This chapter identifies recommendations for the ongoing Service Design Programme, including methods, models and products.

This chapter identifies recommendations for the Gracemount, Southhouse and Burdiehouse area, along themes of buildings, public space, community values and priorities, and data.

This section summarises the range of templates available for re-use in future Service Design Programme locations.

This section includes a range of more detailed reports from the project activities.

An overview of project objectives, outcomes and impacts. Includes project highlights and lessons learned.

Process and findings from the Gracemount data and design project, including different work stages.
Data and Design for Property Planning was a collaborative project between Edinburgh Living Lab (ELL) at the University of Edinburgh and the Service Design and Our Assets programme at the City of Edinburgh Council (CEC).

The Service Design programme requested Edinburgh Living Lab to help them test a data-and-design methodology to make better decisions about significant changes to the Council Estate on a local area basis.
PROJECT OBJECTIVES

• Audit Council data, analyse adequacy of data and deliver recommendations to address key questions about building use.
• Identify key community values and considerations for the future of buildings in relation to service delivery in the area.
• Define options and considerations for the future of buildings in the area.
• Create guidelines for replicating this process in other areas of the city.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Make better use of data in the Council

• Data for planning and decision-making - to base decisions on verified information about the past, present and future.
• Data for community engagement - to explore and validate community perceptions and priorities alongside Council perceptions and priorities

Provide recommendations for the future of the Gracemount Estate that will be acceptable to the community.

The priorities for acceptability were to:
• Involve participants at an early stage of decision-making and keep them involved throughout the decision-making process.
• Capture a diversity of voices.
• Understand and acknowledge community values beyond the specific scope of the project.
• Communicate clearly about the decisions being made and listen to what people said.
• Support decisions with data.

LONG-TERM IMPACTS

• Property joins up their decision-making with other Council departments to deliver better services with less resource.
• Property makes cost savings and optimises the Council estate.
• Communities are more engaged in decision-making with the Council, participate in making difficult decisions, and understand and accept the outcomes.
• The University and the Council collaborate on data-driven innovation and share knowledge and resources that support innovation across the city.

This report highlights the key findings, learnings and recommendations of the project. It is a compilation and summary of individual reports produced during the course of the project. The individual reports cover the project activities and findings in more extensive detail.
Collaboration between different service, building, and community stakeholders helped build relationships and strengthen project outcomes.

A complementary range of community-focused engagement methods were used to reach a diverse mix of stakeholders.
Multiple methods of engagement led to deeper insight into the community.

Over 941 people contributed to the project. The interactive display and photo competition reached many people who wouldn’t have time to come to a workshop. Spot interviews reached people who were not using public buildings.

Engagement started early and focussed on community values and priorities.

People shared their views about what really mattered to them in the community. They were able to speak honestly about what they cared about, the challenges the community is facing and what they think could make their community better.

The narrative changed from Council to community.

There are many passionate people in the community who want to make a change, want to be involved, want to look after things, want ownership of services. When people feel listened to, they are willing to discuss difficult issues, like the loss of the Mansion House, and what might help to take its place.

Relationships built within the Council and with other partners are supporting data sharing and collaboration.

Getting value from data takes time and effort. The project stimulated discussions with the University about how to make better use of the University’s resources to support the Council’s data journey. It stimulated discussions across the Council about how to share and link data from different sources to create efficiencies across departments.
Analysis of data from key buildings in Gracemount helped to identify whether buildings are addressing community needs and values.

Visitor data from Gracemount Leisure Centre and Valley Park Community Centre helped to evaluate community perceptions about local provision of leisure, sports and cultural resources. Data validated certain perceptions (e.g. Valley Park Community Centre [VPCC] is not well-used) and gave a more complete picture of others (e.g. the Leisure Centre is heavily used by locals as well as people from outside the area).

Spatial data from multiple sources provided more insight into access to services within a particular area.

Engagement activities highlighted that community values cover many different aspects of an area, extending well beyond people’s use of Council buildings and services. Combining geospatial data from the Council’s GIS service with crowdsourced data provided by OpenStreetMap, we explored new measures to better understand accessibility to public and private services.

The co-design method leads to ongoing engagement with the community.

The insights from this project are being integrated with other community and Council knowledge, and the next round of proposals will be taken back to the community for further feedback and input.
The Council holds extensive data that could inform the Service Design programme, but the data is distributed across departments, systems and local repositories.

Existing procedures for collecting, storing and using data typically focus on single use such as reporting while giving insufficient attention to data reuse. Investment in data management, data skills, and making data accessible and analysable could deliver a significant return for the entire Council on efficiency and priority outcomes. Developing increased capacity could begin with small prototypes that test and demonstrate the value of data sharing across groups and provide concrete opportunities to develop in-house data skills.

**Challenge:** How might we create a prototype data resource demonstrating the value that sharing and linking Council data can bring to the Service Design programme?

The Service Design programme requires active engagement from other service areas and Localities in order to deliver outcomes effectively.

Property decisions have extensive implications for service design and delivery. Better buildings are better because they deliver better services and outcomes for people. A new building won’t improve a poor service or support a community. The programme will only succeed in building trust with the community if it delivers improved buildings and services.

**Challenge 1:** How might we form cross-service teams that work together?

**Challenge 2:** How could the programme get more high-level support by demonstrating that it can deliver outcomes across services and departments?
While city-wide data collected by the Council is usually of good quality, it needs to be complemented by locally specific data about buildings and services as well as community knowledge in order to support informed decision-making.

**Challenge 1:** How might we support consistent use of simple tools to monitor building usage and standard measures for evaluating service delivery that help to improve coverage, quality, and usability of local-level data?

**Challenge 2:** Could we bring together existing data about communities from the Council, third sector and communities into a shared resource?

**Successful engagement identifies the right people to be involved, demonstrates the value of engagement to them and communicates clearly what is happening and how they can contribute.**

A strong stakeholder team makes all the difference for community engagement. Not every relevant stakeholder will want to be engaged in a project or see the value of the project. Engaging a co-design team of interested people, creating a spirit of collaboration with them and keeping them engaged through regular communication will enable the project to achieve its goals.

**Communications timelines need to be planned well in advance, and the communications strategy needs to account for unknowns.**

Needs to account for unknowns e.g. unforeseen constraints on timings for community events that could not be anticipated at project inception.

**Challenge:** How could we plan the comms review processes from the outset so that it is clear which activities require approval and Council branding and what the timelines are for those? Could we develop a streamlined approval process so that, once the overall messaging has been approved, individual activities can be approved more quickly?
GRACEMOUNT PROJECT PROCESS AND FINDINGS

A summary of the process and findings, by project stage:

- Community Profile
- Data Audit
- Community Engagement: Phase 1
- Data Analysis: Phase 1 and 2
- Community Engagement: Phase 2
PROJECT PROCESS

HOW DID THE DATA + DESIGN PROCESS WORK IN GRACEMOUNT?

DATA ANALYSIS

1. Focussed questions to ask the community
   - Green Space Provision
   - Building Usage
   - Transport Provision
   - Service Provision

COMMUNITY DESIGN

1. Interactive Display
   - Background Work:
     - Data Audit
     - Community Profile
     - Data Analysis
   - School Workshop
   - Photo Competition

DATA + DESIGN INTEGRATION

1. 1:1 Interviews
   - Communication
   - Engagement
   - Findings

2. Online Survey
   - Further Exploration
   - Focusing on key issues
   - Discussion of future options/feasibilities

DATA ANALYSIS

2. Response to community design findings

COMMUNITY DESIGN

2. Further Exploration

DATA PRODUCTS

- New tools and resources to collect/data, synthesise and analyse data
- Co-designed with and accessible to users

BUILDING VALUE

A collaborative approach with Property, Localities and community partners to serve the community and its needs.

LOCATION SPECIFIC

Location-specific tools to take forward location-specific options e.g. third sector, local businesses.

REFERENCE

Further exploration with local residents, service users, local key stakeholders.

OUTCOMES

Locally specific, replicable elsewhere.

BUILDING VALUE MODEL

- New tools and resources to collect/data, synthesise and analyse data
- Co-designed with and accessible to users

DATA + DESIGN PROCESS
COMMUNITY PROFILE

What is it?
Baseline information about key stakeholders, previous consultations, activities and services outside the scope of the Council, and any additional relevant information about the community.

Why do it?
To understand the community and know who to contact and engage and how. To build on existing knowledge about the community and avoid repeating work done by others.

KEY FINDINGS
Community profile findings related to:

- Learning from previous consultations e.g. Youth Talk
- Key community activities e.g. Gracemount Walled Garden
- Key stakeholders and community assets: Libertus, local shops, 'The Dip' park.
- Services delivered in each local building by public and third sector.

See Appendix 01: Community Profile for more details, including how to do a Community Profile.
A Data Audit begins the process of data discovery - learning about buildings, services, and the people who use them and about other resources in the local area. The main activities in the Data Audit are:

- Identify data sources relevant to project questions
- Identify data stakeholders - who is responsible for the data
- Gather key data sets (strategies but also local data sources)
- Identify gaps in data

An output of the Data Audit is a Data Catalogue.

Why do it?
- To understand what data exists that could be relevant to project questions
- To scope the amount of work required to collate and prepare data for analysis
- To determine where new data needs to be collected and to plan for that well in advance

City and local data for the project varied widely in availability and quality. Extensive time was required to source and prepare data for analysis. The data workstream plan had to be modified to account for this.

It was difficult to identify where data was actually held, by whom, and in what format. It was also difficult to identify who could give permission to share data and who could actually source the data and share it. Data stakeholders were sometimes nervous about sharing data due to GDPR.

The project identified quickly that reliable usage data was not available for key buildings. Observation activities were carried out to address this for VPCC.

See Appendices 02: Data Catalogue, 03: Data Workshop Examples and 06: Data Workstream for examples of the process of data sourcing.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: PHASE 1

What was it?
11 methods - interactive Place Standard and participatory displays, spot interviews, pre-arranged interviews, photography competition, community and service provider online and postcard surveys, schools workshops, and formal workshops.

604 participants.

Key questions related to the lived experiences of local residents and visitors in terms of the services, buildings and broader place.

Why did we do this?
To understand the values and priorities of people who use or could potentially use the buildings and services in the Gracemount area.

To engage as many people as possible, including those who don’t regularly use services.

KEY FINDINGS

- Community values and priorities.
- Community hub that supports community connectivity and access to and awareness of services, that supports people and groups offering community services and activities.
- More opportunities and services for young people to support employment development and address youth crime and anti-social behaviour.
- Improvements to traffic and parking around the regional services (Locality Office and Leisure Centre), better road crossings.
- Clean and inviting public space with street furniture, trees and safe connecting paths
- Affordable activities for all

See Appendix 04: Community Engagement Phase 1 for summaries of the engagement activities, findings and a detailed analysis of each building in Gracemount.

See Appendix 05: Workshop 1 report.
DATANALYSIS:
PHASE1+2

Whatwasit?
Phase1-Datacollationandcollection aboutCouncilbuildings-spacesavailable, servicesprovided,howmanypeopleand whousesthespacesandservices 
Phase2-Datacollationandexploratory dataanalysis toaddinsighttokey communitypriorities:mobility,accessibility andtransport;localvs.regionaluse offacilities(e.g.GracemountLeisure Centre);provisionandqualityofpublicand communityspaces.

Whydidwedothis?
Tounderstandhowdifferentbuildingsare usedtodeliverservicesforthecommunity andhowwelltheyareused.
ToinvestigatethowCouncildatacouldbe usedtounderstandandvalidatecommunity valuesandpriorities.

KEYFINDINGS

- DataaboutusageofCouncilbuildings andtheservicesprovidedinthem wasinvaryingdegreesincomplete, inconsistent,difficultto access,iformatsthatcouldnot readilybeprocessedbycomputer, andnotstructuredororganised inawaythatallowedmeaningful assessmentofbuildingusage.
- TheCouncil’scategorisationof localareasintermsofNatural Neighbourhoodsprovides valuableinsightsincommunity perceptionsofgeographyandcould beusedmorewidelytoinformlocal areaplanning.
- ValleyParkCommunityCentre hasthemostroomsavailablefor communityuse.Observationdata confirmedthatthecentreiscurrently under-utilised.
- AnalysisofOpenStreetMaproutedata,combinedwithwalkingtime estimates,supportstheperceptionthatValleyParkCommunityCentreis lessreadilyaccessibletoGracemount residentslivingnorthofCaptain’sRoad.
- SouthNeighbourhoodLibrarydoesnot haveddicatedlibrarystaff,anddoesn’t offerthesamrangeofservices typicalatEdinburghlibraries.
- Edinburgh’sLibrariesservic systematicallycollectsusage datathatmakesitpossibletocompare differentcitylibraries.Forexample, theSouthNeighbourhoodLibraryis visitedsubstantiallylessthannearby GilmertonLibrary.
- SpatialdatafromtheCouncil’sOpen SpaceAudit(2016)isavailable onlineandcouldbeausefultoolfor comparingpublicspaces.
- GracemountLeisureCentresystematicallycollectsmemberusagedata.Thishelpedvalidateacommunity perceptionthatisheavilyusedby peoplefromoutsidethearea.

SeeAppendix06:DataWorkstreamReport
SeeAppendix09:DataWorkstreamProjectActivities
Thank you to everyone who shared their views about services and public buildings in Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse.

We would love to find out more about particular themes identified as important to the local community. Tell us your views via this postcard survey. Or for an online version and more project information: www.edinburgh.gov.uk/mygracemount

What is it?
An online survey, public voting on photography competition local favourite places, a postcard survey, and a professionally-facilitated evening workshop.

337 participants.

Key questions related to Gracemount Mansion’s future, the upcoming St. Catherine’s Primary School building, how services and facilities at a new community hub could best meet local need and broader place outcomes including the street environment.

Why do it?
To focus the priorities for development in Gracemount, to develop a more specific brief for a community hub and the future of Gracemount Mansion and St. Catherine’s Primary.

Co-location of services in the Primary School is a sensitive issue but one that people are open to. Successful implementation would require careful planning about what services were located there and how people would access them.

A community hub is much more than a building. Successful development of a community hub will require a co-design process where key stakeholders are not only engaged but given roles in the development and planning of the hub. People were concerned that if a community hub was co-located in the primary school community use would not be possible during the school day.

Priorities include access to affordable physical activities and connectivity of public space that supports walking and cycling.

Continued work is needed to make Valley Park an effective centre.

Playparks, bins and improvement of the public space continued to be a priority.
This chapter identifies recommendations for the Gracemount, Southhouse and Burdiehouse area, along themes of:

- Buildings
- Public space
- Communities values and priorities
- Data about buildings and services
BUILDINGS

Ensure there are sufficient and appropriate spaces for community activity and services within existing, planned, or new buildings.

EXISTING BUILDINGS

Collaborate with Localities, community workers and local groups to improve management, promotion and use of VPCC. Ensure activities provided here are accessible and affordable to all.

Consider ways of supporting Libertus to build on its existing successes delivering services for older members and other community groups to expand further.

Consider whether the South Neighbourhood Library is providing an appropriate level of service in its current location.

PLANNED BUILDINGS

When plans for the new St Catherine’s RC Primary School are being developed, work with the community (ideally via a new co-design team) and school staff and students to design spaces within the building that function well for both community and school purposes. Refer to Phase 2 reports for guidelines.

NEW BUILDINGS

Challenge: Gracemount has many community assets, but they are not well-linked in physical space. Significant community assets include the Walled Garden and Libertus. Public assets include the GP surgery, Leisure Centre and VPCC. Private sector assets include the supermarkets and local businesses and shops. How might we make better use of existing assets by engaging stakeholders and building connections between them?

A community hub for Gracemount?

Community members expressed the desire to have a physical location that plays a key role in community building and to have a dedicated youth centre or space.

The Phase 2 reports outline the considerations for a community hub, the potential components of a hub and recommended locations.

Creative thinking and co-design with the community could help envision innovative ways to deliver what the community desires within the existing and planned Estate.
PUBLIC SPACE

Improve the public space in front of the shops and improve pedestrian connectivity through the Estate.

PROTOTYPING

This could be prototyped as a first step by:

- Repurposing a small number of car parking spaces for ‘parklets’ adjacent to the local shops.
- Adding temporary street furniture (seating incorporating raised planters, containerised street trees).
- Trialling improved pedestrian wayfinding infrastructure e.g. a pedestrian crossing between the local shops and Tesco, creative visual signage and floor markings to/between key local destinations including VPCC. This could be developed as an artist commission.
- Engaging with Active Travel, Parks and Greenspaces and Planning to better understand current plans or future opportunities for Gracemount which would assist with public space improvements

Challenge: How could the Council engage and support community groups and stakeholders to take the initiative to prototype public space improvements?
COMMUNITY VALUES AND PRIORITIES

Effective decisions about the future of buildings should take into consideration community priorities and engage in dialogue with the community about how those priorities can be met in the context of new developments.

Joined-up and continued communication between the Council and community about planned new developments in any of the priority areas will help to demonstrate that the Council is listening and responding to what people have said.

The first phase of the community engagement process identified key issues that are important to people in the area, their priorities for improvements and aspirations for the future.

These priorities should serve as a guide to inform decision-making and help to direct resources when planning improvements in the area.

PRIORITIES

The priorities can be broadly grouped into eight themes. More detail can be found in the engagement reports.

- Affordability / Access to / Awareness of Services
- Safety and Anti-Social Behaviour
- Youth Services and Opportunities
- Community Hub
- Traffic and Parking
- Public Space
- Green Space
- Connectivity
- Transport

COMMUNITY INTERESTS

Specific community interests to investigate in the near-term include:

- Supporting more collaboration with Libertus for community activities
- Provide further community access to the Gracemount High School pitches
- Improving safety and use of the Dip, and reducing anti-social behaviour and vandalism

Challenge: How could Property and Localities deliver a joined-up effort to ensure that building developments are more closely integrated with place development and service planning and delivery in order to address community priorities?

See Appendix 07: Community Engagement Phase 2 and Appendix 08: Community Workshop 2 reports
DATA ABOUT BUILDINGS AND SERVICES

Insights and recommendations for the Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse area resulting from the data workstream.

INSIGHTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Valley Park Community Centre does not have processes for accurately logging data about activities or building usage. Appropriate processes are needed to be able to assess one of the most valuable community assets in the area.

- Edinburgh Libraries is able to collect fine-grained usage data by virtue of the fact that many if not most of the services are only available to registered members. Establishing some kind of membership system for booking and/or participating in activities in all of CEC’s community centres would facilitate collection of data and allow more intelligent decision-making. Methods which rely too heavily on manual records collected by building staff are prone to errors and missing data.

- Reviewing the services available to a community would benefit from a clearer classification framework that includes not just Council-provided services [e.g., housing advice] but also community-provided services [e.g., knitting classes] and more generic services such as free WiFi. This would make it easier to build a more comprehensive picture of what level of provision is available for a given type of service in different locations in the local area.

Challenge: How might we develop more effective methods for collecting and organising community-level data to inform future planning of services and buildings? How might we involve the community in this process so that we are not collecting data about them but setting priorities and collecting data with them?
METHODS, MODELS, PRODUCTS

This chapter identifies recommendations for the ongoing Service Design Programme, including use of:

- Data and Design Methodology
- Data Workstream
- Longer Term Data Strategy
- City and Local Data Resources
- Data Products
- Guidelines: Maximising the Value of Public Buildings for Local Communities, Services and Neighbourhoods
- Guidelines for Data and Design Process
Data and design methods provide different types of insights into a problem. Data can provide ‘evidence’ or facts about a situation, while design helps to understand how people experience the situation. By integrating the insights that we get from these methods, we develop better understandings of problems and open up opportunities for new conversations and new solutions.

The recommended data and design process is highlighted below. The exploration of relevant insights and emerging themes between both data and design work streams delivers value and improved decision-making.
This table uses Gracemount as an example to demonstrate the beneficial insights, value and improved outcomes a data and design approach can result in.

### Data Insight

- **Very incomplete information**: see 'Activity Analysis Mansion'.

### Design Insight

- **Attachment to Gracemount Mansion**: Perception it was extremely well-used, providing significant value to the community.
- Perception **youth were adversely impacted** by its closure - fewer services, unsuitable re-location of pre-existing services, leading to ore anti-social behaviour/crime.

