

THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

MEETING 2

31 MAY 2018

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Item no 5.1

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Mary Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question (1) For each of the schools built or substantially refurbished under i) PPP1 contracts and ii) PPP2 contracts, please list the dates at which the contracts come to a scheduled end?

Answer (1) i) PPP1 contract terminates on 31 August 2033.
ii) PPP2 contract terminates on 11 August 2038.

Question (2) What steps are planned and in what timescale to ensure that buildings are handed over in good condition, without need for catch-up repairs or life-cycle works?

Answer (2) The PPP1 contract stipulates that the school is expected to have at least five years serviceable life at the point of handover. The two parties will conduct a joint inspection which will determine a schedule of dilapidations and renewal works required. The Council have a right of objection to the final proposed works. Before handover there is a joint inspection of the premises to ensure these works have been undertaken to the Council's satisfaction. The PPP2 contract stipulates that the elements of the buildings are maintained in line with their design life, and similar inspections rights apply as handover approaches.

Item no 5.2

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Corbett for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question (1) Which councillors have passes for i) the APCOA parking at Waverley Court? ii) any other parking in the vicinity of the City Chambers?

Answer (1) i)

Via APCOA Waverley Court Car Parking	
Councillors	
Claire Bridgman	SNP
Norman Work	SNP
Gavin Barrie	Ind
Joan Griffiths	Lab
Jason Rust	Con
Robert Aldridge	Lib
Cammy Day	Lab
Ian Perry	Lab
Waverley Court CEC Garage Car Parking	
Councillor	
Lezley Cameron	Lab

ii)

George IV Bridge (Central Library)	
Councillors	
Ricky Henderson	Lab
Iain Whyte	Con

Question (2) Are those passes provided free?

Answer (2) Yes

Question (3) Of those councillors listed in 1) which of them also receive a free bus pass?

Answer (3)

Jason Rust	Con
Lezley Cameron	Lab
Iain Whyte	Con
Ricky Henderson	Lab

Question (4) Of those councillors listed in a) how many have declared their parking pass as a benefit and so declared on the register of payments in the same way as a bus pass?

Answer (4) None.

Question (5) What criteria have been used to determine which councillors have access to parking permits?

Answer (5) Historically parking has been assigned on a first come request, depending on availability.

Item no 5.3

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Culture and Communities Committee
at a meeting of the Council on 31
May 2018**

- Question** (1) Please provide the number of local police officers per 10,000 of the population for each Council area accepting the best fit to the Divisions of Police Scotland for the years 2013 to 2017, as set out in Motion 9.6 agreed by March Council, now that the 2017 mid-year population data has been published?
- Answer** (1) Police Scotland does not record information by local authority areas. The numbers are based on Command areas that cover more than one local authority area. We are unable to compare council areas as Edinburgh is the only local command area that has one local authority within its boundaries.
- Question** (2) Confirm that in 2017 the number of local police officers serving the City of Edinburgh, on a population basis, has fallen again, for the fourth year in a row, to a new low of 22.5 per 10,000 citizens.
- Answer** (2) This information is not held by the Council and percentage figures per 10,000 population are not recorded by Police Scotland.
- Question** (3) Update Council on what measure of additional local police numbers, relative to population size, he will demand are included as part of the service level agreement with the Police Scotland in return for the Council making good its £2.6M contribution towards local policing in 2018, at a time when other local authorities have ceased to make any payments for a basic service that should be deployed on the basis of need?
- Answer** (3) The Partnership Agreement between the Council and Police Scotland for 2018/19 is still to be finalised and it is planned to report the Culture and Communities on 19 June 2018.

Item no 5.4

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question

Given the reports that the assessing of road defects has changed from a simple measurement of depth could she detail the process of how Grade 1, 2 and 3 road defects are assessed?

Answer

The assessment of roads defects within City of Edinburgh Council has not changed and roads inspectors continue to use the “Operational Guide – Road Safety & Defect Categorisation Procedure” which is based upon the recommendation of the Code of Practice ‘well maintained highway infrastructure’.

