals upgrade at Clermiston Road/St John's Road- £80,000			On site provision 25%	Craigmount HS + Forrester HS - £154,104
			Upgrade Bus infrastructure - £20,000				
			Cycleways linking Clermiston to Edinburgh Park station- £10,000				
<i>original</i>	04/03378/FUL	03-Feb-06	All provisions re-established with 09/01933/FUL				
<i>[11 additional units]</i>	12/03114/FUL	20-Mar-13	Public Transport - £5,000				Fox Covert PS - £28,237
<i>[+5 units]</i>	13/04209/FUL	09-Apr-14					Fox Covert PS - £12,835
1-5 Bughtlin Market	08/02880/FUL	10-Jun-09	Public Transport Contribution - £32,005.63			On site provision 25%	High School accommodation - £59,773.88
Land to East of 20 South Gyle Wynd	13/05183/FUL	05-Dec-14				On site provision 25%	Gylemuir PS + Forrester HS or elsewhere - £543,815.92
<b>FORTH - A04</b>							

WARD - SITE ADDRESS	REFERENCE	DATE GRANTED	TRANSPORT	TRAM	PUBLIC REALM	AFFORDABLE HOUSING	EDUCATION
Land adjacent to Lower Granton Road	02/03635/FUL	20-Oct-03					Education contribution - £166,212.46 [NB/. Monies never recovered]
Granton Harbour (Plot 28)	04/03604/RE M	16-Mar-06					General Education contribution - £116,300
West Pilton Street	05/01925/FUL	11-Jul-12		£200,000 - only to be paid if CEC Tram contract let along West Granton Access		On site provision 100%	
67, 67B Muirhouse Avenue	07/03980/OUT	15-Jun-12					Accom at Craigroyston HS - £138,563 or for public transport infrastructure or accommodation at other local schools
Site NW of 4 South Trinity Road (Trinity Park House)	11/00387/FUL	24-Mar-15	Cycle Link Access works to be completed by developer			Contribution - £777,500	Accom at Wardie PS - £187,181.43
Land to Rear of 500 Ferry Road	13/00604/FUL	27-Sep-13	Signalised junction works to be completed by developer			On site provision 25%	Granton PS - £74,745.47
			TRO - £2,500				
Regeneration Masterplan Pennywell/Muirhouse	13/01954/PPP	18-Sep-13					St David's RC PS accommodation - £9,498
Site at former 347A Pilton Avenue	13/04479/FUL	27-Mar-14	TRO - £2,000				
Land to West of 14 Kingsburgh Crescent	16/00155/FUL	30-Mar-17	20% of developer net profits				School accommodation in Catchment - £136,600
			TRO - £4,000				

WARD - SITE ADDRESS	REFERENCE	DATE GRANTED	TRANSPORT	TRAM	PUBLIC REALM	AFFORDABLE HOUSING	EDUCATION
INVERLEITH - A05							
CORSTORPHINE/MURRAY FIELD - A06							
33 Ellersly Road	12/01683/FUL	29-Jan-13	Public Transport - £15,000			Contribution - £325,000	Roseburn PS - £69,492
			Safer Routes to Schools programme - £10,000				
			TROs - £7,500				
			Signals - £1,500				
1B West Coates, Donaldsons College	15/03780/FUL	23-Jun-16	Roseburn to Leith cycle route - £101,500	Contribution - £261,233		Contribution - £1,243,750	Roseburn PS and/or Craigmount HS - £101,768
			TRO - £4,000				
<i>original - Superseded by (15/03780/FUL)</i>	04/03624/FUL	24-Jul-07		Contribution - £160,000		On site provision 25%	Contribution - £81,223
	KEY:		All monies paid to CEC except:				
			Trigger outstanding				
			Monies repaid				
			Some monies received but other triggers remain outstanding				



## Item no 5.2

### QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

Regarding the Council's ill considered proposal to call residents to ask for £25 payment for the Garden Waste Tax, can you confirm:

**Question** (1) When first you became aware of the potential for fraud and the breach of good practice?

**Answer** (1) The potential for fraud was generally considered as part of the initial setting up of the process. The specific issue raised about fraud to third parties was first identified to Council officers by Cllr Campbell on Friday 22 June after close of business hours.

**Question** (2) On what date the process was changed, so that the Council would not place calls asking for payment, but only accept payments on inbound calls?

**Answer** (2) See response to (3) below.

**Question** (3) Explain why it took so long to close this potential security breach, when the exact nature of this issue was highlighted to senior Officer as early as 22 June\*.

\* text of email sent to Senior Officers and copied to Director, 22 June:

I was keen to catch a word with you today regarding the proposed process for collecting the fee for garden waste.

As I understand it, residents will get a letter explaining that they need to contact us to have T&Cs sent out, which they need to agree to these Ts&Cs and return a signed copy, at which point we will call them to take payment over the phone.

Leaving aside the inefficiency of this process, it seems to me to be fundamentally flawed in terms of security.

I think it is safe to assume that it will be no secret that residents in Edinburgh will be expected to pay a known amount to a known payee over a known period.

\*\*I have drafted a script that a malicious caller could use below. How can residents check the validity of a caller, given all the key information is public?

I understand that we do have an opinion that this is a compliment process. Can this opinion be shared?

As it stands, I don't see how I could advise any constituent to do other than decline to make any payment to CEC over the phone after receiving a call, but instead suggested they call CEC back using the number on the letter to make payment.

Your thoughts would be appreciated.

I apologise if I have not gained an accurate understanding of the process. I am surprised that these letters are now going out, and that we are already receiving contact from constituents on what they need to do, before any briefing has been made or offered to Members.

Kind Regards

*\*\*A draft script was outlined in the question to highlight the risk of fraud and this has been redacted for security reasons.*

**Answer**

- (3)** The email from Councillor Campbell was received on Friday 22 June at 6.14pm. This was passed to the project team on the morning of Monday 25 June. The change to process was confirmed at 2pm on 27 June.

Following discussions between the services involved, an initial change to the process for all new enquirers was made on Wednesday 27 June to reduce the risk of the fraud. This change stopped outgoing calls from the Council seeking payment for all new enquirers.

In good faith, and in order to complete the procedure which had been agreed prior to the process change, 13 citizens were contacted for payment after this date as they had already been sent terms and conditions for agreement and

return prior to the change. It should be noted that from the beginning, all outbound calls made were supported by appropriate security questions and the process had been explained to the customers at the time of their original contact. With the exception of one call made on Monday 2 July, all outgoing calls seeking payment stopped on Friday 29 June.