### Additional Insight Needed

- **Data**: Who was offering activities at the Mansion and how often, how well were the rooms used. *(Room booking system)*
- **Data**: How many people came in and out of the Mansion on a daily basis. *(People counter)*
- **Data**: How many people were attending different activities.
- **Data**: anti-social behaviour, incident reports, youth (un)employment rates. *(Local data resource)*

### Improved Decision-Making

- **Integrating data and design findings**
  - Were all activities maintained and simply re-located when the Mansion closed? Did service/activity providers change? Did numbers drop?
  - Did anti-social behaviour rates / crime increase after the Mansion closure?
  - Would the community report any increased incidents involving young people?
  - Further investigation of youth service funding e.g. what is the current status Dunedin Canmore’s Youth project, did the Mansion closure influence the project’s ability to deliver its target outcomes?

### Outcome [Value Delivered]

- **Accurate assessment about impact on services** of closing Gracemount Mansion.
- Informed decision-making about whether Gracemount needs more/different **investment in youth services** and where to locate them.
- Assessment of whether Valley Park is **successfully** delivering youth services.
- **Improved service design** for youth services (know what works/doesn’t).
- Long term, service re-design **improves outcomes** for community safety (reduce anti-social behaviour) and youth employment.
This table uses Gracemount as an example to demonstrate the beneficial insights, value and improved outcomes a data and design approach can result in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA INSIGHT</th>
<th>DESIGN INSIGHT</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL INSIGHT NEEDED</th>
<th>IMPROVED DECISION-MAKING</th>
<th>OUTCOME [VALUE DELIVERED]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Room booking log: incomplete list of activities, time and day offered, target audience guessed (e.g. baby massage).</td>
<td>• Valley Park is underutilised - because of access issues (have to pass intimidating street spaces, not accessible by public transport), geographical ‘boundaries’ (youth don’t cross Captain’s Road, personal safety concerns), not easy to book rooms, don’t know whether it’s open or closed), and expensive activities.</td>
<td>• Data: complete list of activities, which rooms are being used, who is organising the activity. (Room booking system) • Data: how many people come in and out of VPCC on a daily basis. (People counter) • Data: How many people attend different activities. • Data: walking and cycling routes / improvements. (Local data resource)</td>
<td>Integrating data and design findings • Can we see an increase in activity at VPCC after the Mansion closed? • Was there an impact on services after the Council staff worker was removed from the building and the management committee took over? • Do less expensive/free activities have higher attendance than more expensive activities? • Which rooms are well-utilised and why? • Who is offering community services that are well-attended, and how can we better support them?</td>
<td>• Accurate assessment about impact on services of removing regular staff worker. • Assessment of whether Valley Park is successfully delivering community services. • Better planning for community buildings based on understanding of what works / doesn’t work. • Increase usage by improving services that attract more people and improving access. • Long term, service re-design delivers better outcomes for health and well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALLEY PARK COMMUNITY CENTRE

[...] Recommendation that would have provided this insight
DATA AND DESIGN: GRACEMOUNT. FROM INSIGHT TO OUTCOME

This table uses Gracemount as an example to demonstrate the beneficial insights, value and improved outcomes a data and design approach can result in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA INSIGHT</th>
<th>DESIGN INSIGHT</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL INSIGHT NEEDED</th>
<th>IMPROVED DECISION-MAKING</th>
<th>OUTCOME [VALUE DELIVERED]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Heat map shows that there is a **large distribution of Leisure Centre users**, but that there are high proportions coming from within the Gracemount Burdiehouse Southhouse area. | • **Leisure Centre is too expensive** and is used by ‘outsiders’. | • **Data:** What proportion of users from the Gracemount, Burdiehouse, Southhouse area are on a low income plan? Is it a higher proportion than for users from other areas?  
• **Design:** What are the key obstacles to using the Leisure Centre? Is it really only cost? Or something else? What types of people would like to use the Leisure Centre for what purpose but feel that they can’t afford it? | **Integrating data and design findings**  
• Could the Leisure Centre offer new services for Gracemount, Burdiehouse, Southhouse residents that are tailored to their needs e.g. discount classes for adults during the daytime? Could they use their data to evaluate the uptake of those services? | • Re-design of Leisure Centre services to **better meet local residents’ needs**.  
• Improved health and **well-being**. |
## DATA AND DESIGN: GRACEMOUNT. FROM INSIGHT TO OUTCOME

This table uses Gracemount as an example to demonstrate the beneficial insights, value and improved outcomes a data and design approach can result in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA INSIGHT</th>
<th>DESIGN INSIGHT</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL INSIGHT NEEDED</th>
<th>IMPROVED DECISION-MAKING</th>
<th>OUTCOME [VALUE DELIVERED]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Issue counts show South Neighbourhood library is <strong>poorly used</strong> - almost at the bottom of rankings.</td>
<td>• The community values the library space as a nice place to wait. The services agree that the introduction of the library set up has had a calming effect on the customers. However the community feels it is not a <em>proper</em> library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 80% of <strong>books borrowed</strong> by Gracemount Burdiehouse Southhouse residents are borrowed from South Neighbourhood Library, with Gilmerton the second favourite at 8%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gilmerton residents have a <strong>wider spread</strong> of borrowing from different libraries.</td>
<td>• <strong>Design:</strong> Are Gracemount Burdiehouse Southhouse residents unable to access other libraries - and for that matter other services - because of lack of transport options? Why don’t they travel to use other libraries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integrating data and design findings**

- Data and design together suggest that there is a case for **improving** the local library.
- **Prototype** options could be offering ‘proper’ library services in Valley Park or creating a shared public and school library in the new primary school. Design replies showed that a library as part of the primary school was an acceptable idea.

- The data and design process created a reasonable case for a **new library** in the community and a suggestion of where to place it.
DATA WORKSTREAM

DATA CATALOGUE

Creating a Data Catalogue is the first step in understanding what data is available to inform the programme.

One of the key tasks of the project was to develop a Data Catalogue. When the Data Workstream was started, there was no comprehensive list of relevant CEC datasets which could inform the data analysis work. Future data-driven CEC initiatives would benefit immensely from having a Data Catalogue at the outset. It is crucial that the Data Catalogue we have created be further developed and actively maintained in order to benefit from this investment of time and resources.

DATA ACQUISITION

It may be necessary to begin analysing data before the Data Audit is complete.

Although it would be ideal to have all relevant data identified and assessed before the project begins, this rarely happens. The data workstream should work responsively to analyse data as it is sourced. Analysis can also raise new questions that require additional datasets, so it is helpful to think of data acquisition as a circular and iterative process rather than a linear one (see diagram in Data Workstream report). This also allows data analysis to begin earlier in the project.

LOCAL AREA GEOGRAPHIES

The catchment areas of public buildings are affected by more than distance from the building. The Council ‘Natural Neighbourhoods’ project is a valuable resource for understanding and defining geographical areas for the programme to focus on.

The project brings into focus what counts as a ‘local area’ for planning purposes. The initial brief did not include a definition of the spatial extent of ‘Gracemount’. One suggestion was that it comprised an area within a 1km radius of the South East Locality Office. However this fails to take into account factors such as the following:

- Available modes of transport
- Physical geography (e.g., natural barriers like hills, waterways)
- Route infrastructure and road traffic
- How areas and boundaries are described by residents (e.g. Gracemount is the area north of Captain’s Road, while Burdiehouse and Southhouse are the areas south of Captain’s Road)

These can all play a role in determining what amenities are regarded as ‘accessible’ to residents within a given local area. The experience of the project suggests that much greater emphasis should be placed on the notion of natural neighbourhoods; these were defined on the basis of an important initiative carried out by CEC several years ago and still seem to align well with community perceptions of what constitutes ‘local’.
The Data Workstream and Community Engagement Workstreams need to work together closely and learn from each other as they go. They cannot be seen as separate pieces of work.

The preliminary data workstream activities need to be completed well in advance of the start of the community engagement activities. The pilot has laid the way for making this possible, but the significant delays to the data audit and the lack of actual data on building usage meant that the data workstream had no significant data to work with until the community engagement process was well underway.

A key task of the data workstream is to explore and validate community perceptions. The community perceptions will guide decisions as to which datasets to prioritise and which analyses would be of interest to local residents. It is essential that community engagement issues are opened up early in the process and integrated with the Data Workstream in a structured and systematic way.

Data brings the greatest value when it is used to influence decision-making. In order to do this, it must be clearly understood what the possible decisions are that the data is expected to influence. This then influences the ways that the data is presented or visualised. How data is visualised can have a significant influence on whether it is understood and used well. Data visualisation technology has evolved hugely over the last decade, and best results are achieved using an interactive, browser-based visualisation. For the project to deliver useful visualisations that will have long-term usefulness, it is necessary to agree where and how the visualisation will be hosted online.

The programme requires a robust mechanism for sharing data between CEC and the University.

In particular, there needs to be a mechanism for ensuring that:
- Both parties can view and review what files have been shared;
- Adequate metadata is made available by data owner;
- The lifecycle of data modifications made by the partner is tracked in a consistent manner;
- Any derived datasets or data products are in turn shared back with CEC with clearly specified Intellectual Property Rights (IPR).
DATA ANALYSIS: PHASE 2

LONGER TERM DATA STRATEGY

While the Service Design Programme can address certain issues to improve its ability to make better use of data, many of the issues are structural and need to be addressed at a strategic level over and above the Programme. Therefore we propose that the Programme address the following issues with senior Council leadership.

DATA EXPERTISE

The perspective that a successful business will be data driven is just as valid for the public sector as for the commercial world.

To achieve this requires appropriate leadership, for example by appointing a Chief Data Officer, plus a team of staff with data science expertise.

- To support successful innovation with data, everyone in the organisation should have essential data skills and access to data across the organisation.
- Changes like these are crucial in evolving a data-driven culture which would enable the Council to become more efficient in an era of shrinking budgets and increasing demand.

DATA REUSE AND SHARING

The primary purpose of all data should be reuse.

- Whenever data is collected, stored or procured via contract from a third party, priority should be given to ensuring reusability within the organisation.
- This means, for example, that data formats should be chosen which are most easily machine-readable. In addition, the metadata should be sufficiently detailed that it is clear to any user what the data is about, how it was collected, who owns it, and so on.
- All important datasets should be made available for internal use via web-based APIs.
- This will systematically improve data sharing between teams, lead to greater efficiencies and much better exploitation of existing investments in data. It will also make it possible to automatically track which teams are using which datasets, which in turn can guide future investment.

SPATIAL DATA

CEC’s Mapping Portal is a valuable source of spatial data that could generate much greater returns for the Council with a small amount of investment.

- The portal allows datasets to be accessed in multiple formats, either as downloads or via an API. However, it could be made even more useful, for example by explaining how the data catalogue (i.e. list of all datasets on the portal) can be inspected programmatically; and by providing more information on data provenance.
- The portal does not seem to be widely known and the audience for the data could be expanded by better publicity and by giving brief introductions to the different spatial formats. The relationship between CEC’s Mapping Portal, the CEC Open Data Portal and CEC Atlas is unclear and potentially confusing; better integration (perhaps via a shared point of entry) could significantly boost the value of each portal.
DATA CATALOGUE

An internal, online CEC Data Catalogue would enable all potential users of data to quickly determine what data is available and how it can be accessed.

- Online Data Catalogues are increasingly used for publishing data to external audiences (as for example in CEC’s Open Data Portal) but are also extremely useful for large, complex organisations such as the Council.
- An internal Data Catalogue would provide a standardised framework for recording what data is available together with key attributes such as format, owner, date last revised, topic, spatial and temporal extent and so on.
- There are existing software frameworks that would facilitate the development of an internal Data Catalogue, but there would need to be dedicated resources for actively maintaining it and ensuring that data owners contribute to it guide future investment.
The Gracemount project has highlighted the importance of city-wide and community data and the need to improve its management to inform and link up decision-making at city and local levels. We propose that the Council investigate ways to develop the following resources, with the aim of having a much better overview of the relationship between city strategies and local development and a better ability to deliver joined-up working. This could contribute significantly to delivering on the five Locality priorities:

- Improve access to and deliver more efficient services and reduce bureaucracy
- Bring resources and decision-making closer to the frontline
- Respond to changing local need
- Deliver better outcomes and improve employee and citizen experiences
- Empower citizens and communities

We would recommend adding a sixth bullet point:

- Share data where possible to enable partnership planning and delivery
and Southhouse, as shown in Figure 4. Informally, we will use the term ‘Gracemount’ in this report to encompass points.

### 4.3 HIGHLIGHTS

The answer to the question where is Gracemount?

### 4.2 WHERE IS GRACEMOUNT?

#### 4 PHASE 1

The Council Mapping Portal: East Locality Office does not align well with community perceptions. Instead, we draw on the notion of ‘natural neighbourhood’, as described by the CEC Mapping Portal. The answer to the question where is Gracemount?

#### PHASE 2

More information about the 2014 consultation can be found on the main CEC website page about natural neighbourhoods. The consultation has updated these boundaries. The boundaries will be used by the Council and its partners to plan services, consultations and inform policy and strategy development.

#### PHASE 3

Analysis of the data collected in the 2014 consultation has updated these boundaries. The boundaries will be used by the Council and its partners to plan services, consultations and inform policy and strategy development.

#### PHASE 4

The Community Engagement Workstream has indicated that Gracemount residents north of Captain’s Road should be able to accommodate the proposed services. The Community Engagement Workstream has indicated that Gracemount residents north of Captain’s Road should be able to accommodate the proposed services.

### NEXT STEPS

A first step would be to develop a proof-of-concept Data Catalogue of key existing datasets. This would enable datasets to be searched for according to topic areas e.g.

- Green Space: Open Space audit, Green Flag evaluations, Distance to green space
- Transport (including active travel): Bus routes, Distance to bus access, Planned cycling infrastructure
- Planning: Local development plan, Housing, Annual housing land audit

The second step would be to design and implement two or three specific use cases, together with a suitable data visualisation prototype, in which multiple city-wide datasets can be viewed together based on local geographical areas. For example, overlaying the Green Space audit, planned cycling infrastructure and planned road and improvements in the Gracemount area. This would be most straightforward with spatial data but would nevertheless require the datasets to use common formats, geospatial standards, and so on.

To fully test the approach, the prototype should be able to accommodate third party data (for example, from OpenStreetMap) as well as CEC-owned data.
LOCAL DATA RESOURCE

Why do it?
This could be either a sub-component of the City Data Resource or a stand-alone resource.

The purpose of a local data resource would be to provide a quick overview (with links to more detailed data) of information about a community for anyone planning an initiative in that area. This would minimise duplication of effort, quickly identify key contacts and resources, support effective processes such as asset-based community development, track community values and priorities, and ultimately improve and streamline interactions between the Council and the community.

NEXT STEPS

- The first priority for this could be consultation and Place Standard data.
- Careful planning, including prototyping and testing, would be essential to define a model that would actually be functional and useful and have an owner with an incentive to organise, manage and maintain the data.
- There would be the potential to consider a Data Trust with this approach, which would mean the resource could be owned by city and local organisations or by a body such as the Edinburgh Partnership.
While seeking to understand building usage and service provision in the Gracemount area, the data workstream identified a significant lack of data to inform decision-making.

The data gaps and issues with the data that was accessed have been covered in the various data workstream reports. This section provides a brief summary of the main opportunities to improve data collection. Any decision to collect new data needs to be carefully evaluated with respect to:

- Cost of designing a system to collect the data
- Cost of collecting the data (training people to use a system and ensuring that they use it, time required to collect and input data)
- Cost of analysing the data
- Cost of not collecting the data
- Potential value generated by the data - where and how could it be used beyond the purpose of this initiative and what would be required for that to happen
- Realistic evaluation of whether everyone who needs to engage along the data value chain will engage and what would be required for that to happen. New data collection should generate value not only for the people who want the data but also for the people who put in the effort to collect the data. Otherwise it may be seen as ‘extra work’ and not a meaningful activity.

---

The above image is from the Data Workstream report and refers to analysis of room occupancy in VPCC. See the full report for details.
ROOM BOOKING SYSTEM

What is it?
A room booking system for rooms that are accessible to the community

Why do it?
Help people to know what rooms are available
Provide guaranteed bookings for people offering activities
Create an information resource for the community (e.g. calendar of events and activities including times and locations)
Create an easily analysable data set about what kinds of activities are happening in the community
Identify demand for rooms, especially different types of rooms, and make decisions about how to adapt and improve facilities to meet community needs

How?
Create a prototype with open source tools.

CHALLENGES

Implementing a new room booking system will require:

• training and support,
• careful management to get it running successfully,
• and regular review to ensure that it is delivering on its aims
PEOPLE COUNTERS / BUILDING USAGE MONITORING

What is it?
An automated method to count the number of people entering/leaving the building during opening hours.

Why do it?
To have a cost-effective high-level view of building usage.

How?
Install a people counter at the front door.

CHALLENGES

• High-level data won’t provide a lot of insight into specific uses. However it is quick, easy and cost-effective. If combined with room booking data, it could give a reasonable overview of what is going on and help to identify where to focus effort on developing opportunities and making improvements.

• Monitoring each individual room would provide more specific data, but it would raise significant issues with invasion of privacy and would also likely not provide sufficient insights to make it worthwhile.
**RESOURCE SHARING**

There are a variety of resources in the community that could generate more value if there were mechanisms to make people aware of them and to share them. For example, some people mentioned that a kitchen for training young people on catering would help to improve youth employment opportunities. Further research revealed that there is an industrial kitchen in Libertus as well as a smaller kitchen at Valley Park Community centre. The Walled Garden group also has intentions to convert the stable block and set up a cafe, which would require a kitchen. How could these resources be shared between groups to make the most of them?

**What is it?**

A facilities and resource sharing and booking system that documents available resources, establishes a set of conditions for sharing them, and allows bookings.

**Why do it?**

Make better use of existing resources to develop new opportunities - link resources in one place with people who need them in another place.

Document what resources are available and are most valued / used.

Improve service provision through a digital / data tool that doesn’t require significant infrastructure investment.

**How?**

Look into various sharing apps, programmes and what systems might be available to support communities to share resources.

**CHALLENGES**

- Resource sharing would likely need to be implementable across the city for it to make sense.
- This would require a reasonable amount of time and investment and could be restricted by health and safety and building management issues.
These guidelines outline the factors discussed in the second community workshop that help a public building to deliver value for its local community and neighbourhood. While the factors will vary from place to place, what is clear is that any building and master plan design that Property delivers must include consideration of service design, urban design and community engagement in order to successfully deliver outcomes for people.

These guidelines should not be considered as comprehensive but can provide the start to a conversation. They should be tested and refined in ongoing conversations with other communities.

From the second community workshop report:

“...To create a place that is embraced by the community, there needs to be careful consideration of the organisational structure, including maintenance and governance, alongside designing an inviting space.

We can anticipate that even a well designed building will not be used if it is not maintained and there isn’t a dedicated staff member to manage it.

There was much less focus on what services should be provided, compared to how they should be provided.”
BUILDING AND SPACES

If facilities for specific activities (e.g. dance, IT) are provided in a building, those facilities need to be linked with well-designed services that use the spaces. Building uses should be expected to change over time. The more adaptable and flexible spaces there are, the better the buildings can respond to the changing needs of services.

PRESENCE, CONSISTENCY, COMMITMENT

Have a dedicated worker or consistent face in the building. This makes it feel welcoming, provides a connection and information point for people, and helps to keep things running smoothly. People want to have a sense of ‘knowing and being known’.

Support community workers to feel motivated and engaged. People who work ‘above and beyond’ their work commitment do a great deal to make community centres successful.

Ensure there are frequently-used services in a building. This helps bring people to a space, which can then support them to access or use other services that they might not have sought out.

Maintain consistent opening and closing hours.

MANAGEMENT

Provide community groups who use buildings autonomy, agency and flexibility to make a space ‘their own’ as much as possible.

Carefully consider how to support community management of buildings. Volunteer committees may not have the resources and skills to deliver consistent management and decision-making processes. This can have negative impacts on building use.

ACCESS AND AWARENESS

Work with community groups and youth workers to address the perceptions of ‘boundaries’ that prevent young people who are within the catchment area of a centre from using it.

Create safe and accessible routes to community centres - close to bus stops, along well-lit roads and paths, not passing next to drinking establishments, with good crossing points across major roads, etc.

Create clear signage and wayfinding if a centre is not in a central location.

Ensure that regular information and publicity about what is happening in a centre is distributed through community channels. Many people are still not accessing information online and will look for printed flyers.

Understand what ‘affordable’ means in a community and ensure that people with low incomes can access services and activities.

Create a straightforward and simple process for booking spaces and keeping track of bookings.
There were many positive outcomes of the data and community design process, which are captured in the project highlights. Along the way we identified opportunities for improvement. These have been captured in the improved Data and Design process described below. A more detailed guide can be found in the Appendix.