The assessment of Category 1, 2, 3 & 4 defects is made on an assessment of both the Impact (for which depth measurement is a factor) and Probability of the defect causing harm. The rating from this assessment dictates the category of the defect and the associated target for repair times.

Item no 5.5

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 31 May 2018**

Question

Will the administration commit to providing extra resources to the building warrants team to enable them to tackle the backlog of existing applications and process new applications within agreed timescales?

Answer

An improvement team has been commissioned and are in the process of reviewing the Service Improvement Plan to enable the service to meet the required performance standard. A review of resource levels, including benchmarking against other authorities will be included in the fully costed plan the administration takes forward.

Item no 5.6

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Rose for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

In April 2014 a parent of a child requested assessment by the City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) for a co-ordinated support plan (CSP) in terms of Section 2 of the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004. Subsequent proceedings were raised in respect of a failure to provide a CSP, and the tribunal issued a direction to Edinburgh Council to produce a CSP no later than 6th January 2016. On that date the Council issued a finalised CSP. A second tribunal hearing found the CSP inadequate and that CEC had discriminated against the child in terms of Section 85(2)(a) of the Equality Act 2010.

Question (1) After failing to provide a CSP as requested, why was the CSP instructed by the tribunal produced at the last possible minute and how was it that an inadequate CSP was produced?

Answer (1) The Council accepts the judgement that the CSP put in place was inadequate and has learned lessons in the service area to ensure future instances take account of this judgement. The CSP was produced just before the deadline because the Education Authority and the appellant to the Tribunal could not come to agreement over the contents of the draft CSP despite many months of intense discussion. Therefore the Education Authority had to open the CSP by the deadline given by the Tribunal in a form that would likely be objected to by the Tribunal appellant.

The Education Authority remains of the view that the inadequacy of the CSP arose from the highly unusual circumstances of the case.

Question (2) When it did eventually produce a CSP what caused CEC to produce an inadequate CSP?

Answer (2) Please see above

Question (3) Why was the legal advice given on behalf of the Council found to be unsuccessful on three occasions?

Answer (3) The first two occasions refer to decisions of the Tribunal. The Education Authority was represented by an Education Authority officer using their professional judgement and expertise and not a lawyer, either internal or external. The Education Authority officer did not require assistance from a lawyer for these two occasions.

The third occasion refers to the Court of Session appeal. The Education Authority took legal advice from an internal lawyer and then from Counsel with rights of audience before the Court of Session. The legal advice was to the effect that the Council's case had a reasonable prospect of success. Legal advice in relation to litigation is professional opinion. An adverse judgment does not necessarily mean that the legal advice was not sound at the time it was given.

Question (4) How much has it cost to defend the Council's position unsuccessfully on these three occasions? Please include internal and external costs.

Answer (4) The first two occasions refer to decisions of the Tribunal. No legal costs were incurred as the Education Authority was represented by an Education Authority officer and not a lawyer, either internal or external.

The third decision refers to the decision of the Court of Session to uphold the decision of the Tribunal. The cost to the Education Authority is:

- £946 for internal legal work.
- £7,350 for external legal work.
- Expected maximum of £12,000 for legal expenses of the appellant – the final bill is pending.

Question (5) How is it proposed to review the apparent failing within the Education Department?

Answer (5) The Education Authority will review its decision making on the circumstances under which we may refuse to put in place a CSP.

Question (6) How is it proposed to review the quality of the legal advice followed by CEC?

Answer (6) The principal legal advice that the Council had a reasonable prospect of successful appeal was provided to the Council by experienced Counsel. The finding of the court does not mean that the advice was of poor quality. Legal advice is always considered in context at the relevant time given the individual circumstances of a specific case.

Question (7) Is there a strategy document which guides the circumstances when CEC defends claims made against it? If so, how does it weigh principled considerations? If not, what principles does CEC follow?