It should be noted that the change made on 27 June (2.5 working days following initial identification) significantly reduced the risk of fraud to third parties as the Council had ceased making calls seeking payment for any new enquirers from that date.

It should be noted that of the 56,028 transactions made, only 7800 were processed via telephone or in person in local offices. Of these, only a very small number of outbound calls were made.

## Item no 5.3

### QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

- Question** (1) How many trees has the Council recorded as requiring some work, but where that work had still to be completed on 31 July, 2018?
- Answer** (1) 2,787
- Question** (2) How does this figure compare with the same figure from the end of July 2017?
- Answer** (2) July 2017 = 2,631
- Question** (3) How many of these trees have had work outstanding for (i) over 1 year, and (ii) over 2 years?
- Answer** (3) (i) 575 (ii) 279
- Question** (4) What resources would the Forestry Service required to clear all the outstanding tree works by the end of this financial year? What level of additional resources does this imply?
- Answer** (4) To complete by year end would require hiring several arborist contractors. Without a procurement exercise it is not possible to determine the cost. Alternatively, employing an additional tree squad within the Forestry Service would allow for the back-log to be tackled over a 12-24 month period.
- Question** (5) How many trees are growing on land for which the Council is responsible, but the trees have not been included as part of the Council's Tree Management Plan?
- Answer** (5) 59,536 trees on streets and within parks and cemeteries have been digitally mapped and are regularly condition-assessed. Trees within properties managed by Facilities Management and Housing have not yet been fully surveyed or mapped, nor have trees along cycleways. This is estimated to be a total of some 82,000 trees.

## Item no 5.4

### QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) What is the value of sponsorship secured around Edinburgh hosting the EURO CITIES 2018 conference?

**Answer** (1) Significant in-kind sponsorship has been committed from a number of organisations. There has been no committed financial sponsorship to date. However, officers are continuing to discuss opportunities with potential sponsors.

**Question** (2) What is the most recent projected surplus from hosting this important event?

**Answer** (2) There is no projected surplus anticipated from hosting this event. The Council is not hosting the conference for financial reasons but for the economic and social impact of having such a prestigious international event taking place in the city.

**Question** (3) What are the arrangements for Officers and Councillors from this Council to attend this event?

**Answer** (3) The formal arrangements for attendance at the conference have not yet been finalised. However a strong presence both from Councillors, officers and partners is anticipated.

The Lord Provost, as the Council's political representative for EURO CITIES, will be expected to host and attend a significant number of events over the course of the conference.

## Item no 5.5

### QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### Question

In the Feb budget 2018, approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018 there was an allocation of £100k for a subsidised bus service to provide a service between St John's Hospital and south west Edinburgh, specifically Balerno, Currie and Juniper Green.

What plans are currently being put in place to provide this essential service to this area?

#### Answer

The Council approved funding of £100k for supported public transport in Currie and Balerno.

Council officers are investigating options for providing an enhanced bus link between St John's Hospital and the Currie/Balerno and Juniper Green area. The options considered include: extending the existing service 63 (operated by Lothian Buses, supported by City of Edinburgh Council) or extending the EM Horsburgh Service 40, which is a cross boundary service (supported and managed by West Lothian Council).

The first of these options would entail bus users having to change services in order to access the hospital while the second would provide a direct link.

A new Framework Agreement for Supported Bus Services and mini-competitions will take place later this year for a number of routes. These routes are still to be developed but will be done in consultation with local communities.

In addition, discussions will continue with officers from West Lothian Council to explore opportunities for more mutually beneficial joint working with regards to cross boundary services.

## Item no 5.6

### QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

- Question** (1) How many major development sites with more than 50 units have planning permissions that are due to expire within the next three years, broken by year, whether permission in full or in principle, including the number of units?
- Answer** (1) See table attached at Appendix 1.
- Question** (2) What is the reasonable foreseeable demand for permissions due to expansion of Edinburgh's educational estate?
- Answer** (2) The expansion of the educational estate is a consequence of the future need and demand for housing in Edinburgh. It is not possible to identify whether such expansion in itself generates additional demand for new housing but any such demand is likely to be marginal in comparison to the more fundamental drivers of growth.
- Question** (3) What are the resource implications for the Planning and Building Control if developers bring forward further applications in advance of any existing applications expiring? What level of additional resources would this represent over the resources deployed in June 2018?
- Answer** (3) It is not possible to forecast when planning applications will be submitted for individual sites. The average annual number of major housing applications submitted over the last five years is 31 and while there will be annual fluctuations it is likely to continue around this level. The relevant teams are resourced to process these. It is currently not anticipated that this will increase significantly. The forward plans of the volume housebuilders are monitored annually through the Housing Land Audit and if this situation alters, resources can be reallocated within the services.

**Question** (4) What Planning and Building Control resource are anticipated to be required to support the expansion of the Education estate?

**Answer** (4) Managers in Planning and Building Standards are in regular contact with the project teams delivering the programme to expand the educational estate. The relevant Planning and Building Standards teams are sufficiently resourced to process these. As outlined in Question 6 (6) the issue of workload pressures is known and being addressed.

**Question** (5) What Planning and Building Control resource are anticipated to be required to support the announced and anticipated developments in West Edinburgh, including Parabola, Garden District, Cammo estate, IBG and Edinburgh Airport?

**Answer** (5) Managers in Planning and Building Standards are well aware of these developments and are in regular contact with the developers. While substantial, such developments do not signal a radical change in the teams' workload. As referred to answer 6 (3), managers believe that the existing resource is adequate to respond to anticipated demand. As outlined in Question 6 (6) the issue of workload pressures is known and being addressed.

**Question** (6) What plans has the Convener put in place to secure any additional resources a reasonable person would deem prudent in light of these anticipated demands?

**Answer** (6) The Administration is well aware of the general workload pressures in the Planning and Building Standards service and the impact this is having on customers. The [Planning and Building Standards Action Plans 2018/19](#) were approved by the Planning Committee on 30 May 2018. These plans include proposals to invest the additional budget provision for Planning and some of the increases in Planning and Building Standards fee income in additional staff, in line with the Capital Commitments.