1. **DEFINE THE CHALLENGE**

   **Why?**
   The Service Design Programme recognises that decisions about buildings cannot be made by the Property team apart from other stakeholders - within the Council and in the community.

   **What?**
   This stage will define the scope of the Property requirements for the project and then align and integrate those with other stakeholders who will be implicated in the potential Property changes.

   **Milestones**
   All key stakeholders contribute to, understand and agree to a clearly defined scope for the project.

   A community co-design team guides the process to ensure that it is relevant for the local Council stakeholders (schools, community workers, etc.) and the community.

2. **VALIDATE THE CHALLENGE AND IMAGINE POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS / FUTURES**

   **Why?**
   In order to co-design the future with the community, project leaders need to communicate clearly the intentions of the project and demonstrate how community members can provide meaningful input. Community members need to feel that project leaders are listening to them, even when their views and values challenge project leaders’ perspectives.

   Multiple and varied engagement methods will help to reach as many community members as possible, including those who are not currently accessing services.

   **What?**
   This stage will plan and implement the main community engagement activities. This will include physical engagement points, in-person interviews, presentations and conversations at community meetings, and digital interactions.

   **Milestones**
   The community understands the scope of the project and the decisions being made and will have contributed their opinions and ideas.

   Project leaders and the community co-design team take community input onboard and prepare a draft placemaking masterplan and a selection of opportunities to prototype changes.
CO-DESIGN AND PROTOTYPE FUTURES

Why?
There is often a long day between consultations and actions that follow from them. Prototyping possible futures will engage people in a hands-on way not only to imagine how their community might be changed but to test it out in real-life. It will stimulate broad community engagement by tangibly demonstrating what future changes could look like.

What?
A series of events and activities, leading up to a large festival-type event, co-led by the community co-design team to engage community groups and members in designing, building and installing prototype changes to priority issues. Examples could include parklets in public places, guided walks that imagine new connected pathways, unused or poorly-used spaces (e.g. car parks, old pitches) turned into festival areas, ‘design your community space’ physical prototyping in a community centre or Council building, taster sessions of new community activities and public use of school pitches.

Milestones
• Prototypes are designed and delivered in close collaboration with the community. The prototyping festival reaches a large number of people in the community.
• The project collects large-scale feedback on the master placemaking plan, and the community understands potential changes and timelines.
• Community groups agree to take forward interim actions. The community co-design team has a plan for ongoing communication and engagement.

See Appendix 10: Guidelines: Data and Design Process
This section summarises the range of templates available for re-use in future Service Design Programme locations. This avoids unnecessary duplication of work.

Templates include:

- Sample Interview Questions and How-To Guides tailored for:
  - Service providers and building staff
  - Community stakeholders
- Project Information Sheets tailored for:
  - Service providers and building staff
  - Community stakeholders
- Consent forms for:
  - Interview participants
  - Photo competition entries
- Photo competition Terms and Conditions
- Stakeholder engagement matrix planner
- Community Brief summary findings
- Participatory exhibition display
- Data Workshop template
The following resources were created for re-use in future roll-out of the Service Design Programme.

COMMUNITY SPOT INTERVIEWS:
HOW TO GUIDE + SUGGESTED QUESTIONS

SERVICE PROVIDER INTERVIEWS:
HOW TO GUIDE + SUGGESTED QUESTIONS

GENERAL INTERVIEW
CONSENT FORM

INFORMATION SHEETS
SERVICE PROVIDERS
COMMUNITY MEMBERS

COMMUNITY PHOTO COMPETITION:
CONSENT FORM
TERMS + CONDITIONS

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT MATRIX

COMMUNITY BRIEF
TEMPLATE

Particularly useful for visually communicating engagement plans utilising multiple methods / targeting diverse stakeholder groups, and for summarising key findings from community engagement.

DATA WORKSHOP
TEMPLATE

EXHIBITION DISPLAY
INVITING PARTICIPATION

Bespoke adaptive exhibition structure available for re-use. Designed to incorporate A1 project information boards (attached to side panels via velcro dots), and either a spinning Place Standard wheel and category comment cards, or photo competition entries and exhibition material. Black ballot box allows A6 postcard surveys to be securely returned, and clear card/survey holders for pens and other materials enable participation without staff presence necessary.
The Appendices include the following reports:

1. Community Profile
2. Data Catalogue
3. Data Workshop Examples
4. Community Engagement Phase 1
5. Community Workshop 1
6. Data Workstream
7. Community Engagement Phase 2
8. Community Workshop 2
9. Data Workstream Project Activities
10. Guidelines: Data and Design Process
COMMUNITY PROFILE

OUR COMMUNITY: GRACEMOUNT, BURDIEHOUSE, SOUTHHOUSE
COMMUNITY PROFILE: A HOW TO GUIDE

In order to make it as easy as possible for City of Edinburgh Council to replicate this process in other areas, the following ‘how to’ guide details the steps taken to complete an initial ‘Community Profile’.

This is important, as it helps identify who local key stakeholders are that should be engaged during the service design process. It also sets the scene and context for the project.

1. Make a list of the building assets in question, and the services you are aware of that operate from them.

2. Make a list of all the stakeholders you know already, related to these buildings and services, as well as any other locally important groups. Detail as much information about each as possible, including contact details and any sensitivities/considerations relating to contacting them. This works well as a spreadsheet. This is your starting point, but should continue to be added to throughout the process.

3. Based on your starter list/spreadsheet of buildings, services and stakeholders, do a Google search via their official websites to find additional information relating to services, spaces, activities, links with other organisations, contact details. Complement this with information from their social media / blogs.

4. Review any relevant existing planning documents, or previous community consultation work done in the area.

5. Visit the buildings in question. Collect additional information as needed about particular spaces / facilities / advertised services / groups operating from the buildings. Whilst there, informally observe how people are using the building. Finding a spot to sit and work from the building’s reception/foyer area for a short period works well. Talk to front-line staff about when the busiest/quietest times are, other things that work well/could be improved and their suggested solutions.

6. Contact key stakeholders already identified on your list, and invite them for a 30min conversation about their building / service / the neighbourhood. Ask them to identify other stakeholders you should add to your list / also talk to. This organically grows your stakeholder list and ensures you can listen to and learn from as many relevant stakeholders as possible. This gives you a more holistic picture and balanced perspective about the community, the neighbourhood as a place, and its buildings and services.

7. Analyse what you have found out. This can be done graphically or as a Word Doc. This should include a summary of:
   1. The location of all building assets forming part of this study.
   2. List all the services operating from each building, including their target demographic and cost.
   3. Create a simple connections diagram showing the relationships of each service/stakeholder to any other buildings/services/organisations.
   4. Create a stakeholder map, breaking down groups or individuals into logical categories or themes e.g. ‘education’, ‘health’, ‘governance’. 
LEARNING FROM PRIOR WORK:
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN + LOCALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The current Local Development Plan does not show any proposals highlighted within the Gracemount, Southhouse and Burdiehouse area itself.

However, nearby, significant housing proposals are planned and/or being implemented. For example to the South-West of the Kaimes crossroads, to the South of the Braid Burn in close proximity to Valley Park Community Centre, and the North-East of the Gracemount area. A school is also proposed within the area of new housing to the South West of the Kaimes junction, which will be in relatively close proximity to the schools already based within Gracemount.

The South East Locality Improvement Plan (LIP) includes a ‘small area plan’ for the area covering Gracemount, Southhouse, Burdiehouse, Moredun, Fernieside, Ferniehill and Hyvots. This emphasises demand from local residents for services that will:

- improve outcomes for children and families
- enhance the quality of the environment in which they live.

The LIP identifies key priorities for Gracemount, Southhouse and Burdiehouse as:

- creating employment, training and learning opportunities for local people
- supporting development of people’s digital skills
- promoting the English for Speakers of Other Languages programme
- creating affordable activities for young people.

Actions to address these LIP priorities include:

- better promoting local services
- developing the youth work programme, access to support and advice, and providing diversionary activities from anti-social behaviour
- improving work links with the BioQuarter
- providing affordable activities for young people.
LEARNING FROM PRIOR WORK: YOUTH TALK

Youth Talk was developed in Liberton/ Gilmerton in 2013 by City of Edinburgh Council to consult with young people about their views on local facilities, activities and services.

This engagement process included four steps:

- A survey of 450 young people to determine levels of satisfaction with local services/facilities.
- Wider mapping and analysis with young people, of local services and support (16 sessions).
- An event to bring young people and service providers together to further shape actions.
- Pledges are developed, and changes identified by the service providers.

Actionable pledges fed into the Locality Improvement Plan and Edinburgh Children’s Partnership working groups.

Given the scale of this engagement, focussed around the Gracemount area, the Youth Talk findings are incredibly relevant to this project.

As such, these have been distilled, and the most relevant feedback summarised here. This relates to aspirations to improve Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse as a place, and the characteristics desired for a social space for young people.

Demand for a SOCIAL SPACE for young people. Characteristics would include:

- Safe space to be
- Positive atmosphere
- Rules on how to behave there if you break you get a warning - again you leave. People moved on if causing problems.
- Movies
- WiFi
- Modern style
- Supervision
- Music
- Book space
- Vending machine, McDonald’s
- Like Costa/McD’s without getting moved on.
- A social area like in school, but out of school with activities to occupy people such as pool, movies, music - things to do (not a youth group).
- Physical space - different seating areas
- Shelter but not a building e.g. gazebo
- Place where you can talk to someone without worrying
- Space dedicated to teens

Improving Gracemount as a PLACE:

- Create more ways for communities to get involved and invested in their community.
- Community gardens, events, fun days, inter-cultural day/events, community clean up days.
- Make parks more usable spaces.
- More bins, less litter.
- Safer streets - less speeding
- Better access to facilities - shops, GP surgery
- Fund local services.
- More community jobs.
- Wider range of youth projects.
- Put a gate in the fence beside the early Years Centre, so people don’t break the fence to get through.
- Gracemount High School astro pitch Leave lights on in the evenings so we don’t have to play football outside the shops.
As part of the Grow Stronger project, Transition Edinburgh South conducted research with Gracemount Primary School students in 2016, as well as the wider community 2014-2015.

The research aimed to better understand local people’s eating and food growing habits, as well as their use and experience of the Walled Garden growing and community space within the grounds of Gracemount Mansion. It was conducted using a mix of questionnaires and semi-structured interviews.

Key findings relating to the school children included:

- 92.4% of school children surveyed knew that food growing was happening within the Walled Garden.
- 65.9% of the children enjoyed spending time in the garden (8.3% said they did not, and the remaining either did not answer the question or answered both ‘yes’ and ‘no’).
- Reasons children stated they liked the garden included:
  - growing
  - helping
  - gardening
  - being in the garden
  - harvesting / picking
  - the smell
  - you learn things
  - it gets you outdoors
  - composting
  - it’s fun
  - it’s calming
  - being with friends

Broader research findings included:

- 68% of local people have a garden, but only half of those are growing food in it at present.
- 30% of people were ‘very’ and 25% ‘a bit’ interested in learning more about food growing.
- The community meals and events at the Walled Garden have helped support local people’s confidence and skills in preparing healthy meals (including vegetables, cooked from scratch and with minimal waste).
- Participants felt the project was having wider benefits within the community e.g. “doing quite a lot of positive work in the neighbourhood”.
- Interviewees mentioned various possibilities for the future of the project and Walled Garden land, including:
  - further development of a cafe
  - new growing projects
  - a swap shop for locally grown produce
  - introducing locally grown food and produce to food banks
  - strengthening links between Edinburgh growing communities
WHO ARE THE KEY STAKEHOLDERS?

Key stakeholders within Gracemount, Southhouse and Burdiehouse include both service providers (those involved in service delivery and/or building staff), and service users (including local residents, community members, or those from further afield).

Stakeholders are typically associated with a building that they are based in, deliver a service from, or attend a service at. These have been categorised into the following groups:

- local businesses
- religious
- governance
- health and well-being
- community hubs
- education

The following categories were also included to ensure those stakeholders not currently using local public buildings/services or associated with a particular physical location were also included:

- hard to reach groups
- community organisations
WHAT COMMUNITY ASSETS CURRENTLY EXIST?

Physical community assets currently exist in the form of buildings owned by Council, and those owned by third sector or other organisations such as the NHS.

- **GRACEMOUNT LEISURE CENTRE**
  - Fitness classes, gym, swimming.

- **VALLEY PARK COMMUNITY CENTRE**
  - Various activities and community services.

- **KAIMES SCHOOL**
  - Autistic special education provision for Edinburgh.

- **GRACEMOUNT PRIMARY SCHOOL**
  - Primary school education for local catchment.

- **GRACEMOUNT HIGH SCHOOL**
  - High school education for local catchment. Space rented via school lets.

- **GRACEMOUNT MANSION + WALLED GARDEN**
  - Grow Stronger community garden

- **ST CATHERINE’S SCHOOL**
  - Primary school education for local catchment.

- **MEDICAL CENTRE**
  - GP practice including child health and immunisation services, baby massage, parent and baby group, diabetic, hyper tension, wart, spirometry and antenatal clinics.

- **ST CATHERINE OF ALEXANDRIA’S CHURCH**
  - Services and activities include Lent study groups, bereavement groups, children’s liturgy, communion and youth activities.

- **LIBERTUS**
  - Variety of services, particularly focussed on older people. Building divided into half for daycare, half for other activities (e.g. Positive Futures). Meeting space can be rented out. Has industrial kitchen.

- **GRACEMOUNT MANSION**
  - Community garden

- **SE LOCALITY OFFICE + LIBRARY**
  - Library, range of Council services (e.g. housing, social work).

- **ST CATHERINE’S RC PRIMARY SCHOOL**
  - Primary school educational services.
BUILDING ASSETS

**Gracemount High School**
- High school education for local catchment.
- Space rented via school lets.

**Gracemount Leisure Centre**
- Fitness classes, gym, swimming.

**Gracemount Primary School**
- Primary school education for local catchment.

**St Catherine’s RC Primary School**
- Autistic special education provision for Edinburgh.

**Kaimes School**
- Fitness classes, gym, swimming.

**Trinity School**
- High school education for local catchment.

**Gracemount Primary School**
- Primary school education for local catchment.

**Grow Stronger Community Garden**
- Community garden for local residents.

**Valley Park Community Centre**
- Various activities and community services.

**Gracemount Mansion + Walled Garden**
- Public space with historic significance.

**St Caterine’s Church**
- Services and activities include Lent study, children’s liturgy, communion, and youth activities.

**Libertus**
- Variety of services, particularly focussed on older people. Building divided into half for daycare, half for other activities (e.g. Positive Futures). Rents meeting space, has industrial kitchen.

**Third Sector Ownership**
- NHS Medical Centre
  - GP practice including child health and immunisation services, baby massage, parent and baby group, diabetic, hypertension, wart, spirometry and antenatal clinics.
  - Variety of services, particularly focussed on older people. Building divided into half for daycare, half for other activities (e.g. Positive Futures). Rents meeting space, has industrial kitchen.

**Gracemount Manor**
- Community garden.

**SE Localities Offices**
- Council services (e.g. housing, social work)

**Gracemount Drive**
- Local road

**Captain’s Road**
- Local road

**Gracemount House Drive**
- Local road

**Southhouse Road**
- Local road

**Southhouse Broadway**
- Local road

**Gracemount House Drive**
- Local road

**Gracemount Drive**
- Local road

**Grow Stronger Community Garden**
- Community garden for local residents.

**Gracemount High School**
- High school education for local catchment.
- Space rented via school lets.

**Gracemount Leisure Centre**
- Fitness classes, gym, swimming.

**Gracemount Primary School**
- Primary school education for local catchment.

**St Catherine’s RC Primary School**
- Autistic special education provision for Edinburgh.

**Primary School**
- Primary school education for local catchment.

**Grow Stronger Community Garden**
- Community garden for local residents.

**Valley Park Community Centre**
- Various activities and community services.

**Gracemount Mansion + Walled Garden**
- Public space with historic significance.

**St Caterine’s Church**
- Services and activities include Lent study, children’s liturgy, communion, and youth activities.

**Libertus**
- Variety of services, particularly focussed on older people. Building divided into half for daycare, half for other activities (e.g. Positive Futures). Rents meeting space, has industrial kitchen.

**Third Sector Ownership**
- NHS Medical Centre
  - GP practice including child health and immunisation services, baby massage, parent and baby group, diabetic, hypertension, wart, spirometry and antenatal clinics.
  - Variety of services, particularly focussed on older people. Building divided into half for daycare, half for other activities (e.g. Positive Futures). Rents meeting space, has industrial kitchen.
BUILDINGS, SERVICES, CONNECTIONS

Information gathered about services delivered in Gracemount, Southhouse and Burdiehouse, and the buildings they are delivered from, was gathered during the Community Profile. This was supplemented by interview data during Engagement Phase 1 to create the adjacent summary graphic.

This also includes information about connections and relationships between these different organisations, stakeholders and buildings.
What local services or activities can I access?

How old are you?

- UNDER <5 YEARS
- PRIMARY 5-11 YEARS
- SECONDARY 12-17 YEARS
- ADULT 18-59 YEARS
- ADULT 60+ YEARS

What type of service or activity would you like to access?

- Core service
- Paid activity
- Free activity

Gracemount Medical GP Appointments, antenatal, spirometry, wart, diabetic, well-woman, baby health clinics, child immunisation (Gracemount Medical Centre)

St Catherine’s of Alexandria Church services

Education: Kaimes School, Gracemount Primary School, St Catherine’s RC Primary School, Gracemount High School

Council’s SE Locality Office: Library, Homelessness Prevention and Housing Options, Family Household and Support Services, Customer Contact Team, Transport Services, Revenue and Benefits, Health and Social Care, Criminal Justice, Housing Services, Chai (community help and advice)

Libertus day care services for older residents

Gracemount Walled Garden: garden volunteering

St Catherine’s Church: bereavement group, Alpha.

Libertus (50+): Positive Futures (card-making, cooking, crochet, photography, jewellery-making, knitting, scrap-booking, carpet bowling, gardening), current affairs.

Libertus Young Adults Group (17+): physical/learning disabilities.

Libertus: youth activities

St Catherine’s Church: youth activities, Lent study group.

Liberty (16+): Cooking with Kirsten, garden volunteering

Gracemount High: astro turf (informal use).

Gracemount Walled Garden: garden volunteering

St Catherine’s Church: bereavement group, Alpha.

Libertus: cafe/catering skills, healthy baby clinic, baby massage, baby exploring, Cooking with Kirsten, gardening volunteers, yoga.

Gracemount Medical Centre: baby massage, parent and baby group, Gracemount Walled Garden: garden volunteering.

Gracemount High: astro turf (informal use).

Gracemount Medical Centre: baby massage, parent and baby group, Gracemount Walled Garden: garden volunteering.

St Catherine’s Church: bereavement group, Alpha.

Libertus: cafe/catering skills, healthy baby clinic, baby massage, baby exploring, Cooking with Kirsten, gardening volunteers, yoga.

St Catherine’s Church: bereavement group, Alpha.

VPCC: art group, yoga, gardening, indoor bowls.

Gracemount Walled Garden: garden volunteering

St Catherine’s Church: bereavement group, Alpha.

VPCC: cafe/catering skills, healthy baby clinic, baby massage, baby exploring, Cooking with Kirsten, gardening volunteers, yoga.

St Catherine’s Church: bereavement group, Alpha.

VPCC: art group, yoga, gardening, indoor bowls.
Data Package: **gracemount-floor-plans**

Provides a plan of the site and floor plans of the buildings.