Answer (7) Decisions are made on a case by case basis having regard to:

- i. the facts of the case;
- ii. the law; and
- iii. proportionality in terms of –
 - a. Inconvenience or worse to the actual or potential appellant who is usually the parent of a disabled child. The parent in this case was legally aided for her financial costs and the government provides a free of charge legal service for parents appealing to the Tribunal referred to in these questions.
 - b. The consequences for the child of the Education Authority not contesting a decision of a parent which the Education Authority disagrees with.
 - c. The financial cost to the Education Authority of legal action.

It should also be noted that:

1. The law has changed recently so that appeals from the Tribunal are no longer made to the Court of Session. Instead they are now made to a second, upper tier of the Tribunal. The case in question was the last appeal from the Tribunal to the Court of Session.

2. By far the greatest part of the expense of appeals to the Court of Session arose from the legal requirement to employ Advocates who have rights of audience before the Court of Session. Advocates are very senior members of the legal profession and this is reflected in the significant cost of employing them.
3. It is not a legal requirement to employ Advocates for appeals to the second tier of the Tribunal and the education authority anticipates that it will usually be represented by an Education Authority officer at appeals to the second tier of the Tribunal, largely eliminating the expense in the future of employing Advocates that has arisen previously for appeals to the Court of Session.
4. At a forum organised by the Tribunal for forum users in May 2017, the President of the Tribunal gave an address in which she stated, in terms, her intention that the change referred to above would make the appeal process cheaper and quicker.

Item no 5.7

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question

In light of the physical assault on 3 May on a Syrian man housed in temporary accommodation, which left him hospitalised, can the Convener outline the processes and safeguards in place to ensure secure and safe accommodation for refugees in Edinburgh?

Answer

The Council accommodates people who are refugees in two distinct sets of circumstance – where the arrival is planned e.g. under a government resettlement programme or when someone who is a refugee spontaneously presents as homeless.

In the former - such as under the UK Government's Syrian resettlement programme - the timing of arrival, individual/family profile and characteristics are all known in advance. This information can be used to identify appropriate initial accommodation, which is sourced through the Council's Private Sector Leasing scheme. Addresses are screened in advance for any previous incidents of neighbourhood anti-social behaviour which might suggest addresses would not be appropriate.

In the latter, no pre-planning is possible and it may not always be clear at initial presentation or subsequent assessment that being a refugee is part of an individual's history. Nonetheless, out of the options available, the most appropriate form of temporary accommodation - taking into account need and any vulnerability identified during a homelessness assessment – would always be offered. This would apply to anyone presenting as homeless, whatever their background.

In both circumstances, tenants can move onto permanent Council or Housing Association tenancies by registering with and bidding through EdIndex.

Information around the measures that are in place to ensure the safety of service users

Each year around 10,500 temporary accommodation placements are made.

This incident is the only significant event in bed and breakfast accommodation in, at least, the last five years.

We aim to ensure that all service users are provided with accommodation that is safe.

I can confirm that this property had a 24-hours a day management presence and CCTV coverage.

All bed and breakfast properties used by the Council to accommodate people are subject to regular monitoring. This includes unannounced visits during normal hours and at night.

The property in question has been visited 22 times in the last 12 months and daily telephone contact is made with the management team at all bed and breakfasts.

In addition to ensuring the safety of our properties, we are focussing on supporting the family affected by this incident.

A police investigation is currently ongoing, so whilst it would not be appropriate to comment on the specifics of the case, we will consider any recommendations that are made as a result of the case

Item no 5.8

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question (1) What discussions have taken place with local residents regarding the long term parking of commercial advertising vehicles on the north side of Queensferry Road near the Cramond Brig?

Answer (1) Over the last three to four years local residents have noted long term parking in the lay-by noted above. During this period the Planning and Licencing teams have considered the context of advertising consent, however, this has not been deemed a breach of planning legislation or licencing.

The Locality team are aware of the issue and agreed to promote Waiting Restrictions to limit twenty four hour parking. This location is included in the priority list of traffic regulation orders to promote, however, it is considered a lower priority relative to some urgent road safety related issues.

In the last twelve months our team have engaged with a local resident to confirm the situation above and describe the statutory process for advertising and promoting the necessary order.