**Appendix 1: Planning consents for housing development (50+ units) due to expire within 3 years**

Time period	Number of applications				No of Units			
	PPP*	AMC	FUL	Total	PPP*	AMC	FUL	Total
1/8/18 - 31/07/19	3	1	1	<b>5</b>	630	321	258	<b>1,209</b>
1/8/19 - 31/07/20	4	6	3	<b>13</b>	1,780	1,168	285	<b>3,233</b>
1/8/20 - 31/07/21	0	1	2	<b>3</b>	0	260	202	<b>462</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2,410</b>	<b>1,749</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>4,904</b>

Some of Planning Permissions in Principle (PPP) consents have been partially developed or have Application for Approval of Matters specified in Conditions (AMC) applications for part of the area. The number of units figure relates to the part of the PPP consent that is undeveloped and has no AMC consent.

Two of the PPP consents due to expire have AMC applications submitted, pending consideration (368 units from year 2018 – 2019, 169 units from year 2019 – 2020).

## Item no 5.7

### QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 23 August 2018**

In response to my motion on Kirkliston Congestion at the Full Council meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017, a coalition amendment was passed which included the following;

*To acknowledge that a lack of adequate public transport provision was a major contributory factor to current congestion levels and agree to continue dialogue with Lothian Buses around introducing a direct service to the City Centre.*

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>Question</b> | <b>(1)</b> Can the Convener please advise what actions she has taken over the past year to secure a direct Lothian Bus Service for Kirkliston?   |
| <b>Answer</b>   | <b>(1)</b> I refer to the answer given to Councillor Young's question on <a href="#">15 March 2018</a> which indicates that it would not be appropriate for the Council to request the introduction of any new bus services.   |
| <b>Question</b> | <b>(2)</b> Does the Convener accept that these efforts have been a failure?  |
| <b>Answer</b>   | <b>(2)</b> No.   |
| <b>Question</b> | <b>(3)</b> Given recent announcements of a further diminished service to the village from third party providers, what does the Convener now intend to do to secure this much needed service and to finally put the residents of Kirkliston on a par with the rest of our city? |
| <b>Answer</b>   | <b>(3)</b> Officers will raise this issue with local bus operators as part of our regular liaison with them. In addition, officers are meeting with colleagues from West Lothian Council to consider opportunities for cross boundary services.                                |

## Item no 5.8

### QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) When did the Convenor first become aware of the decision by the City Wide Traffic Management Group to allow two sets of roadworks, both involving lane closures, to run concurrently on Queensferry Road?

**Answer** (1) The Convenor of the Transport and Environment Committee is not generally notified of roadworks. In this circumstance the roadworks were discussed in detail, planned and agreed at the City Wide Traffic Management Review Group. All affected Ward Councillors and Community Councils were offered briefings and updates on the following dates:

- 8 June 18 – Initial Councillor and Community Council briefing
- 19 June 18 – Councillor and Community Council update
- 29 June 18 – Councillor and Community Council update
- 5 July 18 – Councillor and Community Council update
- 10 July 18 – Care Home briefing to Councillor and Community Council update
- 25 July 18 – Stage completion update

**Question** (2) Did the Convenor support this decision? and if so what was her justification for this support?

**Answer** (2) The Convenor was not party to this decision.

**Question** (3) Does the Convenor believe that a 90 minute bus journey time from the City Centre to Cramond is acceptable?

**Answer** (3) It is regrettable that public transport operators, local residents and commuters experienced delays at peak periods during the roadworks. In an effort to mitigate the impact of the roadworks the Scottish Power works were delayed for almost a year and programmed to coincide with the school summer holidays and Fife Trade holidays.

**Question** (4) In hindsight does the Convenor believe that the decision to allow the roadworks to take place concurrently was a mistake?

**Answer** (4) The North West Locality team and other key transport stakeholders (including police Scotland and Lothian Buses) planned and managed these works to mitigate the overall impact on the strategic road network. The main Scottish Power utility works were planned and programmed for some time and deemed to be the most critical activity. However, more recently the new Care Home development has required the construction of a new access and four separate utility connections. These latter additional works were arranged to be carried out under a two week occupation during a period of known reduced traffic flow (Fife trades holiday). If the works were carried out at any other time the resultant impact would have been more significant.

**Question** (5) Given the fact that the roadworks were regularly unmanned during the closure period and that neither set of roadworks was fully completed and both will have to return, does the Convenor accept that the Council has a fundamental issue with contractor management?

**Answer** (5) I do not accept that the Council has a fundamental issue with contractor management. Arrangements are agreed based on the best information available at the time. However, it will not always be possible to carry out works in accordance with these plans once on-site.

## Item no 5.9

### QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 23 August 2018**

The Council's Roads team made two submissions on the planning portal in relation to the proposed development at Cammo suggesting that the status of Maybury Road be downgraded.

**Question** (1) Given that Maybury Road currently exists as a de facto extension of the City Bypass, can the Convener please advise what modelling has been undertaken by the Council to support this transformational change to the roads hierarchy in North West Edinburgh.

**Answer** (1) The trunk road network's extension of the City Bypass to the north and west does not pass through Maybury Road, but instead passes through the M8, M9 and M90. Maybury Road is identified in the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance [street types map](#) as a 'Low Density Residential Street – Strategic'. Relevant changes in the character of the street do not represent a change to the roads hierarchy in North West Edinburgh and accordingly have not been modelled.

**Question** (2) Can the Convener please provide the justification for the proposed downgrading of a key arterial route with no viable alternative?

**Answer** (2) The principle of changing the character of Maybury Road was established in the [Edinburgh Local Development Plan](#), adopted in November 2016. Pages 58-60 set out the Maybury and Cammo Site Brief, which identifies proposals to change the character of Maybury Road through street design, safe path connections across the road and residential frontage with reduced speed limit. These measures were informed by the [Local Development Plan Transport Appraisal](#) (Vol 2 p52).

**Question** (3) Does the Convener believe that displacement of traffic onto established residential streets such as Drum Brae and Clermiston Road is desirable?

**Answer** (3) The Local Development Plan's proposals for change are intended to mitigate the impact of new development by supporting greater use of active travel and public transport. They are therefore intended to address overall growth in traffic and ensure that Maybury Road is suitable for its role as a residential street, comparable with other residential streets in the city including Drum Brae and Clermiston Road.

**Question** (4) Can the Convenor please explain the decision to include a bus lane on the plans for Maybury Road given that it is currently served by no buses?

**Answer** (4) The Local Development Plan site brief proposes enhanced bus infrastructure on Maybury Road (p59). This is also informed by the Local Development Plan Transport Appraisal, which also identifies the potential for bus services on Maybury Road. However, neither of these documents propose bus lanes.