**Description**

Site/building layout including the land that CEC own as part of the site and a floorplan for each storey of the building

**Contact**

Andy Powers

**Usability**

Lack of metadata for the multiple layers in the floor plans and problems with MicroStation data format interoperability limited usability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filename</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1274 Gracemount Primary School.dxf</td>
<td>dxf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367 Kaimies School.dxf</td>
<td>dxf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458 South Edinburgh Area Housing 2004.dxf</td>
<td>dxf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499 St Catherine’s R.C. Primary School.dxf</td>
<td>dxf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772 Gracemount Leisure Centre.dxf</td>
<td>dxf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery - Gracemount.dxf</td>
<td>dxf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vpcc-floorplan.dxf</td>
<td>dxf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre - Valley Park.dwg</td>
<td>dwg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery - Gracemount.dwg</td>
<td>dwg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre - Valley Park.dgn</td>
<td>dgn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458 South Edinburgh Area Housing 2004.pdf</td>
<td>pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772 Gracemount Leisure Centre.pdf</td>
<td>pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School - Gracemount.pdf</td>
<td>pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 02:
DATA CATALOGUE

Behind the scenes example of a Data Catalogue

Behind the scenes of the Data Catalogue:
underlying info to associate metadata with a set of data files

```json
{
    "name": "gracemount-floor-plans",
    "licenses": [],
    "description": "Site/building layout including the land that CEC
own as part of the site and a floorplan for each storey of the
building",
    "dct:contactPoint": "Andy Powers",
    "category": "Area assets",
    "title": "Provides a plan of the site and floor plans of the
buildings.",
    "comments": "Lack of metadata for the multiple layers in the
floor plans and problems with MicroStation data format
interoperability limited usability",
    "profile": "data-package",
    "resources": [
        {
            "path": "1274 Gracemount Primary School.dxf",
            "profile": "data-resource",
            "name": "1274 Gracemount Primary School",
            "format": "dxf",
            "mediatype": "text/dxf",
            "encoding": "utf-8"
        },
        {
            "path": "1367 Kaimes School.dxf",
            "profile": "data-resource",
            "name": "1367 Kaimes School",
            "format": "dxf",
            "mediatype": "text/dxf",
            "encoding": "utf-8"
        },
        {
            "path": "1458 South Edinburgh Area Housing 2004.dxf",
            "profile": "data-resource",
            "name": "1458 South Edinburgh Area Housing 2004",
            "format": "dxf",
            "mediatype": "text/dxf",
            "encoding": "utf-8"
        },
        {
            "path": "1499 St Catherine's R.C. Primary School.dxf",
            "profile": "data-resource",
            "name": "1499 St Catherine's R.C. Primary School",
            "format": "dxf",
            "mediatype": "text/dxf",
            "encoding": "utf-8"
        },
        {
            "path": "1772 Gracemount Leisure Centre.dxf",
            "profile": "data-resource",
            "name": "1772 Gracemount Leisure Centre",
```
APPENDIX 03: DATA WORKSHOP EXAMPLES
APPENDIX 04: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PHASE 1

OUR COMMUNITY: GRACEMOUNT, BURDIEHOUSE, SOUTHHOUSE

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT 1
GRACEMOUNT AS A PLACE

People like:
- The Walled Garden.
- ‘The Dip’ and other green spaces.
- Amenity of local shops.

People dislike:
- The street environment: including presence of litter, dog poo, smoking, vandalism and anti-social behaviour.
- The volume of traffic.
- Poor walkability, including difficulty crossing roads e.g. at Tesco (Gracemount Drive) and Captain’s Road north-south.
- The feeling of neglect implied by poorly maintained and/or old buildings, outdoor spaces and public realm.
- Existing assets, such as the football pitches, not being utilised.
- Difficulties finding a parking space.

What services/facilities are commonly used?
- Tesco and Scotmid (local users)
- Leisure Centre (local and regional users)

What do people feel is missing?
- A ‘proper’ library with a better range of books and dedicated library staff.
- A ‘proper’ community hub, located in the central Gracemount area.
- A ‘proper’ playpark for young children.
- A ‘proper’ large supermarket e.g. Lidl.
- Free activities for young teens (12-15yrs)
- A youth centre / cafe
- A bigger swimming pool with flumes, crèche and soft play at the Leisure Centre.
- More green space, including community food growing space.
- Intergenerational spaces.
- Better promotion and support for existing services e.g. VPCC, Walled Garden.
- Pedestrian and cycle connections and a high quality, green, public realm.

GRACEMOUNT’S SERVICES

What motivates people to use the current services?
- VPCC - to socialise, learn skills, meet others in a positive environment.
- Leisure Centre - for health and fitness, to socialise as an informal local hub/meeting place (cafe area), use facilities (swimming pool, gym) or access classes (fitness, sports) not available elsewhere.
- Library at SE Locality Office - incidental use to pass time whilst waiting for appointments, or dedicated visits to read books or attend book groups.
- SE Locality Office - to access essential services (non-optional use).
- Schools (Kaimies / Gracemount Primary / St Catherine’s Primary / Gracemount High) - compulsory educational attendance.
- Gracemount Medical Practice - essential doctor/clinic appointments
- Libertus - to socialise, eat together, activities, ‘get out of the usual four walls’.

What pains/frustrations are there?
- The cost of Leisure Centre activities.
- Lack of a bigger swimming pool, flumes, crèche and soft play.
- Lack of activities for young people within the central Gracemount area. Particularly free activities, and a space for teenagers to spend time in the evenings/at the weekend.
- Limited Leisure Centre cafe opening hours e.g. only Saturday morning at weekend).
- Lack of dedicated library staff, greater range of books, and family atmosphere at the library (within SE Locality Office).
- Oversubscribed meeting rooms and poor booking system at SE Locality Office.
- Lack of maintenance resulting in the Mansion closure, and football pitches falling into disrepair. Feeling of ‘lost community assets’ and the associated services these offered e.g. youth services.
- Lack of Centre Manager at VPCC, or staff whose role includes welcoming people to the centre and promoting activities.
- VPCC too far away (Southhouse) to attract service users or be considered Gracemount’s community centre. Young people less keen to access services here - the ‘wrong’ side of Captain’s Road from central Gracemount.
- Old primary school buildings in poor condition, without appropriate facilities for staff/students. This limits additional services or activities that could be provided within the school building e.g. PEEP classes at St Catherine’s Primary.
- Lack of disabled/young family dedicated parking at the Leisure Centre/Libertus.
**GRACEMOUNT’S SERVICES**

What works well now?
- **Gracemount Walled Garden** group deliver significant positive community benefits (socialising, healthy food, therapeutic/‘green gym’).
- Library creates a positive pleasant waiting environment for service users (SE Locality Office).
- Primary school staff are highly regarded, the main barrier to better service delivery being the **fabric of the physical school buildings**, in terms of their design, condition, age, and available spaces/facilities.

Aspirations for the future
- Some services would **work well together** (GP, healthcare/social care/families/leisure services), and some would **benefit from separation** (e.g., children’s library and Criminal Justice appointment attendees).
- Generally an aspiration to **work more closely with colleagues from other services**, co-locating as appropriate. This was felt to enable better, more coordinated service delivery and ease of access. For example, via a ‘one stop shop’ community hub incorporating relevant services, whilst also providing a space for young people and intergenerational community activities.

**GRACEMOUNT’S BUILDINGS**

Which buildings are the most/least used?
- Most used: Leisure Centre
- Least used: VPCC

How do people access buildings (transport)?
- Large numbers drive, particularly if coming from further afield to the Leisure Centre, Libertus or SE Locality Office. Parking is a significant and contentious issue.
- **Bus routes** along Captain’s Road are felt to be positive, offering easy transport access to the services within central Gracemount. However, VPCC is felt to be too far off the main bus route to be accessible to all.
- Local users often walk.

Ideas for the future:
- Demand for replacement school for St Catherine’s as a priority, and also soon Gracemount Primary School. Focus should be on ensuring these new buildings have enough rooms/facilities to meet staff/student needs.
- More **green space / growing spaces**.
- A **community hub** incorporating youth services / cafe and free activities.
- A better connected, **pedestrian-friendly public realm**. Linkages to broader cycling network.
- A solution to **parking issues**.
- Better use of **existing assets** (astro pitch, expand positive impact of Walled Garden).
- **Centre Manager role** at VPCC/promotion of activities.
- Employ more **local people** within the buildings/services.
- Kindergarten, youth centre, community centre, or teaching kitchen/catering college at **Gracemount Mansion**. **Opposition** to this being sold for private flats.
- Transformation of **Stables Block** into local food cafe to accompany Walled Garden.
**GRACEMOUNT MANSION • WALLED GARDEN**
- Demands to invest in the structure of the Mansion and Walled Garden before this further deteriorates and becomes more unsafe. Lack of maintenance may also attract vandalism.
- Extremely well loved local landmark and (previously) races, exploratory outdoor play.
- Felt to be a hodge podge of different buildings, with generations of families have memories here.
- Young children play in the mansion grounds/green space.
- Connections to local schools and social workers.
- Significant improvement works underway.

**GRACEMOUNT PRIMARY SCHOOL**
- Parent concerns about lack of space for drop-off/collection, and parking.
- Children missing their parent during drop-off/collection, and parking.
- Bumper to bumper traffic and lack of pedestrian space.
- Possible shared space for drop-off/collection, and parking.

**ST CATHERINE’S RC PRIMARY SCHOOL**
- Students frequent shops/takeaways to buy unhealthy food.
- Younger (primary age) children feel intimidated.
- Anti-social and threatening behaviour and crime, as young people have fewer accessible facilities.

**GRACEMOUNT HIGH SCHOOL**
- Essential new facilities: separate dining room and gym hall, storage space, 14 new classrooms to allow more than single stream and accommodate children from new housing, staff, parents (e.g. BrightMinds, Scenic Lunch, etc) etc (for parents events/meetings, to run PEEP), dedicated rooms for Place2Be and art therapy (support for learning, on atmosphere within waiting area, improves behaviour, provides a valuable function and is an effective use of the space.

**SE LOCALITY**
- Library: a dedicated local library with staff, possibly combined with a community centre for Gracemount.
- Parking and maintenance: a car park offering good access to a south entrance.
- Large numbers of students, but also a diverse range of users: locals who work, local students, people coming in from further afield, just to use the Leisure Centre, rather than any other connection with Gracemount.
- Satellite of ‘community’s attitude to professional’ coming to a service that is practical, but also to address anti-social development.
- Local authority: to address anti-social development.
- Social care: to address anti-social development.
- Liaising with local authority: to address anti-social development.
- Partnership: to address anti-social development.
- Surgery: to address anti-social development.
- Service: to address anti-social development.
- Service: to address anti-social development.

**THE DIP**
- Potential for a garden/park/pocket park/pocket park.
- Potential for a garden/park/pocket park/pocket park.
- Potential for a garden/park/pocket park/pocket park.
- Potential for a garden/park/pocket park/pocket park.

**VALLEY PARK COMMUNITY CENTRE**
- Full to be extended.
- Potential for a garden/park/pocket park/pocket park.
- Potential for a garden/park/pocket park/pocket park.
- Potential for a garden/park/pocket park/pocket park.
- Potential for a garden/park/pocket park/pocket park.
Lack of maintenance may also attract vandalism.

Felt to be a hodge podge of different buildings, with limited connections and few activities (as those still provided at VPCC are too far, with no accessible parking). From a Health and Wellbeing perspective, the Mansion is not fully accessible, with limited disable parking spaces.

Significant demand to keep the lights on at night. In doing so, this existing resource would be better utilised as a free local social space and an area for young people, and not be subventioned as a council asset. The Mansion is more well loved as a local landmark and (previously) the Walled Garden Group still providing significant community-

Significant improvement works underway.

Children enjoy using the green space at the Mansion for play, and increasingly the access road is used for school car parking by parents.

Community feel the mansion was 'taken away' from them, due to Council's lack of maintenance. This is felt to have had a significant impact on the local community, particularly in terms of children playing in the garden.

Demands to use playpark in the evening too, and keep the Mansion as part of a co-ordinated area with other buildings.

Gracemount Leisure Centre

• Demand for assembly hall, swimming pool, improved canteen.
• Opportunity to better utilise outdoor space.
• Astro turf is popular with young people in the evening.
• Significant demand to keep the lights on at night.

Captain’s Road

• Parking issues - car park without surfacing to north-west, affecting local traffic and parking.
• Criticisms of “colonial” attitude to professionals coming in from other places to “tell local poverty-stricken people what to do”. Demand for employment/training of local people. This would also help address parking/unemployment issues.

Captain’s Road. A safer crossing to make this a safer route for children to the centre, and which reduces the perceptual barrier would be beneficial to local residents to be delivered here, and a youth cafe.

Conflicts between Conflicts between

• Generally, support for combination with other schools/
• Rebuilding seen as opportunity to improve and regenerate
• Building well maintained, attractive, clean.
• Opportunities for productive community benefit e.g. growing/green space.

• Generations of families have memories here. • Young children play in the mansion grounds/green space. • Connections to local schools and social workers.

• Demand to use playpark in the evening too, and keep

Gracemount Houses

• Children enjoy using the green space at the Mansion for play, and increasingly the access road is used for school car parking by parents.

Leisure Centre

• Rebuilding seen as opportunity to improve and regenerate
• Opportunities for productive community benefit e.g. growing/green space.

• Building well maintained, attractive, clean.
• Opportunities for productive community benefit e.g. growing/green space.

• Demand to use playpark in the evening too, and keep
OVERVIEW OF PHASE 1 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

AIMS:

- Reveal community users’ values/motivations regarding service delivery/building use within their neighbourhood.
- Reaching as diverse a range of people as possible by using a range of online/digital and offline/in-person methods, going to people where they are, and including activities that don’t feel like ‘consultation’.
- Listening to and learning from service providers/building staff.
- Empathising and understanding different people’s experiences relating to the same services/buildings but from many different angles.

DELIVERING VALUE BY:

- Synthesising these different views across different Council departments, services and community groups to give a more complete picture.
- Highlighting where there is already local capacity, demand and enthusiastic people wanting to contribute to running services, just needing some support.
- Leading to solutions that best address the actual issues in the most effective way, and highlight where the opportunities lie that would have most impact locally.

ACTIVITIES:

- Schools workshop
- Two online surveys (versions for community and service providers)
- Photo competition
- Pre-arranged interviews (45-90mins) with service providers
- Pre-arranged user interviews with hard-to-reach groups e.g. older residents via Libertus, young adults.
- Street ‘spot’ interviews with general public in the area.
- Moveable exhibition/display with Place Standard wheel ‘touring’ 3 different local venues for one week each inviting participation.
- Mini-survey printed postcards
- Posters promoting ways to get involved.
- Community workshop.
Schools workshop with students from Gracemount Primary School, and St Catherine’s RC Primary School, May 2019.
Schools workshop with students from Gracemount Primary School, and St Catherine’s RC Primary School, May 2019
PHASE 1: NUMBERS OF PEOPLE ENGAGED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Workshop</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spot Interviews</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Arranged Interviews</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mostly Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Competition</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Online Survey</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider Online Survey</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Exhibition Display</td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard Survey</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshop 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>604</strong></td>
<td><strong>318</strong> (Comments etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A key part of Phase 1 engagement were interviews with service providers and community members/organisations. Targeted in-depth interviews were complimented by ‘spot’ interviews with members of the public.

### PRE-ARRANGED IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

Longer semi-structured in-depth interviews were pre-arranged with key service providers operating from Council-owned buildings in the Gracemount area. These contacts had been identified as part of the Community Profile process at the start of the project. By asking these contacts who else we should speak to, the list of stakeholders interviewed in this way grew, until we had spoken to 34 individuals/groups. This primarily included service providers (managers and front-line building staff) but also key community organisations/groups with a vested interest in particular buildings or spaces.

Each pre-arranged interview lasted between 45 minutes and 1.5 hours. Interviews took place at a location/time best suited to each participant i.e. we ‘went to them’ rather than expecting them to come to us. Questions were based on the overall ‘key questions’ the wider project’s community engagement plan aimed to address, but tailored as appropriate to the individual person, service/building, or context. This flexibility allows individuals to reveal additional insight or detail specific to their knowledge that it was not possible to anticipate in advance.

Interviews were audio-recorded to assist with note-taking. A template consent form covering how data would be used/stored was signed by each participant. This template is available for future applications. Audio files were anonymised and stored in accordance with GDPR regulations, including deletion at project completion.

Participants were also provided a project information sheet covering project background, how to get further involved and hear back on the final project outcome. This is also available as a template for future Council projects relating to service design/property assets.

An analysis spreadsheet was set up to input interview data, coding each participant’s responses into categories. Starting categories were defined by overarching key project questions, and added to themes emerged. This also allowed easy comparison of various interviewees’ responses by theme.

### SPOT INTERVIEWS WITH COMMUNITY MEMBERS

A total of 40 spot interviews were undertaken. Typically, these are conducted by approaching members of the public ‘where they already are’. For example, in the street or at local shops. This helps ensure a broader diversity of insight from the wider community, including hard-to-reach groups, rather than just those already using the services/buildings or heavily involved in local groups/services. This is also useful to help reveal why certain groups are not using certain services/buildings at present.

Front-line staff and those working in local shops were also targeted for informal impromptu spot interviews, to complement the pre-arranged interviews already conducted with (typically managerial) service/building staff. Front-line staff are particularly important to also speak with, as they see the day-to-day running of services and building operation first hand, and can provide particular insight into themes relating to barriers/frustrations/motivations for use of the service/building from the community or service users’ perspectives. Local shop owners also interact with community members on a daily basis so typically have a good feel for local sentiments about particular buildings, services or places, in addition to observations about adjacent public realm spaces.

Interviews were conducted on both a weekday (Thurs 18 May) and weekend (Sat 23 May) and at various times of day, to ensure the most diverse range of people were approached.

Verbal consent was used, and each participant was given a project information sheet (including other ways to get involved, and how to hear back on the final project outcome). Responses were anonymised. For spot interviews written notes were more practical than audio recording (which can make some participants feel uneasy and requires written consent). Interview data was input into the overall interview analysis spreadsheet under a separate tab to code each participant’s responses by theme.
Increasingly the services provided [in the SE Locality Office] are for vulnerable people. At the same time there has been a reduction in the management capacity of the library - so some of that developmental work in the library to keep it connected to the community - and as an asset to the wider community - have fallen away a bit. Bookbug and other classes really transform the space, and have a really positive impact - both on people’s behaviour and how welcoming the library and office feels. Perhaps there are different ways to re-energise and shape the library space, bearing in mind the vulnerable groups that are coming in.

There are opportunities to work together on a masterplan for the area, connecting green spaces, connecting walks, to create a more tied together community. One of the biggest barriers to that at the moment is cars.

In terms of challenges, car parking is probably high on our [Leisure Centre] customers’ lists. When the GP surgery and Libertus were built, and when Council introduced more of their staff here, the impact on car parking wasn’t considered. We began to get a lot of problems, especially for our more infirm customers, and those with kids. Better car parking would make it more accessible.

There’s a lot of criminal behaviour and people afraid to speak about it. There’s gangs dealing drugs, using young people as couriers. Arranged fights between different gangs, teenagers drinking, knives stashed. There’s an undercurrent of criminal activity in the area. Affinities between different areas.

People come in to use the [Leisure Centre] cafe, without using any of the other services. It’s a community hub.

Overnight Valley Park changed. When they removed the people that were qualified to understand the area: the Community Learning / Development workers, there used to be one in each community centre. That broke links with the community.

The community centre (Valley Park) is too far into Southhouse, so it’s not used by those in Gracemount. Southhouse, Burdiehouse, Gracemount are separate places.

The gym and Leisure Centre are unaffordable for young people and those on low incomes to use.

The Mansion House could be an interesting community hub.

Young people tend to gather on the High School’s astro, but that’s not always safe. It’s dark, and it’s isolated, exposed, and no help around. So that can be a danger area. The young people want the lights left on in the evening so they can use the pitch. Otherwise they have to kick a ball around at the shops.

Young people really need somewhere to play and hang out. The garden, woodlands and mansion have become an HQ for that. This green spot should be preserved for families/young children. And supported - financial, services. If you took it away, you’re asking for trouble. Where would you displace that focus?

Young people really need somewhere to play and hang out. The garden, woodlands and mansion have become an HQ for that. This green spot should be preserved for families/young children. And supported - financial, services. If you took it away, you’re asking for trouble. Where would you displace that focus?

Gracemount needs a building that is open and functions as a youth club but with youth workers, a place for young people to hang out, with a cafe, but also get support for alcohol/drugs if in crisis as needed. A central place to be referred to.

Valley Park closes early on a Friday but should be opened at the weekends and late on a Friday. The window shutters make the building look depressing and uninviting. You can’t tell if the building is open or closed. They should create more awareness. Permanent staff are needed.

Libertus’ ambition is to be a community hub, with a wide range of services provided.

The key challenge at the moment is making (Kaimes) school’s physical environment more student-friendly.

The Mansion House could be an interesting community hub.

The gym and Leisure Centre are unaffordable for young people and those on low incomes to use.

Young people tend to gather on the High School’s astro, but that’s not always safe. It’s dark, and it’s isolated, exposed, and no help around. So that can be a danger area. The young people want the lights left on in the evening so they can use the pitch. Otherwise they have to kick a ball around at the shops.

Overnight Valley Park changed. When they removed the people that were qualified to understand the area: the Community Learning / Development workers, there used to be one in each community centre. That broke links with the community.

There’s a lot of criminal behaviour and people afraid to speak about it. There’s gangs dealing drugs, using young people as couriers. Arranged fights between different gangs, teenagers drinking, knives stashed. There’s an undercurrent of criminal activity in the area. Affinities between different areas.