Question (2) What decisions have been taken to extend the parking restrictions in this area to address the problems identified?

Answer (2) It is agreed that an appropriate TRO would be desirable to restrict the issue. A draft order will be prepared (Single Yellow Line) to prohibit parking between 08:30 and 17:30 Monday to Friday and circulated to the Ward Councillors for consideration. This should resolve the long term parking issue but also allow residents and their visitors to park in the evening and at weekends.

Question (3) If decisions have been taken, what timetable exists to consult on a draft traffic regulation order to progress any changes?

Answer

- (3)** The North West Locality team are currently working through a priority list of Traffic Orders. It is anticipated that a plan will be prepared for discussion and the necessary report will be submitted to the Traffic Orders team by September 2018.

Item no 5.9

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question

What plans exist to make the double yellow lines within the Ingliston Park and Ride legally enforceable?

Answer

The process of implementing a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to allow enforcement of double yellow lines at Ingliston park and Ride has begun. The plan is to advertise proposals for consultation in August 2018 in line with statutory requirements of the TRO process. Any objections would be subject to a further report.

Item no 5.10

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question

At the Council meeting of 14 December 2017 and in response to question 5.10, the Convener said "it is intended to consult with the local community and other stakeholders over possible improvements to the Davidson's Mains roundabout in spring next year." Can the Convener provide an update on this work?

Answer

Consultants have been appointed to undertake design and delivery of safety improvements.

Initial consultation with the local community will take place in June with further consultation planned later in the summer once detailed proposals have been scrutinised with an independent road user safety audit.

Item no 5.11

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question

City of Edinburgh Council has previously made a call for sites for housing to the house building community, prior to the Main Issues Report, when compiling its Local Development Plan. Neighbouring Councils have already made such a call in preparation for their new Local Development Plans. The house building community value the opportunity to engage with Councils at an early stage to try and identify the widest possible range of potential sites, to maximise the supply of much needed homes.

When does the City of Edinburgh next plan to make a call for sites?

Answer

The Council did not make a call for sites for housing in the previous Local Development Plan project. Instead, the Council carried out a comparative assessment all of the land in the relevant areas.

It is not intended to hold a call for sites for the new local development plan project, and the [project timetable](#) does not include a stage for this. Some local authorities use calls for sites to find out where there is developer interest, particularly authorities with large rural areas, many settlements and housing markets of varying strengths.

This is not relevant in Edinburgh, where the remaining rural land is already known, and developer interest is strong throughout. Also, for various reasons a piece of land may not be promoted at a call for sites stage, but is later promoted at the statutory representations stages.

This can give the Council and communities a false picture of what sites will be involved in the plan's formal stages.

There are other ways in which the house building community can engage with the Council, and now that the project is formally underway the project team is available for

meetings with parties wishing to discuss their land interests in the Council's area. The house building representative body Homes for Scotland has been made aware of this opportunity and several such meetings have already been held.

Item no 5.12

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Rose for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question (1) How many planning applications have been subject to Section 75 legal agreements since 1st May 2017?

Answer (1) Since 1 May 2017 39 planning applications subject to Section 75 agreements have been determined.

Question (2) In each case how long did it take to conclude the agreement? Include how many are outstanding?

Answer (2) Of those 39 applications there are 10 section 75 obligations that have been concluded and planning permission issued. These took:

2 months	1	3 months	1
4 months	1	5 months	3
6 months	1	7 months	2
8 months	0	9 months	1

The remaining 29 are under negotiation.

Question (3) In the last three years has there been any change in policy or practise in drawing up the legal agreement in relation to the relative responsibilities of the applicant and the landowner?

Answer (3) There has been no change in policy or practice over the last 3 years in terms of who is responsible for the drawing up of the legal agreement.

In recent months the Council's model agreement has been reassessed to take account of recent experience. This was to ensure it properly reflects the provisions of the current Local Development Plan and is compliant with the relevant

legal tests as clarified in the Elsick Supreme Court decision. The model agreement also incorporates the detailed provisions of the Council's draft Supplementary Guidance 'Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery'.