## Item no 5.10

### QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) Could the Convener provide the number of people registered to pay Council Tax in the City Centre Ward for each of the last 10 years broken down by data zone?

**Answer** (1) The information was not available in the data zone groupings format originally requested in response to this question. An alternative dataset was agreed by officers with Councillor Mowat in advance of this response being finalised. The table below details the number of City Centre Ward properties registered for Council Tax from 1 April for the requested years.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of City Centre Ward properties registered for Council Tax at 1 April</b>
<b>2018</b>	18,429
<b>2017</b>	18,215
<b>2016</b>	18,106
<b>2015</b>	17,826
<b>2014</b>	17,624
<b>2013</b>	17,345
<b>2012</b>	17,072
<b>2011</b>	16,990
<b>2010</b>	16,833
<b>2009</b>	16,675
<b>2008</b>	16,579

**Question** (2) Please provide detail of the number of properties that have had their council tax status changed for the reasons of

- a) becoming uninhabitable,
- b) becoming a second home,
- c) or empty property

**Answer**

- (2) The data has been taken for 1 April for each of the requested years for the City Centre Ward.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Uninhabitable</b>	<b>Second Homes</b>	<b>Empty</b>
<b>2018</b>	31	N/A	552
<b>2017</b>	45	N/A	507
<b>2016</b>	39	678	601
<b>2015</b>	49	643	636
<b>2014</b>	53	646	633
<b>2013</b>	42	854	425
<b>2012</b>	41	1006	273
<b>2011</b>	45	1056	223
<b>2010</b>	43	959	320
<b>2009</b>	36	1005	274
<b>2008</b>	50	923	356

*\*Legislation changes resulted in the full Council Tax charge applying to these properties. Work is ongoing with the national system supplier to record second home status.*

**Question**

- (3) Detail the number of new properties registered for Council Tax?

**Answer**

- (3) The Lothian Valuation Joint Board is unable to break the data down to ward levels. This data reflects the total number of new properties for Edinburgh.

<b>Year</b>	<b>New Properties</b>
<b>2018/19 (Part)</b>	750
<b>2017/18</b>	3452
<b>2016/17</b>	2963
<b>2015/16</b>	3088
<b>2014/15</b>	2273
<b>2013/14</b>	2620
<b>2012/13</b>	1847
<b>2011/12</b>	2242
<b>2010/11</b>	2196
<b>2009/10</b>	2247
<b>2008/09</b>	2504



## Item no 5.11

### QUESTION NO 11

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

- Question** (1) In terms of let holders invoiced by the School Lets Team how many have been invoiced 4 months or more after their let for years 2016 and 2017?
- Answer** (1) The lets team do not hold this information but can confirm we invoice termly – this is under review.
- Question** (2) What is the reason for the delays in invoicing by the School Lets Team?
- Answer** (2) Due to Transformation of Business Support (2016) the lets team went from 3 members of staff to 1 causing a bottleneck in all lets related work (issuing permits, invoicing in timely manner)
- Question** (3) Due to late invoicing (a) how much has had to be written off; and (b) how many payment plans have had to be drawn up?
- Answer** (3) (a) We do not write – off but have re-charged if there has been errors in the rates charged  
(b) none to my knowledge
- Question** (4) What steps are being taken to improve the service levels offered by the School Lets Team?
- Answer** (4) We now have 3 FTE trained in this area and are actively pursuing a lets booking system fit for purpose as our current system is not fit for purpose (data loss, corrupt and ineffective access database)

## Item no 5.12

### QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### **Question**

In respect of each Elected Member Champion appointed by Council in August 2017 please advise from period of appointment to date:

- (a) The number of meetings or events attended/hosted;
- (b) Any travel or other expenses incurred by the Council;
- (c) Any outcomes achieved?

#### **Answer**

A report on Champions is scheduled for the Council meeting in September. This report will cover all the issues raised by Councillor Rust.

## Item no 5.13

### QUESTION NO 13

**By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### **Question**

What progress has been made with regards to finding funding to replace old electrical vehicle charging units across the city?

#### **Answer**

Funding has now been secured from Transport Scotland for the replacement and upgrade of a number of the Council's EV charging units. An Invitation to Tender document and associated Procurement Plan is currently being developed.

I would also ask you to note that a report is expected at the October meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee which will outline proposals to significantly augment the EV charging infrastructure in our Capital city.

## Item no 5.14

### QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

- Question** (1) What steps has the Convener taken to prepare for disproportionate increase in the uptake of places at Council schools in the event of Independent schools not expanding in line with the City's population growth?
- Answer** (1) Any trends in the pupil numbers which enter Council schools increasing would be picked up in the school roll projections which are updated every year and reported to the Education, Children and Families Committee in December.
- Question** (2) Should the Scottish Government change the tax arrangement for Scottish Independent Schools, and this resulted in an increase in fees or a reduction in subsidised places, both with the effect of reducing the number of Students attending Independent Schools in Edinburgh, what preparation has the Convener instructed so that the education of any students in this position can continue uninterrupted in their local Council School.
- Answer** (2) One purpose of the school roll projections outlined in 1) above is to determine future accommodation requirements so that appropriate infrastructure can be provided for the expected future school rolls.
- Question** (3) In addressing these question, could the Convener provide:
- a) Average per pupil cost to Council (secondary and primary)
  - b) Figures for how many school age children are educated independently within each catchment (secondary and primary).
  - c) Details on how many children would have to leave the independent sector in each catchment for state schools to be over-capacity

**Answer**

- (3)** a) £4,105 per primary pupil  
£6,252 per secondary pupil  
(Source: 2016/17 data – Scottish Local Government Benchmarking Framework)
- b) This data is not available.
- c) Edinburgh's School Roll projections are published on the Council [website](#). They show the projected number of places available in each school.

## Item no 5.15

### QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer  
by the Convener of the Planning  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 23 August 2018**

- Question** (1) Can the Convener please confirm whether any plans for chicanes in new housing developments are reviewed by planning officers against the Cycling by Design Guidance prior to consideration of the relevant application?
- Answer** (1) Chicanes are not normally considered acceptable for use in new housing developments. As part of the planning application process, the design of cycle routes is expected to promote cycling and walking and not introduce barriers except to address particular road safety concerns. Any such design is subject to road safety audit and would form part of an application for road construction consent.
- Question** (2) Are chicanes inspected by the Council to confirm compliance following installation by developers?
- Answer** (2) Any chicanes installed as part of a road construction consent will be inspected as part of the construction and adoption process.
- Question** (3) How many non-compliant chicanes have been installed across the city in the last 5 years?
- Answer** (3) There are no records of non-compliant chicanes being installed as part of housing developments in the last 5 years.

