

# Amendment by the Conservative Group

## City of Edinburgh Council

28 June 2018

### Item 8.3 – Implementing the Programme for the Capital Coalition Commitments Progress to June 2018

#### Council

1. Notes the Report “Implementing the Programme for the Capital” and considers that this report is potentially misleading and confusing;
2. Specifically considers many of the actions, measures, metrics and targets in the Report are unclear or so general in assigning an outcome to cover a number of specific measures contained within a larger plan to render them meaningless;
3. Is concerned that so many commitments have yet to have a target, metric or baseline measure defined over a year into this Council term;”
4. Further notes the Report contains only part of the Council’s performance framework;
5. Agrees that a performance framework should measure outcomes and improvements to improve the transparency and accountability of the Council to residents so they can easily assess how the Council is managing the city;
6. Regrets the lack of measures in the Appendix to determine the status of each commitment and therefore instructs the Chief Executive to (a) include in the Progress Report in Appendix 1 the latest metric for each measure as at August 2017, in order to assess progress from the date the Council adopted each commitment; and (b) to replace the words “increasing trend” and “decreasing trend” with specific measures that reflect the specific Council target for each commitment;
  - a) A Vibrant City C2 request data against each measure for the last two years available, to back up the “on track” assertion. Seeks clarity on what Employees in Employment is actually measuring, if not employment.
  - b) A Vibrant City C7 notes that the failure to start any work on this commitment until August 2018 will give the opportunity to build on Cllr Graczyk’s motion Disability Employment Gap, item motion 9.4 on this Council meeting’s agenda
  - c) A Vibrant City – C37 and C38: numbers should be stated (rather than solely percentage which can be misleading) along with the starting metric so progress can be assessed by both percentages and actual numbers and status should be changed to reflect the deterioration in performance in health and social care measures since the minority Administration took office;

- d) A Vibrant City – C39: amend the status to “off track” to reflect the expected reduction in use of leisure facilities by sports clubs as a result of cost increases;
- e) A City of Opportunity – C1: a measure of approvals is not a measure of delivery and the “on track” reference needs to be clarified given approvals are running at less than required for this year and 1,475 of approvals for 2017/18 equates to 14.75% of the 10,000 homes required and the report does not make it clear how these figures, even with the future plans indicated, constitute ‘on track’;
- f) A City of Opportunity – C10: the competence of appearing to change site allocations within LDP outwith the LDP process to be assessed;
- g) A City of Opportunity – C30: questions the “on track” reference when the baseline requires to be established;
- h) A City of Opportunity – C33: questions the meaningfulness of the “on track” reference to the entire item when the actions refers to a previous plan;
- i) A Resilient City – C18: replace “increase” in the target for this commitment with “decrease” or otherwise explain figures;
- j) A Resilient City – C19: explanation of how identifying funding requirements is a metric;
- k) A Resilient City – C22: questions why the assumption of tram delivery is assumed and dependent on full consultation rather than examination of the business case;
- l) A Resilient City – C23: further evidence to be provided of the “decreasing trend”;
- m) A Resilient City – C24: explanation as to how “Increase Reporting / Decrease Incidents” is a target and replaces with a specific measurable target;
- n) A Resilient City – C51: questions why this notes the ‘number of antisocial behaviour complaints per 10K population was 41.39% for 16/17’ and the target is to have a ‘Decreasing Trend’, yet a Briefing note to ECSP on January 25th 2018 notes that there had been an increase;
- o) An Empowering Council – C52: considers there remains a lack of clarity in relation to the formation and remit of localities committees and also that non-attendance at Locality meetings is a serious concern.
- p) A Forward Looking Council C21 could it be explained what failure has led to this commitment not gaining an achieved status in this report

**Moved by** Councillor Doggart

**Seconded by** Councillor Mowat