Once the Supplementary Guidance has been approved by Housing and Economy Committee for consideration by Scottish Ministers, then the model agreement can be finalised and published on the Council's website for full use by all parties.

Question

(4) Are such legal agreements drafted up by the City of Edinburgh Council, by the applicant or by a third party?

Answer

(4) In the majority of cases the initial draft section 75 planning obligation will be prepared and issued by the Council. There is however no prohibition on the applicant opting to take the lead in preparing the initial draft section 75 planning obligation and this occurs in some cases. The draft is then negotiated between the parties, within the limitations identified by Committee or the Chief Planning Officer, to reach an agreement.

Item no 5.13

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

- Question** (1) Since May 2017, how many planning applications have been withdrawn and re-submitted?
- Answer** (1) 345 applications were withdrawn between 1 May 2017 and 22 May 2018. It is not known how many have been re-submitted without checking the property history of each case but a 5% sample check has been done and 60% of withdrawn applications had further applications submitted.
- Question** (2) What are the comparative figures for the previous 5 years?
- Answer** (2) There were 1772 applications withdrawn between 1 May 2013 and 22 May 2018. Due to the timescale and volume a sample has not been completed.
- Question** (3) Since May 2017, how many of these withdrawals and re-submissions been made at the request or suggestion of the Council Officers?
- Answer** (3) There are usually 3 reasons why applications are withdrawn – at the request of the applicant, at the request of the officer as refusal is the likely outcome, and by the Council as planning authority on the basis that the application is inactive. The reasons are not recorded in a form that can be counted as it takes the form of email correspondence which is then uploaded into the document management system for the case. This information is not therefore available.
- Question** (4) Of applications withdrawn and re-submitted since May 2017, what was the average duration from the validation of the original application to it being withdrawn?
- Answer** (4) The average duration from validation to withdrawal for the withdrawn cases from 1 May 2017 is 125 days. The re-submitted applications, based on the 5% were not withdrawn.

Item no 5.14

QUESTION NO 14

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question

Can the Convener provide a table, detailing how many housing units have been completed, started, or permission granted since the 4th May 2017 broken down ownership tenure (including, but not limited to, Council, Housing Association, other affordable and private market).

Answer

The Following tables are taken from the Draft 2018 Housing Land Audit and Delivery programme. The draft audit is subject to consultation with housebuilders as such, the figures below may be subject to adjustment, and will be reported to housing and economy committee later in the year. However, if these figures were confirmed, this would be the highest level of overall completions in Edinburgh, since at least 2008.

The audit is conducted annually and is a snapshot position as at 31 March each year. Completions relate to the period 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018. Similarly, the table dealing with sites under construction and sites with consent relate to the position at 31 March 2018.

The not confirmed category in the table relates to those homes where the tenure is subject to further information from the developer

Table 1. Housing Completions 1/4/2017 – 31/03/2018

Market	1846
Social Rent	229
Mid-Market Rent	381
Shared Equity	54
Golden Share	30
Not-confirmed	55
Total affordable (*1)	749
Total completions	2595

* 1 In addition to the new build figures above, there were also 211 affordable homes acquired through open market shared equity. Open market shared equity is a programme funded by the Scottish Government and managed by Link Housing. The Open Market Shared Equity Scheme is available through Scotland and is open to everyone but prioritises, social tenants, veterans and people whose people over 60 and widows and widowers of serving members of the armed forces who lost their lives while serving.

Table 2. Housing sites with consent for housing at 31/03/2018

	Capacity		Complete at 31/03/2018		Remaining at 31/03/2018	
	Market	Affordable	Market	Affordable	Market	Affordable
Under Construction	6,604	3,288	1,861	617	4,743	2,671
With Full Consent	3,381	730			3,381	730
With planning permission in principal	5,824	1,458			5,824	1,458

There is also capacity for an additional 11,800 units on land allocated in the local development plan but yet to gain planning consent.