## Item no 5.16

### QUESTION NO 16

**By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### Question

What progress has been made regarding the introduction of a community parking zone in Murrayfield on match days where large crowds are expected?

#### Answer

Investigations into the introduction of event parking restrictions on match days around the Murrayfield Stadium area are currently ongoing.

A report on a [Strategic Review of Parking in Edinburgh](#) was approved by the Transport and Environment Committee on 9 August. This report notes the areas where parking problems require to be investigated and in which order. As the west of Edinburgh is the first area to be considered, it is intended to take forward the investigation of possible event parking restrictions in Murrayfield in conjunction with this strategic approach. This will help to identify possible boundaries and better avoid any unintended consequences should such a scheme be introduced.

The procurement processes for these work streams have already started and it is anticipated that these investigations will be undertaken before the end of the year.

## Item no 5.17

### QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

- Question** (1) To ask, broken down by type of bin:-  
How many bins the council has had to replace in the past three years broken down by each type of bin?
- Answer** (1) Please see attached table.
- Question** (2) What the cost of replacing these bins was?
- Answer** (2) Please see attached table (and caveat).
- Question** (3) How many of these were replaced due to damage caused by collection teams?
- Answer** (3) We do not hold records on damage by collection teams only replacement requests.
- It should be noted that the percentage of replacements is comparable to other Local Authorities. It should also be noted that when the service was redesigned in 2015/16 there was an increase in requests for food and red & blue boxes. In addition, boxes issued when the service began in 2006/7 are reaching the end of their natural life also resulting in an increase in requests



**Waste Bin Requests for the 3 years Aug 2015 to July 2018 by Subject**

Subject Name	2015 / 16	2016 / 17	2017 / 18	Grand Total
WS: Replace Food Individual	13,769	7,387	7,737	28,893
WS: Replace Box BLUE	9,311	7,121	9,563	25,995
WS: Replace Food Kitchen Caddy	7,314	3,302	3,444	14,060
WS: Replace Residual Ind Grey	4,017	3,873	4,488	12,378
WS: Replace Garden Individual	2,548	3,140	3,796	9,484
WS: Replace Recycling Bin	1,962	2,120	2,241	6,323
WS: Replace Residual Ind Green	1,056	286	335	1,677
WS: Replacement Food Set	943	207	292	1,442
WS: Replace Box RED	598	256	442	1,296
WS: Replace Box Set	515	363	369	1,247
WS: Replace Gull Proof Bag	263	232	234	729
WS Request 360 Recycling Bin	289	158	167	614
WS Req. Additional Garden Bin	109	193	83	385
WS Request 360 Residual Bin	21	47	22	90
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>42,715</b>	<b>28,685</b>	<b>33,213</b>	<b>104,613</b>

**Waste Bin Requests for the 3 years Aug 2015 to July 2018 by Subject & Cost (\*)**

Subject Name	2015 / 16	2016 / 17	2017 / 18	Grand Total
WS: Replace Residual Ind Grey	£84,076	£81,062	£93,934	£259,072
WS: Replace Garden Individual	£65,356	£80,541	£97,367	£243,265
WS: Replace Recycling Bin	£50,325	£54,378	£57,482	£162,185
WS: Replace Food Individual	£42,271	£22,678	£23,753	£88,702
WS: Replace Box BLUE	£26,257	£20,081	£26,968	£73,306
WS: Replace Residual Ind Green	£27,086	£7,336	£8,593	£43,015
WS Request 360 Recycling Bin	£13,710	£7,496	£7,922	£29,128
WS: Replace Food Kitchen Caddy	£6,583	£2,972	£3,100	£12,654
WS Req. Additional Garden Bin	£2,796	£4,950	£2,129	£9,875
WS: Replace Box Set	£2,905	£2,047	£2,081	£7,033
WS: Replacement Food Set	£3,744	£822	£1,159	£5,725
WS Request 360 Residual Bin	£996	£2,230	£1,044	£4,270
WS: Replace Box RED	£1,686	£722	£1,246	£3,655
WS: Replace Gull Proof Bag	£757	£668	£674	£2,100
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>£328,549</b>	<b>£287,983</b>	<b>£327,451</b>	<b>£943,983</b>

**Notes:**

(\*) Costs are based on 2018 / 2019 Prices for Bins and do not represent the cost at the time.

## Item no 5.18

### QUESTION NO 18

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) How many approvals have been granted for Student accommodation since 2000? Provided by year

**Answer** (1) Applications and consents for purpose-built student accommodation have been recorded separately from other planning applications on a calendar year basis since 2010. The number of consents granted each year is shown in the table below.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of consents</b>
2010	3 (670 beds)
2011	3 (589 beds)
2012	8 (2,487 beds)
2013	5 (714 beds)
2014	2 (461 beds)
2015	12 (2,104 beds)
2016	16 (1,399 beds)
2017	6 (836 beds)
2018 to 15 August	Nil

The information for 2000 to 2009 is currently being retrieved from archives and will be provided to members in advance of the Council meeting on 20 September 2018.

**Question** (2) And subsequently, again given by the total number each year since 2000, how many bedrooms are now available?

**Answer**

- (2) Please see table below for the number of student bedspaces completed on a calendar year basis since 2010, and the cumulative total of available purpose-built student bedspaces.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Bedspaces completed</b>	<b>Cumulative total of Bedspaces available</b>
2010	888	10,498
2011	486	10,984
2012	611	11,652
2013	932	12,915
2014	1,181	13,260
2015	1,677	15,048
2016	2,178	17,215
2017	1,874	18,988
2018 at 15/8/18	n/a – survey undertaken 2019	n/a

The information for 2000 to 2009 is currently being retrieved from archives and will be provided to members in advance of the Council meeting on 20 September 2018.

## Item no 5.19

### QUESTION NO 19

**By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### **Question**

1. What discussions or representations did the administration make to the UK & Scottish Governments to secure funding from the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal for enhancing:

- (a) the Hermiston and Ingliston Park & Rides?
- (b) new Park & Rides at Lothianburn, Edinburgh Park & Edinburgh Gateway stations?

#### **Answer**

The Transport element of the Edinburgh and South-East Scotland City Region Deal has been informed by the West Edinburgh Transport Appraisal with the City Deal including £36m of identified funding to support its implementation.