In terms of challenges, car parking is probably high on our [Leisure Centre] customers’ lists. When the GP surgery and Libertus were built, and when Council introduced more of their staff here, the impact on car parking wasn’t considered. We began to get a lot of problems, especially for our more infirm customers, and those with kids. Better car parking would make it more accessible.

There are opportunities to work together on a masterplan for the area, connecting green spaces, connecting walks, to create a more tied together community. One of the biggest barriers to that at the moment is cars.

It’s hard to recruit enough GPs [at the Medical Centre] to meet the demand.

Overnight Valley Park changed. When they removed the people that were qualified to understand the area: the Community Learning / Development workers, there used to be one in each community centre. That broke links with the community.

Valley Park closes early on a Friday but should be opened at the weekends and late on a Friday. The window shutters make the building look depressing and uninviting. You can’t tell if the building is open or closed. They should create more awareness. Permanent staff are needed.

The community centre (Valley Park) is too far into Southhouse, so it’s not used by those in Gracemount. Southhouse, Burdiehouse, Gracemount are separate places.

The gym and Leisure Centre are unaffordable for young people and those on low incomes to use.

Young people really need somewhere to play and hang out. The garden, woodlands and mansion have become an HQ for that. This green spot should be preserved for families/young children. And supported - financial, services. If you took it away, you’re asking for trouble. Where would you displace that focus?

Overnight Valley Park changed. When they removed the people that were qualified to understand the area: the Community Learning / Development workers, there used to be one in each community centre. That broke links with the community.

In terms of challenges, car parking is probably high on our [Leisure Centre] customers’ lists. When the GP surgery and Libertus were built, and when Council introduced more of their staff here, the impact on car parking wasn’t considered. We began to get a lot of problems, especially for our more infirm customers, and those with kids. Better car parking would make it more accessible.

There are opportunities to work together on a masterplan for the area, connecting green spaces, connecting walks, to create a more tied together community. One of the biggest barriers to that at the moment is cars.

It’s hard to recruit enough GPs [at the Medical Centre] to meet the demand.
We know that some of the schools are coming to the end of their life - there are the asbestos issues at St Catherine’s, Gracemount Primary is a hodgepodge of different buildings, the football pitches at the back of the leisure centre are no longer fit for purposes, there are issues with parking denying the land. There’s a lot that could be done - but it’s not putting patches on it. It’s putting an underlying plan behind it that has a long term impact. Make it a place for people not cars. Removing the fences would be a good start. For example removing the fence at the back of the High School. There’s a lot of land but it doesn’t connect. It all needs to connect, and be accessible to the community. We need to look more broadly at Gracemount - open up pathways, remove fences, car free zone, clean air. It’s not connected at the moment, but easily doable. But it has to involve the community.

There are opportunities to work together on a masterplan for the area, connecting green spaces, connecting walks, to create a more tied together community. One of the biggest barriers to that at the moment is cars.

It doesn’t feel good, reflect well on the area, when things are just left to rot (the mansion and football pitches).
COMMUNITY SPOT INTERVIEWS

We need a ‘proper’ community centre, and another GP. The current one it’s impossible to get an appointment at. There are lots of new homes, and not enough doctors to see everyone.

I’d like to see local people trained up and able to work here. At the moment its lots of professionals driving in from elsewhere to tell the local people what to do. Colonial. Patronising. It’s what always happen - the put the ‘professionals’ in charge of the poverty stricken people.

It doesn’t feel good, reflect well on the area, when things are just left to rot (the mansion and football pitches).

Young people want a place they can freely play, that’s not constantly supervised by adults but is safe.

That mansion was used for decades before us - a legacy. It’s been left in the deeds to young people. There’s a bike track there that the kids use, but it’s closed now. £1.5 million to repair and bring up to standard, or knock it down. The gardeners still use it. The primary kids. They love it there outside. [...] It’s a big loss to the community. [...] They tried to move youth services over to VPCC, but the kids won’t come here - it’s off the bus route, and outside of their territory - some of them come from Liberton.

Gracemount needs a building that is open and functions as a youth club but with youth workers, a place for young people to hang out, with a cafe, but also get support for alcohol/drugs if in crisis. A central place to be referred to.

Council didn’t maintain the Mansion properly - so now no-one can use the building. Such a waste.

I’d like to see outdoor spaces in Valley Park, and more opportunity for social ownership.

We need more areas for kids, like a bigger play area and a softplay.

I tried to get a room at Valley Park but couldn’t find a staff member who could help. The lack of organisation in the Community Centre was frustrating.

We need a place where families can go and do things together - a proper community centre. Accessible and affordable. And with classes on outside of working hours - it’s good for unemployed people that there are classes during the day, but if you’re working you can’t take your kids to them. They need to cater for those that do work as well.

I’d never go to Valley Park - it’s too far and I went there once and the person on the front desk didn’t know what was going on - it’s not welcoming. So I never went back.

It’s quite a rundown area. It feels neglected round here.

Council didn’t maintain the Mansion properly.

I’d like to see local people trained up and able to work here.

We need a ‘proper’ community centre, and another GP. The current one it’s impossible to get an appointment at. There are lots of new homes, and not enough doctors to see everyone.
TOURING PARTICIPATORY DISPLAY

A bespoke exhibition display was built to invite participation from local people. This focussed on eliciting feedback on more general themes of ‘place’, in terms of the neighbourhood as a whole. This broader context helps set the scene in which the buildings/services exist. For example, it helping identify other factors influencing service users’ experience, or other gaps that exist in provision locally. This allows for a more joined up ‘solution’ as a project output.

The display was designed to invite participation without needing an attendant facilitator. It was situated in 3 locations for one week each during May 2019: Valley Park Community Centre, Gracemount Leisure Centre, and the SE Locality Office / Library. During that time, more than 318 people added their comments, scored their neighbourhood using the Place Standard wheel, or added route-mapping information.

The Scottish Government’s ‘Place Standard’ tool was adapted for use in the exhibition, via a spinning Place Standard wheel on which participants could score the Gracemount/Southhouse/Burdiehouse neighbourhood according to 14 different categories. Comment cards were provided, for people to add their thoughts along these 14 themes. An additional ‘I Wish’ card helped capture and better understand local people’s aspirations for the future of their neighbourhood.

Participants could also fill in a postcard survey about local services/buildings, and leave this in a black box mounted on the display. A route-mapping exercise inviting people to add where they had come from, were going to, and mode of transport was also included.

The exhibition display has been provided to the Council for future use within other neighbourhoods as part of the broader Service Design and Our Assets project. It will also be used for Phase 2 of this project to display photo competition entries and invite participation via a postcard survey.
PARTICIPATORY DISPLAY: COMMUNITY ‘PLACE’ COMMENTS

housing & local community
All the new housing will put more pressure on services. It's already hard to get a GP appt.

work & local economy
I'd like more jobs, training and apprenticeships for local young people.

facilities & amenities
There's no community hub in Gracemount. Valley Park is in Burdiehouse. I love swimming at the Leisure Centre.

play & recreation
I'd like a bigger bike track. Leave the lights on at the big astro. Let us use the Leisure Centre pitches.

I wish...
More free activities and clubs for young people. More parks, a softplay, water flumes, less litter and vandalism.

streets & spaces
It's difficult to walk due to all the cars. Traffic makes it hard to cross the street.

natural space
I'd like more green space in the centre of Gracemount. Better maintained /connected green spaces.

traffic & parking
Streets are crowded with cars. Too many cars and not enough parking. Especially at the Leisure Centre.

public transport
Gracemount is well served by bus routes. The drivers are very friendly.

care & maintenance
Often glass, dog poo, litter on the pavement. Vandalism. It feels like no-one cares about outside spaces.

social contact
We meet at the Leisure Centre but the cafe isn't always open. We need more youth clubs.

influence & sense of control
I don't like it when people smoke in our faces in the street. We have to walk past and can't do anything.

moving around
The pavement is very deteriorated and there are lots of potholes. It makes it difficult to get around.

feeling safe
I don't feel safe. Gangs, shootings, motorbikes. I'd like more CCTV. Gang culture is a direct result of no community hub.

identity & belonging
Develop local social groups that young people can join. Territorialism limits social opportunities.

We need a range of spaces and activities to meet people. e.g. libraries, cafes, performance spaces.
The adjacent graphic summarises all 49 sets of Place Standard scores added to the participatory wheel during Phase 1 engagement. This includes participants’ input whilst the display was situated in Valley Park Community Centre and Gracemount Leisure Centre, as well as targeted facilitated input from older community members at Libertus, the Primary Schools Workshop and initial Stakeholder Workshop (8 May). The SE Locality Office has not been included due to lack of participation at this venue. Due to sample sizes, this is only an indication of how some groups within the community may feel.

Public transport achieved the highest overall average score (5.11). This corresponds with positive comments about driver friendliness and proximity of multiple bus routes. Traffic and parking received the lowest overall average score (2.97). This is supported by comments regarding a car-dominated public realm, pedestrian difficulties crossing the road, and lack of sufficient car parking (particularly near the Leisure Centre).

Notable is the low score for ‘traffic and parking’ from Leisure Centre participants (1.4 average) - likely for this reason. Also interesting, is that the primary school children group gave the highest score for natural space (7.0). This corresponds with school-age children commenting they frequently spend time in the grounds of Gracemount Mansion, Burdiehouse Burn park and ‘The Dip’. As a result, they may be more aware of and regularly use local green spaces, than - for example - the Libertus older members group, who conversely gave ‘natural spaces’ the lowest group score of 2.5, and typically are dropped at the door of Libertus by car/van direct from their home.

The group least satisfied overall with Gracemount as a place, were those visiting the Leisure Centre (average of 3.07 across all place categories). The most satisfied were the primary school children (average of 4.86 across all categories), despite giving the ‘identity and belonging’ category a lower score than any other group.
PARTICIPATORY DISPLAY: MODE OF TRANSPORT FEEDBACK

The participatory display incorporated a map allowing people to input the mode of transport used to visit that venue, as well as where they had come from/were going to. Data shown here relates to Leisure Centre visitors, as the high footfall of this venue resulted in the largest sample size.

Destination mapping showed key public buildings/destinations visited in Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse as:
1. Gracemount Leisure Centre (by far the most frequently visited - as to be expected given the location of the display)
2. "The Dip" and Burdiehouse Burn parkland
3. Gracemount Primary School
4. Tesco and Scotmid shops
5. Gracemount Walled Garden
6. St Catherine’s Primary School

Other destinations related to residential addresses or locations participants had boarded/disembarked buses.

The dominant mode of transport was driving by car (50.9% of participants). This was supported by Place Standard written comments left on the display, which particularly focussed around a desire from Leisure Centre visitors for more car parking spaces.

The second most popular mode was walking (22.6%) - less than half of the car driving figure. This may indicate that just under a quarter of people visiting the Leisure Centre are likely to live locally. Following these two modes of transport were bike (11.3%) and bus (9.4%). A small number of participants arrived by taxi or ‘other’.
QUESTIONNAIRES / SURVEYS

A series of survey questionnaires formed an integral part of Phase 1 of engagement as part of the My Gracemount project (now called ‘Our Community: Gracemount, Burdiehouse, Southhouse’).

To help ensure the widest diversity of people could contribute their thoughts to the project, these were available both digitally online (promoted via the project webpage and direct email invitation) and via a physical postcard.

Hard to read groups, such as older residents - were targeted via additional facilitated sessions, working together with local group leaders (e.g. Positive Futures at Libertus), and via in-person conversations to ensure their input could also be captured.
An online survey was created using Survey Monkey, specifically targeted at those providing services, or working from Council-owned buildings in the Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse area. Questions were based on the overarching project and engagement questions, including focus on which buildings/services people used, liked/disliked (and reasons why), and their aspirations for the future.

The online survey was available for one month, during May 2019. Service provider/building contacts identified during the Community Profile were contacted by email and invited to both take part themselves, and pass on to colleagues.

In total, 14 service providers filled in the survey. This figure is likely due to those the survey was emailed to having typically already spent 45mins-1.5hours speaking to us as one of the 34 in-depth interviews, and as such having felt they had already contributed their insight. The 14 respondents are therefore likely to be these key stakeholders’ colleagues who had not already spoken to us directly. Most of those participating were from St Catherine’s Primary School, Council’s SE Locality Office, Gracemount Medical Centre and the Walled Garden.
Online Survey: Service Providers Key Findings

- Services located within the central Gracemount area were felt to have good transport connections by car (via the bypass) and bus [due to nearby bus connections/routes].
- Services needing to charge a fee were said to exclude those experiencing poverty, this is particularly pertinent given the area is SIMD 1/2, reducing service access to many local residents.
- Demand to improve spaces outside the buildings - in particular, high quality outdoor public spaces incorporating green space, playpark, running/walking tracks, and exercise equipment.
- Lifelong Learning's Youth Talk and Street Work have been very successful. Having community and school librarians part of the team also works well. There are strong relationships with Gracemount High School, and the locality office's Communities and Children/Families [social work] service However, dedicated operational budget for youth programmes is needed, as well as additional staff resource to improve service delivery outcomes.
- Gracemount Mansion and Walled Garden
  - Positives: Walled Garden and mansion grounds are a welcoming refuge for children, local people and wildlife, with the community garden a positive influence despite limited budget.
  - Negatives: closure of the Mansion has resulted in a lack of facilities [toilets, cooking, warm dry gathering space] for garden volunteers/visitors. The building closure is starting to attract anti-social and unsafe behaviours around the mansion structure. Repairs are also needed to a section of the Walled Garden which recently has become unsafe.
  - Aspirations: varies by stakeholder. Generally themed around utilising the mansion and/or grounds as a community resource if feasible, whilst acknowledging it may not be possible to utilise the Mansion building itself due to renovation costs. Ideas include a fully funded local third sector youth project within the Mansion building and grounds, development of a creative community space within the Mansion itself, and for the Stable Block to be transformed into a dynamic community run cafe/shop, training and educational space.
- St Catherine's School
  - Positives: felt to have good pupil support, quality staff, and an inclusive and positive ethos.
  - Negatives: safe, quality, outdoor green spaces needed for PE lessons and other activities. Separate dinner hall and activities hall needed. Lack of breakout spaces for additional learning activities. Limited space means constrained to single stream despite significant demand. Current building issues - water leaks, asbestos, lack of storage, dated IT equipment, poor sports facilities, larger playground needed.
  - Aspirations: new school to address current buildings’ failings, not to be located near a busy main road, and to have sufficient space (inside facilities and outside green space).
- The Medical Centre
  - Positives: district nursing team is felt to have strong positive patient relationships.
  - Negatives: patients queue outside in all weather. Desire to form better connections with wider community/local projects and other service providers (current referrals through social care direct or online referral system restricting relationship development).
  - Aspirations: to develop closer relationships with local community groups and services, to be able to recruit enough GPs to meet demand.
- SE Locality Office
  - Positives: having multiple services under one roof is seen as a positive, improving communication and service user outcomes.
  - Negatives: conflicts between different users in the waiting room/library space. Demand for more meeting room space to meet clients, and with additional security features. Busy reception can mean delays between service users arriving and staff being alerted they are here. “Tired-looking” building exterior putting to users. Library perceived as “in the Council office” so not used by young people.
- Valley Park Community Centre
  - Positives: excellent facilities, potential and capacity for increased use.
  - Negatives: Poor location, away from bus routes and too far into Southhouse to be safely accessed by those from wider Gracemount. Lack of full-time centre manager or community development staff limits promotion of existing services delivered within the building, and means visitors are often unclear who to speak to on arrival or what/how they can get involved.
ONLINE SURVEY: SERVICE PROVIDERS

It is really important to keep green spaces such as the walled garden as this is such an important local resource.

There needs to be a limit on how many services can realistically be based in the Council office and still be able to deliver a service.

The areas around the buildings need more attention - picking up rubbish, plants, signage etc. Looking nice encourages pride in your local environment. It doesn’t look well cared for. Better play area for kids. Adult outside exercise equipment and walking/running track incorporated into the kids’ play area and green space. More trees, planters with flowers etc.

Better networking with local community services and groups would mean we are more engaged with what is going on locally. Communication between different sectors is not great. We visit people who are house bound so we have good connections with people on a personal level but we are not well connected to the local community/local projects. [District Nursing at the Medical Centre]

Leaving the Mansion House vacant is inviting anti social and criminal activity into Gracemount.

A better swimming pool with more adventurous attractions for older teenagers - like the Olympia in Dundee. Flumes, diving boards, inflatables. But affordable. Better and cheaper gym access. A place where teenagers can hang out without disturbing others, lit at night.

There should be a centre solely for young people, that doesn’t have to be shared with other users who might disapprove or feel intimidated, staffed all the time with a team of full time youth workers.

It would be good to have touch down desks in the West Wing for 3rd Sector Staff, so they could work from here. This would improve communication with EHSCP and thus improve services. It would be useful to give EHSCP Council staff access to Gracemount Medical Centre with a fob, so they could easily access their DN colleagues.

I think that Gracemount House has the potential for being a dynamic and creative space which is much needed in the area. I would like to see health services working alongside the local community and collaborating on creative solutions to local problems. A shared space for working would be fantastic.

Libertus is a great service. But what can we do for the well being of younger residents too. How do we tackle loneliness and social isolation for all ages? Can we do cross generational work?

How would you rate the physical building you deliver a service from, in terms of meeting the needs of service users and the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>ST CATHARINE’S + WALLED GARDEN</th>
<th>ST CATHARINE’S, SE LOCALITY OFFICE</th>
<th>SE LOCALITY OFFICE, MEDICAL CENTRE</th>
<th>GRACEMOUNT HIGH SCHOOL, MEDICAL CENTRE, ST CATHARINE’S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALLY INADEQUATE</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Captain’s Road [SE Locality Office] is an adequate office space for staff but lacks meeting space and is not young person friendly. The library is not seen by them as a place they want to go, unlike Moredun and Gilmerton libraries. It is perceived as being ‘in the council’, not ‘in the community.”
IN TOTAL, teenagers). Participation (for example, older residents, as well as provided direct to leaders of hard-to-reach groups/activities to encourage their involvement. For example, schools sent this on to their mailing lists of parents. In total, 78 community members filled in the survey.

POSTCARD SURVEY: COMMUNITY + SERVICE USERS

A printed postcard short version of the same survey was also produced. This was widely distributed to public buildings and local shops around the Gracemount area, as well as provided direct to leaders of hard to reach groups/activities to encourage their participation (for example, older residents, teenagers).

In total, 20 postcard surveys were completed.

ONLINE SURVEY: COMMUNITY + SERVICE USERS

An online survey was also created using Survey Monkey, specifically targeted at service users and local community members. Questions were based on the overarching project and engagement questions, including focus on which buildings/services people used, liked/disliked (and reasons why), and their aspirations for the future.

The online survey was available for one month. The survey link featured on the My Gracemount (now ‘Our Community’) project webpage (www.edinburgh.gov.uk/mygracemount), and was promoted via Council social media, posters and illustrative postcards distributed and displayed in public buildings and local shops, as well as a direct link emailed to key stakeholders identified in the Community Profile for further distribution to their networks. For example, schools sent this on to their mailing lists of parents. In total, 78 community members filled in the survey.