It is not possible to give a complete breakdown of houses in table 2 as breakdown of tenure depends on a variety of factors – like investment funding – that are decided closer to the point of actual construction or in some cases not until homes are full complete.

Item no 5.15

QUESTION NO 15

By Councillor Daggart for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

Question (1) Could the Convener please list the dates of meetings he, or his Vice Convener, has had with the Education Minister?

Answer (1) I have not met with the Education Minister.

The Vice Convener had a meeting with all the SNP spokespeople and leads on education across Scotland (including the Education Minister) on 4 April 2018.

Question (2) Could the Convener summarise the outcome of those meetings?

Answer (2) The Vice Conveners meeting of 4 April was to discuss mutual issues and to agree to meet on a more regular basis to share best practice.

Question (3) Could the Convener confirm whether the Scottish Government will provide additional funding for schools in Edinburgh?

Answer (3) I wrote to the Deputy First Minister on 9 March 2018 asking him to clarify the position in relation to Wave 4 funding - I await a response.

Item no 5.16

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 May 2018

- Question** What analysis has been carried out of average pedestrian waiting times at signalised crossings on Leith Walk and at other points along the proposed route?
- Answer** No pedestrian modelling has been carried out. This is not unusual at this stage of a project. The new proposals will take cognisance of pedestrian desire lines and movements to establish crossing points where conflicts can be avoided. These will also consider the location of existing crossings.
- Question** (2) Has the Council taken the view that zebra crossings are incompatible with safe tram operation? If so, when was this view adopted and why? Will this view be reviewed in light of international best practice?
- Answer** (2) The designs issued for consultation suggested a four lane configuration on Leith Walk. The result of that was that the width from kerb to kerb is too great to permit the use of Zebra crossings. As part of the design review additional crossings are being considered on Leith Walk. We are assessing the type of crossing on a location by location basis. In addition, uncontrolled safe crossing points may be introduced to maximise the pedestrian permeability of Leith Walk.
- In general Zebra crossings have been deemed unsuitable due to tram journey time reliability and as a preference we would look for a Toucan crossing.
- Question** (3) The Council's Street Design Guidance, published January 2015, states that "pedestrian crossing points (controlled or uncontrolled crossings)" should be provided "every 50-100m". Do the proposed designs for the tram extension to Newhaven comply with this guidance? If not, why not?

Answer (3) Through the design review we are assessing additional crossings and will take cognisance of the latest street design guidance.

Question (4) Has an equalities impact assessment been done on the proposals? If not, when will this be carried out?

Answer (4) An equalities impact assessment was carried in August 2017 and is due to be assessed in August 2018 which will align with the design review.

Question (5) What lessons have been learned from the original Edinburgh tram project?

Answer (5) In establishing the project team for the tram to Newhaven the Council has retained a number of individuals who successfully delivered the Airport to York Place project following mediation in 2011. In retaining this knowledge, the project is drawing on a number of lessons learned and these have been incorporated into the planning for the extension.

These lessons include, for example;

- The use of industry standard contracts to govern the project
- Rigorous project governance with highly qualified key personnel with experience of delivering light rail projects in the UK and abroad
- Setting up cross industry networks with other cities including Manchester, Birmingham and Dublin to ensure best practice is being adopted at each stage of project development
- Adopting traffic management plans that provide the contractor with expanded sites to ensure that works can continue in the event that problems are encountered during construction, as well as adopting a strategy of only opening up roads once and completing all works prior to reinstatement - no double-dig
- Carrying out robust quantitative risk analysis and ensuring the contingencies set aside for unforeseen events

- Carrying out comprehensive formal consultation with the market to road test the overall delivery strategy for the project and encourage strong competition

And contingencies are set aside.

Question (6) Has bilingual Gaelic / English signage been considered for the tram extension to Newhaven? If not, why not?

Answer (6) The issue of consistency in signage across the entire extended tram system, if it goes ahead, would have to be considered by the operator, and I would hope that the use of Gaelic would be considered favourably given its importance to Edinburgh as Scotland's capital city.