The WETA appraisal included consideration of an upgraded bus interchange facility at Ingliston Park & Ride, as well as a new Park and Ride at Kilpunt, West Lothian together with other public transport infrastructure improvements. City Region Deal partners will prioritise the WETA recommendations in line with the identified funding.

## Item no 5.20

### QUESTION NO 20

**By Councillor Rose for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) What proportion of road repairs and resurfacing has been outsourced in each of the last five years?

**Answer** (1) All revenue funded road repairs are carried out by Edinburgh Roads Services (ERS). In addition, ERS carry out some capital works.

However, we do use external framework contractors to deliver capital funded resurfacing works. The table below shows estimate of the % of capital works delivered by external contractors.

Financial Year	External
2013/14	40%
2014/15	41%
2015/16	42%
2016/17	51%
2017/18	64%

**Question** (2) What is the anticipated proportion for the current year?

**Answer** (2) Road repairs continue to be delivered both by ERS and external contractors. The estimate for capital works is 70% being completed by external contractors in 2018/19 due to an expected increase in the number of capital schemes being delivered, compared with 2017/18

## Item no 5.21

### QUESTION NO 21

**By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) What have the administration done in the last 15 months to improve safety at the Dalmahoy junction?

**Answer** (1) Electronic vehicle-activated warning signs were erected in April 2017. These are triggered by vehicles waiting to turn at the junction and warn traffic approaching the junction to slow down.

The speed limit on a 1.2km section of the A71 and a 300m section of Dalmahoy Road on the approach to the junction was lowered from 50 to 40mph in April 2018.

Details of these measures, together with the background to the scheme, were provided in a Business Bulletin to the Southwest Locality Committee on 19 June 2018.

**Question** (2) With only one landowner having agreed in the last 3 years and with less than 14 months before the section 75 monies have to be handed back – how confident is the Convener that agreement will be reached with the other two landowners?

**Answer** (2) The remaining landowners have been engaged; one has responded.

If both parties demonstrate a willingness to facilitate the sale of land that will benefit the wider community, there is no reason why an agreement cannot be reached.

Compulsory Purchase Order powers are available if required.

**Question** (3) Has any design work for the junction been carried out? and if so, please can you share this detail?

**Answer** (3) The junction layout design is complete.

A plan has been shared with the Community Council and residents, and has also been displayed in Ratho Library. This is attached.

**Question** (4) What is the estimated timeframe from agreeing a deal with the other landowners to completion of the improvements to the junction?

**Answer** (4) As stated previously, provided that both parties are willing to sell, and if there are no unforeseen delays to the process, it is hoped that the Council can be in full possession of the land by January 2019.

That being the case, construction could feasibly begin in Spring 2019, with construction estimated to take 4 to 5 months.





## Item no 5.22

### QUESTION NO 22

**By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

Regarding the VIP Waste email address, please may the Convener confirm:

**Question** (1) Since January 2018 to date, per month and by ward:

- a) How many were responded to within the agreed designated response timeframe?
- b) How many are outstanding?

**Answer** (1) a) Resources and Place Directorate teams work closely together to provide this service.

The following table sets out the number of Members Waste emails received since January 2018

January	667
February	351
March	445
April	295
May	282
June	251
July	287
August (part)	137

The current process does not group queries by Ward and a manual check of the 2,715 jobs would be required to provide this data. The outlook system does not provide a reporting tool for response times, however, Members Waste emails are typically logged within 24 hours on the appropriate system for action by the Waste and Cleansing Service.

- b) The mailbox is currently up to date with all jobs logged on the system for action.

**Question** (2) The follow-up procedure for informing councillors/staff of the status/progress of requests received.

**Answer**

- (2) Emails are acknowledged when the enquiry is raised and a further update is provided on the issue/complaint upon receipt from the service. If the complaint is due to a repeat service failure, the Contact Centre agent will escalate this to the Waste supervisors to allow for an update to be given to the Councillor concerned or Member Services Support Staff.

Member Services Support Staff are also being given access to the Waste Service system to enable them to track jobs directly.

As part of service improvement activities, a new system is being sourced that will specify functionality that provides a detailed overview of service requests and will also track progress. This will remove a currently manually intensive process with appropriate tracking and performance data. While this is being progressed, the service will review its current process to introduce a manual tracking process, with updates for all enquiries.

## Item no 5.23

### QUESTION NO 23

**By Councillor Mary Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### **Question**

Which schools have active travel action plans, and when were they produced, and last reviewed?

#### **Answer**

0.8% School do not have a Travel Plan – this does not mean that they are not engaging in road safety activities etc.

22.1% schools are currently working on Travel Plan.

77.1% of schools have existing Travel Plans which should be updated annually.

## Item no 5.24

### QUESTION NO 24

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) What legal powers does the Council have to influence the timetabling of utility works on adopted roads in the City?

**Answer** (1) The Council as Roads Authority has power under Section 115 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 to 'Give directions as to timing of works'.

The effective co-ordination of road works is one of the most important aspects of road works legislation. The New Roads and Street Works Act sets out the duties of road works authorities when co-ordinating and utilities when co-operating to ensure safety, minimise inconvenience to people using a road and to protect the structure of the road and apparatus in it.

The Code of Practice for the Co-ordination of Works in Roads forms part of the legislative framework for all works in roads.

The aim is to balance the statutory rights of road works authorities and utilities to carry out works with the expectation of road users that disruption from work shall be kept to a minimum

**Question** (2) What requirements are placed on utility companies and bus operators to place notices on bus stops which are either closed or where services have been diverted as a result of planned road works?

**Answer** (2) Utilities can be asked to put notices on bus stops where the Road or Transport Authority believes it is necessary to do so. This can be specifically requested as part of the approval process. However it depends on a number of factors including duration of works, time of day works are being carried out and what arrangements bus companies have put in place as a result of the works.

Members of the public are encouraged to use Lothian Buses web site and Mobile App that has up to date information on bus stop closures and the alternative arrangements in place.

Lothian Buses and other Public Transport Operators are an integral part of the approval process and are involved in site meetings and discussions with utilities at the planning stages. Lothian Buses place out temporary bus stops where they are needed.

## Item no 5.25

### QUESTION NO 25

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) On what date did she write to the chief executive of Transport Scotland following Council's approval of motion 9.2 on 15 March 2018?

**Answer** (1) I unfortunately did not proceed with this request as it was missed in the follow-up to the council meeting. Please see below, however, for continuing development of this topic by the Scottish Government.