ONLINE + POSTCARD SURVEY: COMMUNITY COMMENTS

• The most popular service was ‘swimming at the Leisure Centre’, with 61.3% of online survey respondents saying they used this service. The gym (32%) and fitness classes (26.7% of respondents) were also popular.
• The Medical Centre is also well used - with 46.7% of online survey respondents using this service.
• Schools were also heavily used services by those responding to the survey. 85.4% of online respondents or their family members attend Gracemount High School (16%), Gracemount Primary (36%), St Catherine’s Primary (30.7%), or Kaimies School (2.7%). This overall figure was lower for postcard survey respondents (39%), many of whom were older members at Libertus that live in Liberton or other school catchment areas outside of Gracemount.
• The library within the SE Locality Office was used by 33.3% of respondents, and Grow Stronger at the Walled Garden by 17.3%.
• Other services were less well used. For example, no respondents to the online survey or their family stated they attended ESOL or Rag and Roll at Valley Park Community Centre, or use Transport Services at the SE Locality Office.
• The online survey showed 0% of respondents using Positive Futures and various 50+ clubs at Libertus (likely due to this being digitally available). This was balanced by the postcard survey filled out in person, which showed the majority of respondents both using Libertus and specifically naming it as the reason they liked Gracemount.
• 47% of respondents to the postcard survey also stated they used Valley Park Community Centre - a higher proportion than the 28% of online survey respondents.
• There was broad support for clustering relevant services, but an awareness some services have value in separation. For example, a dedicated library as part of a community hub including family/children’s services would be appropriate, but combining this with Criminal Justice services where appointment attendees spend time in this space would not.
• Opinion was divided whether a youth centre should be a standalone space dedicated to youth and youth services - or incorporated within a community hub.
• Concern regarding impact of new housing on existing services already felt to be over capacity.
• Strong demand for a multi-functional integrated community centre and/or youth centre within central Gracemount that incorporates relevant families/children/healthcare/social work services and a ‘proper’ library. An intergenerational space which provides free activities and a safe place for young people to spend time in the evenings as well as during the day. A focus on employing local people as a core part of this centre/these services.
• Strong demand for the Mansion and Walled Garden to be invested in, supported, and further developed as a community asset and resource. Cited as a possible location for a new youth centre, community centre, cafe, or school/nursery, with continuation and further development of the Walled Garden and Stables as a growing space and social hub.
• Strong demand for public realm improvements, including overt focus on green space, growing spaces, and sustainable travel (walking, cycling routes), rethinking of parking, and better connecting existing buildings/spaces. This includes possibilities of better connecting up land between the four local schools.
• Strong demand for new primary schools to replace St Catherine’s and Gracemount Primary with purpose-built new schools away from busy main roads, with high quality outdoor play areas and sufficient internal rooms and spaces to meet demand for clubs, activities, dining and teaching.
• Demand for an extension to the High School.
• Demand to reduce prices at the Leisure Centre to better accommodate local low-income people, and invest in the football pitches to the rear of the building (either retaining these as sports facilities or for another community use).
• Demand for dedicated Valley Park staff to help promote activities and welcome service users.

KEY FINDINGS

- Demand for a dedicated library in a multi-functional space within the centre.
- Support for clustering social services.
- Concerns about the impact of new housing.
- Strong demand for new primary schools.
- Demand for public realm improvements.
- Support for better connecting up land between local schools.
In terms of the buildings listed below, are there any you dislike or feel do not work well for those using them at present?

- **Gracemount Primary School**: 20.8%
- **Gracemount High School**: 7.6%
- **Kaimes School**: 5.7%
- **St Catherine's Primary School**: 30.2%
- **Gracemount Medical Centre**: 22.6%
- **Gracemount Leisure Centre**: 15.1%
- **Valley Park Community Centre**: 5.7%
- **SE Locality Office/Library**: 18.9%
- **Gracemount Walled Garden**: 13.2%
- **Libertus**: 0%
- **Howdenhall Police Station**: 5.7%

---

The primary school and high school will be stretched with all the new housing as they're already struggling for space.

The primary school is just depressing. It's pokey and falling apart and old fashioned and ugly and spread out in a weird way, like someone ate a primary school and then vomited it out again.

Kaimes needs rethought. Unattractive. Poor access for taxis. Poor environment for learning. Go see Broomlands in Kelso and what can be achieved.

The Medical Centre is insufficiently resourced to meet the growing needs of the community.

“Leisure Centre” does not bring the local community together and is too expensive for the area.

The primary school is just depressing. It's pokey and falling apart and old fashioned and ugly and spread out in a weird way, like someone ate a primary school and then vomited it out again.

The Medical Centre is insufficiently resourced to meet the growing needs of the community.

Poor state of [St Catherine’s] building, potentially unsafe for use. Too small for school population.

The primary school is just depressing. It's pokey and falling apart and old fashioned and ugly and spread out in a weird way, like someone ate a primary school and then vomited it out again.

Limited private space for meetings, building not fit for purpose.

Library could be improved and bring back a community centre manager to Valley Park!!

Library could be improved and bring back a community centre manager to Valley Park!!

Dedicated library staff needed. The library has gone significantly downhill in the past year or two. Our son used to love going there to choose some books, but the selection is now very poor. Appears to be more like an office/help desk with a few books chucked in the corner now, rather than an actual library.

The police station is never open at times! I've tried to access it!

Gracemount Walled Garden is wonderful, but the mansion house needs urgent attention to support the groups that used to work out of there but are now unable to because the Council hasn't looked after the building.

The football pitches need upgraded, prices in the leisure centre need slashed and youth need more investment in them.

Dedicated library staff needed. The library has gone significantly downhill in the past year or two. Our son used to love going there to choose some books, but the selection is now very poor. Appears to be more like an office/help desk with a few books chucked in the corner now, rather than an actual library.
ONLINE + POSTCARD SURVEY: COMMUNITY COMMENTS
HOW COULD BUILDINGS AND SERVICES IN GRACEMOUNT BE IMPROVED?

Theres no enough places for wee ones like nice playgrounds in this area.

The SE Locality and Library need to be two separate buildings. We don't use the library because of all the people hanging about in there waiting to complain about things, it's not a nice friendly atmosphere. Also the library is tiny and has a terrible selection of books.

Valley park community centre have a lot of great activities on for older people and adult learning. However, beside a drop in youth group on a Friday afternoon, the space is not being used for regular youth work.

The neighbourhood feels neglected and devoid of any real sense of community.

[St Cat's] School and staff absolutely amazing. But can't say same about building. Looks old and not safe.

There is no community building in Gracemount as the Mansion House is closed at the moment.

Leisure Centre cafe should be open at the weekends! It's only open Saturday mornings.

I'd like to see more suitable places for children to play, new play park, outdoor gym etc

I think that things would improve if Council imagined this was Morningside instead of Gracemount. If they provided services that they would provide for the more affluent areas. That should be the guideline. This area, and other poorer areas are not treated with the same care by the Council as the richer areas.

There needs to be a space for professional, focused youth work. There are so many vulnerable young people in Gracemount who would hugely benefit from regular, organised group work, as well as 1:1 work, which other youth centres in Edinburgh offer (i.e the Citadel in Leith, Canongate in town). There is very little for young people to do in Gracemount and a youth centre/youth work would help address this.

Thinking about place and clustering services together that people would need, for example, the doctors surgery with services for older people who may struggle to get between them due to accessibility issues. Social work services, housing, money advice should all be provided together, and Healthier Wealthier Children asks for pregnancy and maternity services to be delivered alongside money advice services - locating these in GP practices would be good to see. But overall there should be a greater offer for children and young people in the area - an extended offer from the leisure centre alongside other youth club activities and other opportunities.

Schools and community locations are short of space for services to work together and are often not open at the weekend or evenings when families might access them. Speech & Language Therapy could offer more support to families if there were suitable spaces to use. My service would like to make better use of these locations but limitations of space and accessibility cause problems and limit what can be achieved. Staff are keen but unable to be flexible.

There is much more potential in the Walled Garden, making more workshops, more activities. The Mansion should be repaired and used for community groups, maybe a Cafe.. It would be nice to have a steam room or some spa space in leisure centre.

There is no enough places for wee ones like nice playgrounds in this area.

Thoughts about place and clustering services together that people would need, for example, the doctors surgery with services for older people who may struggle to get between them due to accessibility issues. Social work services, housing, money advice should all be provided together, and Healthier Wealthier Children asks for pregnancy and maternity services to be delivered alongside money advice services - locating these in GP practices would be good to see. But overall there should be a greater offer for children and young people in the area - an extended offer from the leisure centre alongside other youth club activities and other opportunities.
Playpark adjacent to Gracemount Leisure Centre, Libertus and Tesco is limited in size and play opportunities and popular with both families and other young people at peak times.

"I’d like to see more suitable places for children to play, new play park, outdoor gym etc."
ONLINE + POSTCARD SURVEY: COMMUNITY ASPIRATIONS

How could buildings and services in Gracemount be improved?

- Increase GP/healthcare provision to meet local needs - incorporate community health/leisure facilities and expand GP services.
- More classes in Valley Park, and better used.
- More things for kids to do cheaply.
- The Mansion could be a great base for a kindergarten.
- I would like to see regular pavement cleaning outside the primary schools and nurseries. Seriously. You can’t wear sandals on those pavements in the summer. And litter bins!
- I’d like to be able to get hot and cold food [at Valley Park Community Centre], and for it to be used to its full potential.
- Traffic management to divert away from schools/pedestrian areas.
- Traffic management to divert away from schools/pedestrian areas.
- Parking on the east side of Gracemount Drive from the Medical Centre to Captain’s Road should be banned.
- Create basic community facilities (toilets, small kitchen, meeting and storage areas) for the Walled Garden in order that it continue its activities.
- Separate areas for traffic and parking with community hubs containing all the core services arranged in family friendly and accessible buildings. Employing people in their own community to train and develop kids and parents to look after and service their own environments. Co-located nurseries and elderly care. Libraries, gyms and cinemas where all ages can spend leisure and learning time as part of their daily routines.
- A new school building for St Catherine’s which will accommodate the increasing number of children who will be moving into the vast number of new builds in the area.
- A purpose built community centre that has capacity for all that is in it and a library that works well as a library rather than a space that becomes a waiting room.
- Talk Gracemount up. Improve the environment. Collect the rubbish. Rethink access to public buildings. Use imaginative architectural and landscaping solutions. Be overtly sustainable.
- I’d like to be able to get hot and cold food [at Valley Park Community Centre], and for it to be used to its full potential.
- A new school building for St Catherine’s which will accommodate the increasing number of children who will be moving into the vast number of new builds in the area.
- Expand school and health accommodation to house more family services and make them more accessible in the evening or at weekends. Give children and young people a safe place to go outside of school hours and also places where families can access health, education and leisure activities.
- There is a huge amount of land between the four schools and a brilliant opportunity to create a community hub. Shared state of the art facilities and resources would enhance learning and opportunities. Would also improve links between professionals involved in safeguarding vulnerable children and adults as social work, teachers, police & health workers can be found in one place.
- Parking on the east side of Gracemount Drive from the Medical Centre to Captain’s Road should be banned.
- Improve the green space. There is nowhere in the area that is safe and age appropriate for school children and teenagers. There is a small play are at Gracemount leisure centre but is only suitable for young children.
- Traffic management to divert away from schools/pedestrian areas.
- Traffic management to divert away from schools/pedestrian areas.
- Traffic management to divert away from schools/pedestrian areas.
- Traffic management to divert away from schools/pedestrian areas.
- Traffic management to divert away from schools/pedestrian areas.
Valley Park Community Centre is often quiet and appears underused, despite its facilities.

I’d like to be able to get hot and cold food [at Valley Park Community Centre], and for it to be used to its full potential.
ONLINE + POSTCARD SURVEY: COMMUNITY ASPIRATIONS
WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE GRACEMOUNT TO BE LIKE IN 20 YEARS TIME?

"Good mix of housing including affordable, part owned and private. Sufficient schools, health facilities, leisure facilities and local shops, cafés etc to accommodate the significant increase in residents in this area."

"Bigger swimming pool, new outdoor sports facilities, better affordable shopping facilities and a proper community Centre with community cafe, family and youth activities."

"More community spirit and a good reputation for youth activities."

"A thriving community where everyone feels valued and involved. Gracemount pioneering a new approach to education, leisure and social care."

"More commercial enterprises should be encouraged to move into the area."

"Roads that you don't drive around in zig zags to avoid potholes. Roads are a disgrace."

"An area well connected by sustainable public transport, new cycle routes and a pedestrian focus with high percentage of people in well paid work. New imaginative sustainably designed facilities using stone and wood. Natural areas with good, well-thought out landscaping. Clean and litter-free throughout. A mixed community in terms of age and wealth where people are supportive of each other."

"Greener, more cycling lanes, less litter/fly-tipping"

"For it to be a welcoming place to live, nice buildings to look at and that are being used to benefit those in the community."

"Improved traffic management and parking controls to make life safer for all residents."

"Greener, more cycling lanes, less litter/fly-tipping"

"I hope that in 20 years, Gracemount is a place which offers young people opportunities to relate to each other, adults, and their community in a positive way. This could be achieved through a centre which seeks to provide youth work to all ages of children and young people, with all sorts of interests. As well as perhaps some parenting work and intergenerational work. There will be a lot for young people to do, which is affordable to families living in poverty in the area and inclusive to those with disabilities also."

"More clean and greener space, youth groups, adult groups."

"More local businesses, community projects, gardens and green space."

"Good mix of housing including affordable, part owned and private. Sufficient schools, health facilities, leisure facilities and local shops, cafés etc to accommodate the significant increase in residents in this area."

"A new education/community hub, with modern primary school facilities, sports centre and community facilities."

"To have good spaces for schools, youth clubs, groups for individuals and families, groups for older people, churches, activities. To have good infrastructure for the community rather than things being tagged on or squashed in to existing spaces."

"For it to be a welcoming place to live, nice buildings to look at and that are being used to benefit those in the community."

"Area around mansion landscaped and integrated with an active community walled garden."

"Improved traffic management and parking controls to make life safer for all residents."

"I hope that in 20 years, Gracemount is a place which offers young people opportunities to relate to each other, adults, and their community in a positive way. This could be achieved through a centre which seeks to provide youth work to all ages of children and young people, with all sorts of interests. As well as perhaps some parenting work and intergenerational work. There will be a lot for young people to do, which is affordable to families living in poverty in the area and inclusive to those with disabilities also."

"More clean and greener space, youth groups, adult groups."

"More local businesses, community projects, gardens and green space."

"Education, health and leisure facilities that can provide for the expanded population of south Edinburgh. Increased use of available green space for leisure."

"A thriving community where everyone feels valued and involved. Gracemount pioneering a new approach to education, leisure and social care."

"A new education/community hub, with modern primary school facilities, sports centre and community facilities."

"To have good spaces for schools, youth clubs, groups for individuals and families, groups for older people, churches, activities. To have good infrastructure for the community rather than things being tagged on or squashed in to existing spaces."

"For it to be a welcoming place to live, nice buildings to look at and that are being used to benefit those in the community."

"Greener, more cycling lanes, less litter/fly-tipping"

"A thriving community where everyone feels valued and involved. Gracemount pioneering a new approach to education, leisure and social care."

"To have good spaces for schools, youth clubs, groups for individuals and families, groups for older people, churches, activities. To have good infrastructure for the community rather than things being tagged on or squashed in to existing spaces."

"For it to be a welcoming place to live, nice buildings to look at and that are being used to benefit those in the community."

"Roads that you don't drive around in zig zags to avoid potholes. Roads are a disgrace."

"An area well connected by sustainable public transport, new cycle routes and a pedestrian focus with high percentage of people in well paid work. New imaginative sustainably designed facilities using stone and wood. Natural areas with good, well-thought out landscaping. Clean and litter-free throughout. A mixed community in terms of age and wealth where people are supportive of each other."

"Greener, more cycling lanes, less litter/fly-tipping"

"I hope that in 20 years, Gracemount is a place which offers young people opportunities to relate to each other, adults, and their community in a positive way. This could be achieved through a centre which seeks to provide youth work to all ages of children and young people, with all sorts of interests. As well as perhaps some parenting work and intergenerational work. There will be a lot for young people to do, which is affordable to families living in poverty in the area and inclusive to those with disabilities also."

"More clean and greener space, youth groups, adult groups."

"More local businesses, community projects, gardens and green space."

"Education, health and leisure facilities that can provide for the expanded population of south Edinburgh. Increased use of available green space for leisure."

"Greener, more cycling lanes, less litter/fly-tipping"
Gracemount Community Park, adjacent to Gracemount Primary School and Gracemount Mansion
PHOTOGRAPHY COMPETITION

A photography competition ran for 3 weeks during May 2019 as part of Phase 1 of the My Gracemount project. Participants were invited to contribute a photo of a place they love in the Gracemount area, together with a caption communicating:

1. the reason why they chose that place
2. an aspiration for the future of the neighbourhood

A total of 28 photos were submitted. These were sent in to the project via a mix of:

- the project email address - promoted via posters, postcards, Council project webpage, and social media.
- schools workshop - which included a group photo exercise, enabling those without camera-phones to contribute.
- in-person interviews - where public spot interviews revealed someone would like to submit a photo of a place important to them, but did not have a computer/email address/camera-phone/SLR enabling them to do so.

A number of key themes emerged from the photos and captions submitted:

- The importance of local green spaces, including The Dip, Walled Garden, Mansion grounds, and Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park and Nature Reserve to local people of all ages.
- The important role buildings such as Gracemount High School can play in offering a space for community events and activities (e.g. ‘Stage’n’Slam’).
- The importance of informal community meeting places, such as Captain’s Cafe, given the lack of other community centre facilities.

Photo entries to the competition. Photos will be displayed as part of a public exhibition in June 2019, enabling local people to vote for their winner.
"I like the Dip because the equipment is not just for small kids. I’d like there to be a new pitch, a new bike track, a Cineworld, and after school club space."
PRIMARY SCHOOL WORKSHOP

A workshop was conducted in May 2019 with 13 students from Gracemount Primary School and St Catherine’s RC Primary School. This was organised for early in the project’s first phase of engagement to help gain insight from younger community members. This was particularly pertinent given the project’s focus on schools.

The workshop included a Place Standard exercise including writing comment cards about Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse according to each category, and agreeing a group score for each using a spinning Place Standard wheel.

Large A1 maps of the area were used to add emoji stickers and annotation to reveal the children’s feelings about various local places, buildings and services.

A walkabout exercise followed with small groups leading a facilitator around their favourite places in Gracemount. Each student was given a different role, including Note-taker, Journalist, Leader/Navigator and Photographer. Photos taken were entered into the broader project’s photography competition.

KEY FINDINGS

- Local shops are extremely popular with primary age children for food.
- ‘The Dip’ at Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park Nature Reserve is an important meeting place for young people.
- There is demand for more bike tracks, green space, and youth clubs.
- Burdiehouse Burn Nature Reserve is popular for family walks.
- Smoking in the street, litter, vandalism, drug use, anti-social behaviour, and groups of teenagers gathering in public spaces (including at ‘The Dip’) were felt to be negative aspects of the local environment that diminished feelings of safety, and prevented use of certain public spaces, particularly in the evening.
- The grounds of Gracemount Mansion and Walled Garden are a popular well-used spot for natural play, races and den-building.
- St Catherine’s School is well loved by the students.
- Most children walk to school - living within 5-10 minutes walk.
- Glass on the High School astro pitch is a problem.
- The library, High School and Friday drop-in at Valley Park are well liked.
Primary school workshop. Each group sharing their views of the local area according to their comments and scores for each Place Standard category.
POSTCARDS / POSTERS

Printed postcards and posters were distributed to public buildings around Gracemount, Southhouse and Burdiehouse to promote the project, communicate the various ways stakeholders could participate, and offer an alternative printed version of the online survey.

These postcards and posters complemented online/digital engagement methods to help ensure the widest diversity of people could get involved in the project.
PEDESTRIAN ROUTE-MAPPING: TRACING STUDIES

Tracing studies are a direct observation method used to map the routes that pedestrians use to move around the external public realm. This gives useful information about how service users are currently accessing public buildings in the local area. They also help reveal which routes are busiest, pedestrian desire lines, and any practical issues pedestrians experience moving around the area.

Tracing studies were conducted on both a weekday (Thurs 23 May 2019) and weekend day (Sat 18 May 2019), at three times of day (10am, 12.30pm, 5.30pm) to give a better understanding of pedestrian flows throughout the day and week.

Studies were conducted at 6 locations around Gracemount, for a 10 minute period each. Locations were chosen to focus on the central Gracemount service area and public realm due to the concentration of services and buildings. The pedestrian connection and Gracemount House Drive road near Gracemount Mansion and Gracemount Primary School were also focussed on.

OVERALL FINDINGS

- Tesco and the Leisure Centre are the two primary destinations for pedestrians in the area.
- The route with heaviest footfall is along the edge of the local shops, and through the pedestrianised footway between Libertus and the Tesco playpark toward/from the Leisure Centre.
- The south/north pedestrian footway between the Mansion and Gracemount Primary is also heavily used.
- The most popular location to cross the road at Gracemount Drive, is at this key desire line, moving between the north-east edge of the plaza in front of the local shops to/from the pedestrianised footway to the south of Libertus near the playpark. There is currently no designated pedestrian crossing point at this location, and frequently pedestrians were observed struggling to cross between cars.
- A large number of pedestrian journeys in the area start or end by car, particularly at the car park in front of the Leisure Centre and Tesco car park.
PEDESTRIAN ROUTE-MAPPING: TRACING STUDIES

FINDINGS BY TIME OF DAY/WEEK

- **Saturdays** were found to be busy with people in the morning but became significantly more quiet in the afternoon and evening. This corresponds with the Leisure Centre’s peak period. On Saturday late afternoon and evening, young people were observed playing football on the concrete pavement slabs in front of the local shops and the takeaways started to become a popular destination.
- **Thursdays** showed a different pattern, with lunchtime and late afternoon rush hour particularly busy with pedestrians.
- The **SE Locality Office / Library and Gracemount Medical Centre** are only open on weekdays. This is evident from the pedestrian footfall which shows people only walking to/from these locations on weekdays, not at the weekend.