**Question** (2) Will be publish a copy of her letter and the reply received from the chief executive of Transport Scotland?

**Answer** (2) Not available.

The Scottish Government published an [update](#) on this matter as part of the Questions to Ministers in June 2018.

**Question** (3) What assessment has officials made of the legality of current Fairtrade road signs in Edinburgh in light of the written parliamentary answer given by the Transport Secretary on 26 June 2018 (reference S5W-17275)?

**Answer** (3) Local roads authorities are granted the power to erect road signs under national legislation issued by the UK government. That legislation determines which signs can be used, how they may be used and where they may be used. Every local authority is required to ensure that the signs that they provide fall within the legal boundaries set out by standing legislation.

In the main, and as is reflected in the statement made by the then Minister for Transport, local authorities are afforded significant discretion in terms of the signs that they provide. One example where we sought special agreement from the Scottish Government was when we introduced tram safety

signage, which is, of course, specific to Edinburgh's needs. Even so, all signs must comply with the legislative requirements.

It is the view of officers that, if the issuing body (represented in Scotland by the Scottish Government) has determined that a particular type of sign does not meet the requirements of the standing legislation, then that sign may not be used on or adjacent to any road within Scotland. Any such signs should therefore be removed.

## Item no 5.26

### QUESTION NO 26

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### Question

In response to March 2018 Questions on Garden Waste Collection it was noted that only 46% of eligible households were predicted to opt-in to the new scheme and that the Council's Household Waste Recycling Centres are being prepared for increased demand.

Given refurbishment works at Seafeld Depot due to complete September 2018 and Sighthill (Bankhead) Depot due to complete June/July 2019:

- (a) What is the current capacity at both depots while work is ongoing, in relation to garden waste and other approved waste?
- (b) In each case how does this compare to the capacity prior to work commencing?
- (c) In each case what will the capacity be once the work is completed in September 2018 and June/July 2019 respectively?

#### Answer

- (a) It should be noted that the overall capacity of a site does not just reflect the number of skips on site but also transport available to remove the waste from the site. Waste will be removed from sites at varying rates of frequency.

The current skip provision at all three depots are:

Seafeld – 14 skips, 2 of which are for garden waste

Sighthill – 16 skips, 2 of which are for garden waste

Craigmillar - 17 skips, 2 of which are for garden waste

- (b) There has been no change in the waste accepted on the sites during the construction, this has been managed through increased containers and transport on site to manage the waste.



- (c) The skip provision at both sites is expected to remain the same following completion of these works. However, the changes will allow for more flexibility to change the composition of skips on each site to reflect demand.

## Item no 5.27

### QUESTION NO 27

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### Question

What actions are taken to ensure that streets are clean and bins are not overflowing during Edinburgh's summer festivals and other times of peak demand?

#### Answer

Every year, cleansing activity is increased to manage demand as the city population almost doubles during the festival, and is planned based on demand over previous years.

This summer 40 additional staff have been brought in to support the existing 90 city centre street cleansing operatives to cope with demand over the busy summer period.

Crews provide a 24-7 service, covering 180km of city centre streets to clear litter, service bins and uplift fly-tipping – all of which require extra resource as visitors pour into the city during August.

As part of the #ouredinburgh campaign, city centre bins – of which there are 350, emptied daily – have been specially branded to encourage the public to drop their rubbish in, while posters and social media posts featuring lame gags promise to 'bin our bad jokes if you bin your litter'.

Day time 'barrow beat' staff are assisted by a night services crew, on hand to service litter bins waste near pubs, clubs and fast food shops while Environmental Wardens will focus on particularly busy periods, discouraging litter-dropping and fly-tipping, working alongside the Waste Compliance Team to enforce again any trade waste infringements by businesses.

In Princes Street Gardens the servicing of the underground 'Silo' bins has been increased from the usual frequency of twice per fortnight to two times per week.

Vehicles are routed on a daily basis to empty litter bins across the area. This will be routed twice daily with a number in hot spot locations serviced 3 times per day. The frequency of emptying will be monitored using the fill rate sensor data depending upon their location and festival event activities, therefore, an additional vehicle is being deployed to provide increased frequency of litter bin emptying.

As experienced recently during the period of hot weather, litter bins in some locations can become full to overflowing in a very short period. The barrow-beat staff assist with tackling this issue by bagging the contents of the bin to provide sufficient capacity for public use in advance of the next vehicle servicing visit.

A dedicated power washing resource is in place to target known problem locations that demand this type of service; this includes Closes off the High Street, Scotsman Steps and other known problem locations associated with the night time economy.

The Fringe Festival Society manage litter within the High Street performance area. However, the Council does supplementary cleaning in the morning prior to the performances starting.

In addition to this, communal domestic waste containers in the city centre streets have their frequencies increased to deal with the additional visitors' waste from those staying in residential areas.

## Item no 5.28

### QUESTION NO 28

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### Question

When did the council last undertake a review of pedestrian waiting times at key crossings in the city centre, what were the findings, and what action was taken as a result of the review?

#### Answer

The council does not have a programme to review pedestrian waiting times at key crossings in the city centre.

However, a review was undertaken earlier this year of pedestrian crossing times at key junctions within the vicinity of the Tram in the city centre, which included the maximum waiting times for pedestrians. The outcome of this included adjusting pedestrian waiting times where they were believed or reported to be excessive.

When signalised junctions or crossings junctions are installed, refurbished or changed signal timings, including pedestrian waiting times, are set in line with National Guidance. This takes into account any local requirements, such as volumes of pedestrians using the crossing points.

The council also check and investigate any feedback received about crossings and will make alterations to the timings as necessary where issues are identified.

## Item no 5.29

### QUESTION NO 29

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) When does the council intend to open the cycle path on Leith Street for use by cyclists?

**Answer** (1) The newly constructed two-way cycleway on Leith Street, whilst completed, will unfortunately remain closed for the foreseeable future. This is primarily due to the access arrangements in both northbound and southbound directions and its continuation with the impending reconstruction of Picardy Place.

Officers are currently liaising with Laing O'Rourke on the programming and phasing of the reconstruction of Picardy Place and temporary traffic management to explore the possibility of opening the cycleway for southbound cyclists only.

In addition to the above, the Redetermination Order has been referred to Transport Scotland/Scottish Ministers for consideration, in line with the report to the Transport and Environment Committee on [17 May 2018](#).

**Question** (2) How will the council evaluate the experience of users of Leith Street, including disabled people, other pedestrians and cyclists?