OTHER NOTES

Researchers observed large puddles build up to the south side of the car park between the Leisure Centre and SE Locality Office following heavy rain.

It should be noted that the Thursday observations coincided with the SE Locality Office being additionally used as a polling place. As such, more pedestrian flows may have been observed compared to a ‘normal’ weekday.
PEDESTRIAN ROUTE-MAPPING: TRACING STUDIES

Gracemount Mansion, Walled Garden and Gracemount Primary School
- Very well used pedestrian route along west side of Gracemount Primary School, Gracemount Nursery and St Catherine’s RC Primary School, connecting to housing to the north.
- This is a key north-south movement route between the services, shops and bus stops in the central Gracemount area and the residential area to the north.

Local shops
- Heaviest footfall in the area falls along the pedestrian desire line between the west of Captain’s Road and local shops, toward/from the Leisure Centre.
- There is also significant foot traffic to/from Tesco and the west side of Gracemount Drive. A large number of pedestrians also come from the Tesco car park having driven here.
- The playpark to the north of the Tesco car park is very well used by both families and young adults.

Leisure Centre, Playpark, Libertus, Medical Centre
- Main pedestrian flows to/from the Leisure Centre go to/from the car park to the south, the local shops to the south-west, or direct over the low walls to the car park to the north-west.
- The latter has become an informal route following pedestrian desire lines and is not facilitated by the existing pedestrian infrastructure. Instead pedestrians hop over low walls and planted areas to shorten their route between the north side of the central car park and Leisure Centre doors.
- A large number of pedestrians start/end their journeys in cars in this central car park.

SE Locality Office and Library
- This area is much quieter than elsewhere.
- There are two key routes through this area. One is between the SE Locality Office and west Captain’s Road. The second is between the local shops (via the car park) and to/from the east end of Captain’s Road. This was observed to be particularly popular with high school students on weekday lunchtimes.
Our Community:
Southhouse, Burdiehouse & Gracemount
This workshop was part 1 of 2 engagements which took place on 30th May and 25th of June respectively.

The workshop, delivered by design studio Andthen, took nineteen participants through a series of creative and interactive tasks to explore opportunities for improvements to delivery of services and places in Gracemount.

The first part of the workshop focused on building a picture of how and where services are currently being used. The second part of the workshop collectively identified the most important services in the area and where they should be located.

The ideas and insights produced during this workshop culminated in a report presented to the City of Edinburgh Council.

**Activities:**

**RE—NAMING THE ‘MY GRACEMOUNT’ PROJECT**  
Reflecting on issues with 'My Gracemount' and suggesting changes.

**MAPPING GRACEMOUNT**  
Understanding Gracemount.

**MAKING CONNECTIONS**  
Identifying trends in service use.

**HOPES AND FEARS POSTCARD**  
Sharing hopes and fears about future of Gracemount.

**MATTER MOST/USED MOST FREQUENTLY CHART**  
Understanding priorities in service provision.

**RE-MAPPING SERVICES**  
Exploring opportunities for integrating services.
**Issues raised**

**TRANSPORT**
There are good bus routes along main roads but poor connection to Valley Park (VPCC).

Some areas feel unsafe or uncomfortable for walking.

Road crossings are difficult at key locations.

**TRAFFIC & PARKING**
Parking areas are too crowded.

Parking areas fill all the spaces between buildings.

People that don’t live in the area make the Leisure Centre and Locality Office particularly busy.

**GREEN SPACE**
There isn’t enough green space.

The current greenspace is underutilised and poorly maintained.

Valley Park is removed from everything else, although geographically the Dip forms a nice link between the Gracemount service centre and VPCC.

**PUBLIC SPACE**
Litter, dog poo, smoking, vandalism and anti-social behaviour present in the street environment.

Feeling of neglect implied by poorly maintained and old buildings, outdoor spaces and public realm.

**PHYSICAL ACTIVITY**
Need reduced/free access to existing facilities.

Walking and cycling conditions need to be improved.

Sports pitches are misused or underused.

**ACCESS AND AWARENESS**
Limited opening hours.

Limited offering.

VPCC is underused and geographically removed from everything else.

Leisure Centre is too expensive.

**COMMUNITY HUB**
Gracemount Mansion and grounds has been an important facility for the surrounding community.

When Gracemount Mansion closed, important activities were lost and have no been relocated.

There is no alternative place to deliver all services that are on offer under one roof.

**IDEAS**
- Affordable Cafe
- ‘Proper’ library
- Superschool
- Community festivals
- Intergenerational activities
Do you live, work or use a local service in Southhouse, Burdiehouse or Gracemount?

If so, we want to hear from you.

#Our Community
Southhouse, Burdiehouse and Gracemount

www.edinburgh.gov.uk/ourcommunity

Sign up to our mailing list to find out about future engagements here.
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SUMMARY AND KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Data Workstream was responsible for scoping, developing and delivering data analysis, findings and insight to inform decision-making with the Data and Design for Property Planning. It was only concerned with machine-readable data, i.e., data in a format that can be readily processed by a computer. In many cases this is tabular data of the kind that is stored in a spreadsheet, but can also comprise spatial data of the kind that underlies digital maps.

The Workstream data analysis provided new insights on building usage in Gracemount while also complementing informal perceptions on the part of both CEC and Gracemount community representatives. The process of executing this component of the project also clarified ways in which data management for similar projects in the future could be improved. Some of these are specific to local area planning exercises and others concern more generic issues of how CEC can extract value from the data it collects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

LOCAL AREA PLANNING

Data Register: One of the key tasks of the project was to develop a Data Register: when the Data Workstream was started, there was no comprehensive list of relevant CEC datasets which could inform the data analysis work. Future data-driven CEC initiatives would benefit immensely from having a Data Register at the outset. It is crucial that the Data Register we have created be further developed and actively maintained in order to benefit from this investment of time and resources. See Appendix A for more details.

Local Area Geographies: The project brings into focus what counts as a ‘local area’ for planning purposes. The initial brief did not include a definition of the spatial extent of ‘Gracemount’. One suggestion was that it comprised an area within a 1km radius of the South East locality office. However this fails to take into account factors such as the following:

1. available modes of transport,
2. physical geography (e.g., natural barriers like hills, waterways),
3. route infrastructure and road traffic,
4. and vernacular geography

These can all play a role in determining what amenities are regarded as ‘accessible’ to residents within a given local area. The experience of the project suggests that much greater emphasis should be placed on the notion of natural neighbourhoods; these were defined on the basis of an important initiative carried out by CEC several years ago and still seem to align well with community perceptions of what constitutes ‘local’.

Data Reporting Requirements: Most data analysis is communicated via some type of data visualization and this is consequently a core part of reporting. Clearer guidelines should be given about the intended audience for the Data Workstream reporting in terms of what purpose the data visualisations should serve, for example, in what way they might be used to support decision-making. Using data to develop actionable insights is only feasible with a reasonably clear specification of the space of possible actions, together with feedback from the end user as to whether the data visualisations are fit for this purpose.

As importantly, consideration should be given to the fact that data visualisation technology has evolved hugely over the last decade and best results are achieved using an interactive, browser-based visualisation. For this to be feasible, it would be necessary to agree a framework on for access, e.g., whether the visualisation was hosted in-house by CEC or whether a partner would commit to hosting it for a specified period of time.

Data Transfer and Data Lifecycle: The project was handicapped by the absence of a robust mechanism for sharing project data between CEC and the University. It is also important for both partners to be able to share information about the data lifecycle, namely how a ‘raw’ dataset provided by CEC has been modified as a prequisite for, or in the course of, computer processing and analysis. In particular, there needs to be a mechanism for ensuring that

• both parties can view and review what files have been shared;
adequate metadata is made available by data owner;
- the lifecycle of data modifications made by the partner is tracked in a consistent manner;
- any derived datasets or data products are in turn shared back with CEC with clearly specified IPR.

LONGER TERM DATA STRATEGY

Data Expertise: It is increasingly true that a successful business will be data driven; that is, it “acquires, processes, and leverages data in a timely fashion to create efficiencies, iterate on and develop new products.” This perspective is just as valid for the public sector as for the commercial world. However, it requires appropriate leadership, for example by appointing a Chief Data Officer, plus a team of staff with data science expertise. Moreover, in order for this to feed innovation, “everyone in an organization should have access to as much data as legally possible.” Changes like these are crucial in evolving a data-driven culture which would enable the Council to become more efficient in an era of shrinking budgets and increasing demand.

Data Reuse and Sharing: The primary purpose of all data should be reuse. In other words, whenever data is collected, stored or procured via contract from a third party, priority should be given to ensuring reusability within the organisation. This means, for example, that data formats should be chosen which are most easily machine-readable. In addition, the metadata should be sufficiently detailed that it is clear to any user what the data is about, how it was collected, who owns it, and so on.

In the longer term, all important datasets should be made available for internal use via web-based APIs. This will systematically improve data sharing between teams, lead to greater efficiencies and much better exploitation of existing investments in data. It will also make it possible to automatically track which teams are using which datasets, which in turn can guide future investment.

Spatial Data The CEC Mapping Portal is a valuable source of spatial data and allows datasets to be accessed in multiple formats, either as downloads or via an API. However, it could be made even more useful, for example by explaining how the data catalogue (i.e. list of all datasets on the portal) can be inspected programatically; and by providing more information on data provenance. The portal does not seem to be widely known and the audience for the data could be expanded by better publicity and by giving brief introductions to the different spatial formats. The relationship between CEC Mapping Portal, the CEC Open Data Portal and the CEC Atlas is unclear and potentially confusing; better integration (perhaps via a shared point of entry) could significantly boost the value of each portal.

2. “an application programming interface (API) is a set of subroutine definitions, communication protocols, and tools for building software. In general terms, it is a set of clearly defined methods of communication among various components.” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Application_programming_interface
1 INITIAL BRIEF AND DELIVERABLES

The Data Workstream was primarily responsible for scoping, developing and delivering data analysis, findings and insight on building usage for Data and Design for Property Planning. The term 'data' can be interpreted in a variety of ways within the context of this project. For avoidance of doubt, we use the term in this document to mean 'information which is structured (e.g., not textual data) and machine-readable (i.e., in a form that can be readily processed by a computer). In many cases this is tabular data of the kind that is stored in a spreadsheet, but can also comprise spatial data of the kind that underlies digital maps.

The Data Workstream objectives, as listed in the project proposal, were the following:

1. Identify key questions about building and service use
2. Review data register provided by CEC on building and service use and provisions for access to / transfer of data
3. Review legal and ethical requirements concerning data protection and what measures are required for compliance
4. Carry out initial data triage: what is the quality of the data and metadata? Classify into adequate / remediable / too poor to be useable
5. Analyse data and identify gaps which prevent questions about property usage being answered adequately
6. Assess options for finding data that can answer key questions and implement options that are feasible within the scope and budget of the project

In addition, the Data Workstream was expected to advise on the development of generic data processes and flow models for CEC which can be re-used in future partner projects.

Like the rest of Data and Design for Property Planning, the Data Workstream was divided into two main Phases. Phase 1 had the broad goal of data identification and collection, in the expectation that this would progress to more specific outcomes that extract information from the data to yield analysis and insight. Phase 2 was intended to be informed by the project’s Community Design Workstream, with increased emphasis on exploring data that reflects community priorities within Gracemount. Key themes that emerged for Phase 2 were

1. mobility, accessibility and transport;
2. Neighbourhood vs non-neighbourhood audiences for facilities, especially Gracemount Leisure Centre;
3. the provision and quality of public and community spaces.

1.1 OVERVIEW OF DELIVERABLES

The main deliverables envisaged for the Data Workstream were set out in the project proposal as follows:

- A data register, managed by CEC
- A data audit and preliminary analysis of adequacy of data in addressing key questions for understanding building use
- An initial assessment of building use
- Recommendations for what would be required to better understand building use through data and how to align future data collection about building use with community priorities
- Documentation of how the data assessment process was carried out

2 DATA ACQUISITION METHODOLOGY

As hinted to above, our planned approach was to adopt a linearly-structured method for data acquisition, as indicated in Figure [ ]
However, this linear approach turned out to be infeasible, for a couple of reasons:

1. Crucially, the Audit and Collect steps in Figure 1 have to be carried out before actual data analysis can take place. But given the short timescale of the project and the fact that these initial phases took longer than anticipated, we needed to start working with data before the Audit was completed.

2. Moving from the high-level brief to a more detailed and informed characterisation of the data requirements revealed a lack of clarity about what counted as ‘relevant data’. Moreover, many of the datasets were managed by stakeholders local to Gracemount rather than those based in the Council’s main office. Consequently, more effort than expected was required to liaise with the stakeholders and to discover what datasets they could provide.

As a result, we adopted a more iterative approach, along the lines shown in Figure 2. That is, after a partial phase of identifying and sourcing data, preliminary review and analysis of the data provoked new questions and new opportunities for data-driven investigation, which in turn kicked off further efforts to source additional data. This allowed us to look at how we might use the data at a much earlier point in the process.

To illustrate the iterative process, we briefly describe one use case. We decided, in consultation with stakeholders, to initially focus attention on room usage in Valley Park Community Centre (VPCC). In March, we built an initial prototype of a space occupancy visualisation tool, shown in Figure 3, based on information provided by VPCC staff about room capacity and estimates of the number of people participating in activities hosted at VPCC. However, it was not possible to progress with this prototype in the absence of hard figures for actual usage of the rooms at VPCC. Concern about this lack of empirical data was shared by members of the Coordination Team and it was agreed that CEC would carry out observations of room occupancy for five days at VPCC, and this was carried out in early May. In summary, initial work with a specific dataset brought to the surface a key gap in available data. This could not be remedied from existing data, but instead required manual collection and a significant investment of CEC staff time. In addition, data analysis work that was originally scheduled for March had to be pushed back to May, with inevitable knock-on effects.

### 3 DATA PROCESSING AND DATA COLLECTION FRAMEWORKS

Most R&D groups involved in data science have adopted open source toolsets for data processing. Within the context of the Data-Driven Innovation programme, EPCC (which is leading the WCDI infrastructure compon-
Figure 3  Screenshot of prototype space occupancy tool. The $y$ axis represents a notional occupancy level relative to the total room capacity.

en3 offers libraries of data science processing tools based either on the R or Python programming language. Within Data and Design for Property Planning, we have followed the Python route.

By contrast, data collected and processed within local authorities, including CEC, tends to use proprietary data formats and data processing frameworks. The reasons for this include familiarity (nearly everyone knows Excel) and commercial support for specialised, single-purpose applications. The disadvantages of this approach include little or no provision for programmability and built-in limitations of functionality.

We have encountered a number of problems in converting data provided by CEC into formats that can be processed programmatically. Many of these are quite trivial but nevertheless can involve quite time-consuming manual intervention. For example, in order to ingest tabular data from Excel files, each tab in the worksheet had to be saved as a new file in CSV format. In some cases, inconsistencies in the visually-based formatting of Excel sheets had to be addressed by additional manual modification. In another case, tabular data was provided within a Word file, but the 'logical' table columns had not been conformed to the table structure.

Issues like these could be avoided by CEC adopting better procedures for exporting data in non-proprietary formats. However, these procedures are unlikely to be robust unless there is also a community of practice within the organisation of consuming data in non-proprietary formats, which would involve a significant culture change.

Across the stakeholder organisations in Gracemount, we noticed a lack of consistency in data collection, particularly with regard to room booking and collecting occupancy data. There is a strong case to be made for encouraging and supporting these organisations in adopting a common room booking application.

4 PHASE 1

4.1 OVERVIEW

The general brief for the Data Workstream during Phase 1 was:

4.1 Overview

Data collation and collection about Council buildings — spaces available, services provided, how many people and who uses the spaces and services.

The buildings in question were the following (1–7 are part of the CEC estate):

1. Valley Park Community Centre
2. Gracemount Leisure Centre
3. South East Locality Office
4. Gracemount Primary School
5. St Catherine’s Primary School
6. Kaimes School
7. Gracemount High School
8. Gracemount Leisure Centre
9. Libertus

Given that we lacked a pre-existing collection of usable data about these buildings, the brief turned out be too broad to allow us to proceed in a methodical manner.

Data Assessment 1: Building Floor Plans

We received floor plans for most of the buildings listed above and our initial hope was that we could integrate these into an interactive occupancy visualisation tool to help decision-support. Many of the floor plans had been created using the proprietary application MicroStation. Although the files could be exported from MicroStation in an ‘exchange’ format called DXF, the latter has numerous versions, and we were unsuccessful in finding an open source software tool that could easily read the files or convert them into a more generic format. Each DXF file consisted of over 1000 layers (most of which were unused boilerplate) and lack of metadata for the layers was also an obstacle. We concluded that the potential value of this data was not sufficient to justify further effort.

The floor plans for three of the buildings were provided in PDF format, which is not machine-readable and therefore not of direct use.

We also lacked a clear conceptual framework for classifying services which made it hard to meaningfully measure what was provided, either by CEC or other relevant organisations. Consequently, we homed in to the following two questions:

Q1: Are the rooms and facilities at Valley Park Community Centre (VPCC) under-utilised?
Q2: What is the level of community after-hours use of rooms in Gracemount secondary school?

The only information initially relevant to (Q1) was a list of room bookings with estimated group sizes. However, actual usage was not collected by VPCC and as mentioned above, on-the-ground observations of room occupancy were carried out by CEC staff over the course of 5 days to remedy this gap. We received no data relevant to (Q2) and were consequently unable to address this issue.

The South East locality office provides many Locality-level services but since data about these would contain much personal data, some of it possibly sensitive, we deemed it out of scope for this project. Access to consultations at the office is managed via the Q-Matic ticketing facility and we were provided with cumulative data from the facility for the period March–May 2019. This data reached us too late to be analysed.

During the end of the project, we were provided with extensive data about Edinburgh Libraries and this provoked the following question:

Q3: Does the location and absence of staffing for the South Neighbourhood Library appear to have a negative impact on its usage?

More formally, Edinburgh City Library and Information Services

This is the library that serves the Gracemount area and its full name it South Neighbourhood Office and Library. It is located in the building now known as the South East locality office.
4.2 WHERE IS GRACEMOUNT?

The answer to the question Where is Gracemount? is not self-evident. The recently introduced structures of Localities and Neighbourhood Networks are too coarse-grained, as are the areas covered by Community Councils. On the other hand, taking Gracemount to be the area that falls within a 1km radius of the South East Locality Office does not align well with community perceptions. Instead, we draw on the notion of ‘natural neighbourhood’, as described by the CEC Mapping Portal:

Natural neighbourhoods are neighbourhood definitions and boundaries created during a consultation with Edinburgh residents. Natural neighbourhood boundaries were created in 2004 as part of a review of ward boundaries. The city has changed much since then, the population has increased, new neighbourhoods have appeared and demolition has taken place in other areas so the 2014 consultation has updated these boundaries. The boundaries will be used by the Council and its partners to plan services, consultations and inform policy and strategy development.

More information about the 2014 consultation can be found on the main CEC website page about natural neighbourhoods. The three natural neighbourhoods relevant to this project are those for Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse, as shown in Figure 4. Informally, we will use the term ‘Gracemount’ in this report to encompass all three of these natural neighbourhoods — this aligns best with the original project brief even though it departs from the vernacular geography of the residents themselves.

4.3 HIGHLIGHTS

Our analysis of the building and service data relevant to questions (Q1) and (Q3) highlighted the following points.

1. Valley Park Community Centre has the most rooms available for community use within Gracemount but does not have processes for logging data about activities or building usage. Analysis of the data collected by the observation exercise confirmed that the centre is currently under-utilised.

---

8 http://data.edinburghcouncilmaps.info/datasets/4082b4d47f4eb4da8b5935be2d5a0185_27
9 http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/news/article/1564/natural_neighbourhoods__whats_your_patch
10 Arguably the area south of Burdiehouse Burn is not relevant to the project, but this doesn’t appear to be a problem in practice.
2. South Neighbourhood Library is atypical in that it occupies the entrance hall for the South East locality office and is entirely self-service — no library staff are present. Due to the building configuration, the library space is mostly occupied by resident waiting for appointments in the office’s interview rooms. Whilst the library allows books, CDs etc to be borrowed, it does offer as wide a range of services for adults and children as nearby Gilmerton Library.²¹

3. Edinburgh Libraries systematically collects usage data for all libraries in the city and this allowed us to carry out preliminary comparisons between Gracemount and Gilmerton libraries for a very limited time period (February 2018). In this snapshot, the number of visits to Gracemount library was roughly 55% of those to Gilmerton library. The data also suggests that residents registered at Gilmerton library travel further to, and make greater use of, other library branches in the city compared to people registered Gracemount library.