**Answer** (2) The reconstruction of Leith Street comprises extensive works to create a much more accessible and people-friendly thoroughfare than the existing layout.

Any feedback received from the Active Travel Forum, from Councillors, user groups and members of the public will be gathered, considered and responded to in line with normal practice.

## Item no 5.30

### QUESTION NO 30

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

#### **Question**

What training has been provided to locality transport officers in active travel and provision of active travel infrastructure over the last three years?

#### **Answer**

There has been no specific training for locality transport officers over the last three years. However they are in regular contact with colleagues working in Active Travel and take account of the best practice guidance available in carrying out their duties.

In addition training on the approved [Edinburgh Street Design Guidance](#) will be rolled out across relevant Council staff (including Locality staff) starting in September and will emphasise active travel and public transport in more standardised design solutions.

## Item no 5.31

### QUESTION NO 31

**By Councillor Staniforth for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment at a meeting of the  
Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) The reason given for the closure of the footpath beside Princes Street Gardens during the 'Summer Sessions' events is public safety. Has there been an assessment into the possibility of closing the road to traffic instead, keeping the way open for pedestrians?

**Answer** (1) The footway has not been closed to pedestrians. Barriers were placed along the mid-line of the footway to allow continued pedestrian access and access to the bus stops whilst maintaining a sterile area in front of the spiked park railings.

**Question** (2) What degree of public consultation has there been on the safety measures put in place during the 'Summer Sessions' events?

**Answer** (2) There has been no public consultation on safety measures. This would not be normal practice. Safety measures are discussed and agreed between appropriate Council Officers and representatives of the emergency services at Events Planning and Operations Group meetings.

The issues that have arisen out of this series of events, and the summer Festivals as a whole, will be discussed in the annual 'Managing the Festival City' report'.

## Item no 5.32

### QUESTION NO 32

**By Councillor Staniforth for answer  
by the Convener of the Culture and  
Communities Committee at a  
meeting of the Council on 23 August  
2018**

#### **Question**

Given the recent reported misuse of firearms by police in Edinburgh (by the Edinburgh Evening News and the BBC), what discussions have been had with the police via our community partnership or otherwise regarding the deployment of armed police in Edinburgh?

#### **Answer**

The Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership held discussions with Police Scotland and the Council Administration for the Culture and Communities Committee around the issue of Armed Response officers in Edinburgh during the negotiations of the Police Partnership Agreement.

The discussions concluded that the deployment of Armed Police Officers is a national policy for Police Scotland and therefore falls out with the remit of the agreement. National police deployment decisions and armed response matters are operationally independent decisions for the Chief Constable, with Scottish Police Authority (SPA) oversight.

The Culture and Communities Committee received a presentation and input from Police Scotland at the Committee meeting held on Tuesday 19 June 2018 regarding Armed Policing in Edinburgh.



## Item no 5.33

### QUESTION NO 33

**By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

**Question** (1) Since April 2016, how many applications have there been for planning consent for change in use to Short Stay Commercial Visitor Accommodation; how many have been granted; how many have been refused?

**Answer** (1) Table 1 below set out the planning applications and certificates of lawfulness received with the outcome.

**Question** (2) Since April 2016, how many enforcement cases have been logged in relation to the use of residential accommodation for holiday letting?

**Answer** (2) 99 enforcement cases have been logged since April 2016p which have used a compatible description.

Table 1

Type of Application	Number of Applications	Granted	Refused	Withdrawn	Pending Consideration
Planning Permission	6	1	2	1	2
Certificate of Lawfulness	7	3	1	1	2

### Background information

Database analysis is dependent on descriptions used by the applicant in making an application and by enquirers in reporting an enforcement case. The statistics have been gathered using a broad interpretation of "Short stay commercial visitor accommodation" and "holiday letting".

## Item no 5.34

### QUESTION NO 34

**By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 23 August 2018**

As Council will recall, after a detailed investigation by the Council into problems with the surface dressing in 2017 of roads at 10 sites across four Wards including Craigcrook Road and three others in Inverleith, we were told that surface dressings need 3-4 months of good temperatures to fully bed in before the winter frosts arrive.

The Council's response at the time was to call on the contractor to do remedial works using the same approach under the existing contract.

- Question** (1) What lessons have been learned from this exercise of investigating reported issues with surface dressing of roads?
- Answer** (1) The additional measures incorporated into the contract include:
- additional sweepers to remove loose chippings
  - water bowser and pressure washers on stand-by to deal with any dust issues (note: to date there have been no dust issues reported this year)
  - Dedicated recovery vehicle provided by the Council's parking contractor to remove parked cars
  - [Information Leaflet](#) available on Council website with FAQ's
- Question** (2) What measures are in place for monitoring how these remedial works perform?
- Answer** (2) Monthly inspections of the completed dressings will be carried out and on-site inspections take place at the point that the work is being undertaken.
- Question** (3) If there is a recurrence of these issues, how will that be addressed?

**Answer**

- (3)** As an initial measure, sweeping of the carriageway and adjacent footways will be carried out until all loose chippings have been removed. Depending on the severity of the failure, further remedial works will be considered which could range from temporary patching to permanent repairs using alternative materials.

As surface dressing can only be carried out during summer months, if the failures are superficial, the defects will be permanently repaired next summer with another dressing.

Any remedial works required will be undertaken at the cost of the contractor.

## Item no 5.35

### QUESTION NO 35

**By Councillor Rae for answer by the  
Convener of the Planning Committee  
at a meeting of the Council on 23  
August 2018**

#### Question

Of student housing developments given planning consent since February 2016, what is the total gross floor area occupied by a) student accommodation b) by residential accommodation?

#### Answer

The council's Student Housing Guidance, which came into effect in February 2016, states that:

*'sites with greater than 0.25ha developable area must comprise a proportion of housing as part of the proposed development, to balance the mix of land uses and to contribute to housing land need. On these sites the new build residential gross floor area shall represent a minimum of 50% of the total new build housing and student accommodation gross floor area.'*

There have been 11 consents for student housing developments since the guidance came into effect. Of these, 10 had a developable area of less than 0.25 ha and did not require the provision of residential accommodation.

One application (17/03675/FUL) had a developable area of greater than 0.25 ha. This was granted consent by the Development Management Sub Committee without the provision of residential accommodation. Committee accepted that, in this particular case of conversion of an office building, mixed use would not be appropriate.

The 11 consents totalled 10,434 sq. m. of student bedspace and no residential accommodation.