4. Edinburgh Libraries is able to collect fine-grained usage data by virtue of the fact that many if not most of the services are only available to registered members. Establishing some kind of membership system for booking and/or participating in activities in all of the CEC’s community centres would facilitate collection of data and allow more intelligent decision-making. Methods which rely too heavily on manual records collected by building staff are time-consuming and prone to errors and missing data.

5. Reviewing the services available to a community would benefit from a clearer classification framework that includes not just Council-provided services (e.g., housing advice) but also community-provided services (e.g., knitting classes) and more generic services such as free WiFi. This would allow us to provide a more comprehensive picture of what level of provision is available for a given type of service in different locations in the local area.

4.4 ANALYSES

4.4.1 Valley Park Community Centre

Data Assessment 2: VPCC Observation Data

| The data was contained in an Excel worksheet with a tab corresponding to each observation day which we converted to CSV format. This involved exporting each tab to a separate file, all five of which then had to be combined. Although the observation data had been entered using a common template, there were minor inconsistencies in table placement across the tabs which required further cleaning before further processing was possible. Finally, we queried one data field which seemed unusually high and subsequent correspondence indicated that this was the result of the observer in question having adopted an idiosyncratic interpretation of the guidelines for counting occupancy. We therefore estimated a new value which was more consistent with the other observations in the data.

Although Valley Park Community Centre (VPCC) offers a rich programme of activities for the community, evidence from the centre itself and from the Community Engagement Workstream suggests that take-up is relatively low. As mentioned earlier, manually collected observation data for VPCC, spanning 5 days (Thursday 8 May–Tuesday 14 May 2019), provided a more detailed snapshot of actual usage.

The maximum capacities for VPCC rooms are shown in Table 1. The room labelled as ‘Meetingroom’ can be subdivided into two with a partition, but during the week’s observations, all activities utilised it as a joint space. The ‘Interview’ room is also known as Meeting Room 3. The ‘SSO’ room is where the janitor is stationed.

We will not attempt to provide a comprehensive account of the observation data here, since the details are probably of limited interest. An overview of the data is shown as a heatmap in Figure 5. This attempts to combine three dimensions: (i) the room in question (plotted along the y axis), (ii) the day and time of day (plotted along the x axis); and (iii) the degree to which the room is occupied (plotted as colour intensity). A darker colour on the heatmap corresponds to a higher level of occupancy. We can notice a few things at a glance. The more or less white columns correspond to late afternoon (17:00-18:00) and early morning (09:00-10:00) slots — the exceptions along the bottom (SSO) row show that the janitor is present. (Note that this heatmap, as well as the following figures, omit the weekend that intervened in the observation period.) It is also clear that the Main Office and the Rental Office are fairly consistently occupied. Most of the other rooms appear to be relatively unoccupied, but the Meetingroom shows the most consistent level of usage.

¹¹For more details, see Appendix 3.
4.4 Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafe</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creche</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games/Chill</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance/Fitness</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Office</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/craft</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetingroom</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Suite</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Office</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSO office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Going into a bit more detail, Figure 5 calculates room occupancy as a percentage of the rated capacity for each room (cf. Table 1). The colour-bar at the righthand side of the figure shows the mapping from percentages to colours. For example, Main Office has a capacity of 4 and often contains 2 or 3 people, so occupancy frequently oscillates between 50% and 75%. The Art/craft room has a rated capacity of 12 and was fully occupied for a couple of hours in the middle of 13th May.

**Figure 5** Heatmap showing the room loadings for each room in Valley Park Community Centre across the observation period. Room loading is (raw count/room capacity) * 100.

For a slightly different perspective, Figure 6 shows the maximum level of occupancy, as a percentage of capacity, that the rooms achieved at any point during the period of observation. Accordingly, only Kitchen and Art/craft ever achieved 100% loading during the period.

**Figure 6** The maximum occupancy reached in each room over the observation period, using the same room loading calculation as Figure 5.

Finally, Figure 7 shows the average room occupancy over the whole of the observation period. These figures will be skewed somewhat by the fact noted above that the building appears to be almost unused at the start and end of each day. However, if we discount the Main Office and Rental Office, it does suggest that only Meetingroom
is used heavily for activities throughout the week.

Mean room occupancy over period

![Graph showing mean room occupancy over period]

Figure 7 The average occupancy of each room over the observation period, using the same room loading calculation as Figure 5

In conclusion, this data seems to confirm the view that the spaces in Valley Park Community Centre are not being used to their full extent. As a caveat, it may be more important that a room is, say, 50% full for most of the time than 100% on fewer occasions.

4.4.2 South Neighbourhood Library

Data Assessment 3: Edinburgh Libraries Data

The library issue data collected for Edinburgh Libraries is extensive and detailed. It includes, for example, information about where and when items are borrowed and which library the borrower is registered at. The source data is managed and stored in a relational database by a third party commercial partner, Axiell. It appears that Axiell automatically generates reports by entering the results of a database query into a summary table in Excel workbook, which includes some facilities for library managers to search the table. Only the workbook is provided to library management staff. There is no live access to the source data from within the Excel spreadsheet and apparently Axiell does not provide Edinburgh Libraries with an API which would offer more direct access to the data.

In order to convert the data into a form which can be consumed for further analysis, it is necessary to save the file as CSV. However, attempting to serve the Excel Workbook as provided as CSV only saves the summary table, not the underlying data. In order to get hold of the latter, the following steps are required:

1. Double-click in a month × totals cell, which creates a new sheet in the workbook, and
2. save the resulting sheet as CSV and give it an appropriate filename.

There does not seem to be any alternative to carrying out these steps manually for each Excel workbook, which is time-consuming and can potentially introduce errors. Once this has been done, the separate CSV files have to be recombined to recreate the whole dataset.

A further set of Excel files covers activity data in individual libraries. These have a visually-oriented design which is presumably intended to assist with manual data entry by a librarian. The data layout is relatively complex and we did not have time to process these files computationally.

The library that serves the Gracemount area is self-service only and is located in the public area of the South East locality office. As well as offering basic library services, the space acts as a waiting area for clients of the primary South East locality office services. According to the Phase 1 Community Engagement Report, one of the perceived ‘pains’ in Gracemount concerns the library, in particular the lack of dedicated library staff, the restricted range of books, and the absence of a family atmosphere.
However, it is difficult to determine the extent to which these deficiencies detract from the value of the library in its current form. One possible approach is to compare usage of South Neighbourhood Library with that of nearby Gilmerton Library, on the grounds that the latter could act as proxy for what South Neighbourhood Library might be like if it were staffed and had dedicated space.

We have carried out preliminary analysis to explore this hypothesis, based initially on one month’s worth (February 2018) of issue data from the Edinburgh Libraries. The observations are provisional and require strengthening with the additional data that is available but not yet integrated into the analysis.

Counts for issues will usually be higher than borrower numbers, since each borrower can withdraw multiple items on a given visit to a library.

Figure 8 gives a snapshot of the issue figures for Edinburgh Libraries, excluding Central Library. The actual counts for Gilmerton and South Neighbourhood Library (labelled here as 'South Neighbourhood Office') are 532 and 293. Gilmerton lies between the first quartile and the median while South Gilmerton Library than in the case of South Neighbourhood Library. That is, if my 'home' library was Gilmerton, I would be more inclined to use it (because of its better facilities) than I would be if my 'home' library were South Neighbourhood.

Figure 8 Indicative level of use of Edinburgh Libraries, excluding Central Library

Counts for issues will usually be higher than borrower numbers, since each borrower can withdraw multiple items on a given visit to a library.
Figure 9  Comparison of South Neighbourhood and Gilmerton Library in terms of percentage of issues made in 'home' branch. 

However, this hypothesis is not supported by the borrowing data we have examined. Figure (a) shows that over 80% of issues made to borrowers registered at South Neighbourhood Library are in that branch itself. Of the other 10 library branches visited, Gilmerton is the unsurprising favourite, at just under 8%. Bear in mind that the raw counts are small and thus these percentages need to be viewed with caution. By contrast, just over 60% of the issues made to borrowers registered at Gilmerton Library took place in that branch. What is even more striking is the much greater spread of other libraries that were visited by these borrowers: 26 as opposed to 10. We can only speculate as to the reasons for this, but they might involve a variety of factors including greater mobility across the city of Gilmerton residents and greater engagement with libraries in general.

5 PHASE 2

As a result of the project’s community design stream, there has been increased emphasis on exploring data that reflects community priorities within Gracemount. Repeating what was said in section 4, the main issues that emerged were:

1. mobility, accessibility and transport;
2. Neighbourhood vs. non-neighbourhood audiences for facilities, especially Gracemount Leisure Centre;
3. the provision and quality of public and community spaces.

5.1 HIGHLIGHTS

1. The perception that Valley Park Community Centre is not readily accessible to residents north of Captain’s Road can be supported by estimating average walking time required to reach it from various locations across the area.
2. Although Gracemount Leisure Centre appears to be well used by residents of Gracemount, by far the greatest proportion of users are based in other parts of the City Region.
3. The data available from the CEC Open Spaces Audit (2016) does not allow us to draw conclusions about the provision of parks and greenspaces in Gracemount.

5.2 ANALYSES

The analyses that follow are more partial than we would like and lack a clear framework for evaluating qualitative concerns of the kind expressed by the Gracemount community. Nevertheless, they do appear to largely substantiate these concerns.
5.2 Analyses

5.2.1 Accessibility

The concept of accessibility within a local area is hard to pin down. Whether a given amenity is judged to be accessible or not depends on a range of factors, including available transport modalities, any physical limitations on mobility (e.g., parents accompanied by young children), the physical infrastructure of routes (e.g., uneven pavements, pedestrian crossing points on roads) and so on. When we try to characterise an area more generally there are more or less explicit assumptions about what is normal; consider, for example, the notion of a ‘food desert’.13

One helpful approach is the isochrone map. This displays all the locations which can be reached within a given travel time from a specific ‘central’ point \( p \). If we think of this central point \( p \) as a destination rather than a start point, the isochrone gives us a notion of how long it would take to travel to \( p \), which in turn can be regarded as a measure of accessibility. We have computed isochrone maps for Gracemount in terms of how far one can walk at a walking speed of 4.5 km/hour and with trip times of 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 minutes. Figures 10a, 10b show isochrone maps centred on Gracemount Leisure Centre and Valley Park Community Centre respectively.

![Isochrone map centered on Gracemount Leisure Centre](image1)

![Isochrone map centered on Valley Park Community Centre](image2)

**Figure 10** Isochrone maps representing distances walkable from specific locations. A darker colour represents a shorter trip time, with thresholds at 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 minutes.

The Community Engagement Workstream has indicated that Gracemount residents north of Captain’s Road regard Valley Park Community Centre as relatively inaccessible and Figure 10b seems to support this perception in that the main area that can reach VPCC within 10 minutes walking time lies to the south of Captain’s Road. Conversely, a large area to the north of Captain’s Road lies within within 10 minutes walking time to Gracemount Leisure Centre. Potentially the difference in perceived accessibility might be understated in these maps, since Captain’s Road represents an additional barrier in terms of traffic flow and as a division between natural neighbourhoods.

The maps in Figure 11 attempt to provide a picture of the location of key amenities in Gracemount compared to the surrounding area of Edinburgh. The data is taken from OpenStreetMap and markers correspond to nodes marked as Points of Interest, such as restaurants/fast-food outlets, GP surgeries, banks/ATMs and libraries. On the one hand, the data is clearly incomplete — for example, the cafes in Gracemount Leisure Centre and Valley Park Community Centre are not recorded. On the other hand, the relative density and location of amenities appears to be broadly correct.

---

5.2 Analyses

5.2.2 Gracemount Leisure Centre Catchment Area

Data Assessment 4: Edinburgh Leisure Data

Edinburgh Leisure systematically collects usage data for all the Leisure Centres and includes postcode information for activity bookings by members. Although the location data can be misleading when it reflects the headquarters of organisational members, there is sufficient volume of data over several years to provide a good picture of the catchment area for the Leisure Centre.

One of the views captured by the Community Engagement work is that Gracemount Leisure Centre (GLC) is aimed at a target audience outside Gracemount itself and that this is reflected in the prices, which are perceived to be too high for some local residents. In order to explore this issue in more depth, we have carried out preliminary analysis of the locations of members participating in activities at GLC, based on their postcodes. The data for 2018\(^{14}\) is represented in Figure 12 as a heatmap. The density of points (where red is most dense and blue is least dense) corresponds to GLC members’ postcodes represented as geocoordinates.

The data shows convincingly that the catchment area for GLC does indeed stretch far beyond Gracemount. Moreover, although GLC appears to be well used by residents of Gracemount, by far the greatest proportion of users are based in other parts of the City Region. Figure 12a suggests that a high concentration of visits come from relatively affluent areas surrounding Gracemount, particularly Buckstone, Liberton and Gilmerton.

\(^{14}\)Only partial data for 2018 has been analysed. Fuller data is available but we did not have time to integrate it.
5.2 Analyses 5 PHASE 2

5.2.3 Gracemount Greenspaces

The topic of Gracemount’s greenspaces cropped up a number of times in the Community Engagement report; for example: “the feeling of neglect implied by poorly maintained ... outdoor spaces and public realm”. Machine-readable spatial data about the city’s greenspaces based on the CEC Open Space Audit can be found on the CEC Mapping Portal, and the relevant areas are shown shown layered on the Gracemount natural neighbourhoods in Figure 13.

The Mapping Portal data download page provides this brief description of the Open Space Audit:

The open space audit was carried out in 2009 as part of the open space strategy. The Open Space Strategy was approved by the Council’s Policy and Strategy and Planning Committees at the end of September 2010. The preparation of an open space strategy is a recent requirement of national planning policy, requiring the creation of an audit, a strategy and action plans. The implementation of the strategy and action plans will be monitored and every five years, from 2015, the strategy will be reviewed and updated.

Figure 13  Spaces included in the Open Space Audit which fall within the Gracemount natural neighbourhoods

It is not clear from Mapping Portal download page whether the data comes from 2009 or 2016. The more recent web page Edinburgh’s Open Space Map shows losses and gains in open space but is not easy to compare with the downloadable data on the Mapping Portal. In addition, metadata about the latter is sparse and it is unclear how to interpret the different assessment methods or what criteria different assessment methods were used to arrive at the audit score.

Table 2 shows the underlying data, ordered by the AuditScore values. It will be seen that some of the spaces are marked as not accessible. However, assuming that ‘Gracemount House’ is the same as ‘Mansion

15http://data.edinburghcouncilmaps.info/datasets/2239a62124086b30aa5ed8fc2e1ef_15
17https://edinburghcouncil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/StorytellingSwipe/index.html — the underlying data is not made available as a download.
Table 2  Tabular representation of open spaces within Gracemount that were audited by CEC

House', this seems to incorrectly classify the Walled Garden as non-accessible. It will also be noted that many of the spaces are classed as residential, presumably because they form part of apartment blocks or similar. A further oddity is that Burdiehouse Burn Park is listed four times, with different AuditScore values. The same data can also be represented as a bar chart, as in Figure 14.

Figure 14  Plot of AuditScores of Gracemount Open Spaces. The bars represent variation in values where the same location receives multiple scores.

In order to evaluate the quality of greenspaces within Gracemount we would require clearer criteria for evaluation metrics as well as more up-to-date surveys.
APPENDIX A DATA REGISTER / DATA CATALOGUE

The project has succeeded in collecting a rich portfolio of datasets, amounting to about 1GB of data divided over approximately 1000 files. Within this, three subsets of data are particularly notable:

1. Almost 100 Excel files of library usage data (140MB), covering all the city’s libraries.
3. A large volume of GIS datasets (700 MB) mostly in the form of ESRI Shapefiles, again with city-wide coverage.

In addition, the project has acquired much smaller datasets for buildings and services specific to Gracemount; although these are more project-specific they provide useful insights into what might be available in other parts of the city.

The specification of what should be provided as a Data Register has evolved during the course of the project. Although it is relatively easy to provide a bare listing of data files, this has two key limitations.

- A file listing only makes sense in the context of a file storage system. Ideally this would be available online, subject to suitable access controls. However, currently there is no such provision, either within CEC or within the University of Edinburgh.
- The data files are only useful when accompanied by informative metadata. For example, metadata should include information about file formats, ownership, access mechanisms, provenance, etc.

To address these issues, we need to move to some kind of Data Catalogue which systematically associates data files with metadata. A promising approach uses data packages; these are descriptor files for "putting collections of data and their descriptions in one place so that they can be easily shared and used". We have experimented with this technique and the results are encouraging. However there has not been time for a comprehensive implementation.

[https://frictionlessdata.io/docs/data-package/]
APPENDIX B  GRACEMOUNT SERVICES

Although we have received partial data about services and activities that are offered within Gracemount, we have not been able to come up with a satisfactory method for categorising and counting them. The following lists give an indication of the breadth and heterogeneity involved.

Services offered at South East locality office:

- Benefits
- Children and Families
- Council Tax
- Criminal Justice
- Edinburgh Housing Advice Partnership/Community Help and Advice Initiative
- Environment
- Family and Household Support
- Housing
- Housing Options / Homeless Assessment
- Library
- Payments
- Temp Accommodation

Activities hosted at Valley Park Community Centre:

- Antenatal class
- Anxiety management
- ARK
- Art Group
- Baby Explore
- Baby Massage
- Careers advisor
- Cooking Class
- Cooking Group
- Dance group
- Employment Training
- English
- English (ESOL)
- English & Skills
- English creche
- Fitmammas
- Friday Club
- Gardening Volunteers
- Give it a go
- Health Baby Clinic
- High school sports group
- Indoor Bowls
- Irish Dance
- Jujitsu
- Machine knitting group
- Midwives
- P1-P3 Club
- P4-P6 Club
- Phoenix Singing Group
- Rainbows
- Senior Youth Club
- Tai Chi
- Tutor Group
- Yoga
- Yoga Creche
- Zumba
Activities hosted in Gilmerton Library, Sept 2018:

- Bookgroup Meeting
- Councillor Ash Denham
- Gilmerton/Inch Community Council
- Let Our Voices Be Heard
- Purty Queens Knitting Group
- Smoke Free South Scotland
- Visually Impaired I-Pad Training
- Bookbug
- Colouring In
- Speech and Language Lego Club

Activities hosted in South Neighbourhood Library, Sept 2018:

- Bookgroup Meeting
- Bookbug
- Writer’s Group
- Nursery Visit
APPENDIX C  SUMMARY OF DATA INGESTION AND PROCESSING METHOD

This appendix briefly summarises the main steps involved in receiving and processing data from the perspective of the University of Edinburgh.

1. Most datasets have been acquired in the form of Excel Workbooks, typically containing multiple worksheets. On receipt of the data and after a quick preliminary inspection, we have organised it into folders, mainly based on the relevant building.

2. The programming environment uses the Python programming language. Apart from the core libraries provided as part of the language, there is a wealth of easily-installed, special-purpose modules for Python which can be accessed within a consistent programming framework. To aid reproducibility, the complete set of library dependencies have been captured as a conda environment file.

3. There are numerous development environments for Python, as with most modern programming languages. We have chosen to use JupyterLab, an interactive user interface that runs in the browser and offers rich support for data visualisation. In addition, it encourages a programming style in which code is interspersed with text, and therefore richly documented.

4. Although there are libraries in Python for reading Excel Workbooks, these do not always operate reliably. Instead, we save each sheet within a Workbook as a separate file in CSV format, using UTF-8 as the text encoding. If the Workbooks contains numerous sheets, this can be quite time-consuming. The resulting CSV file is then read into memory as one of the preliminary steps of the processing.

5. Geospatial data has been ingested in, or converted into, GeoJSON format.

6. In order to develop a viable approach to a particular dataset, we have found that it is usually best to work with a portion of the data first of all. Since most of the relevant datasets are already subdivided along a temporal dimension, this usually means starting with a subperiod of the time span. Once an approach has been developed for the smaller portion, it should be relatively straightforward to integrate the remaining parts of the data.

7. An important preliminary step has turned out to be data normalisation. This might, for example, involve converting mixed 12-hour and 24-hour timestamps into a uniform format. Other cases involve normalising textual references. For example, in the library borrowing data, this involved steps like the following to ensure that all library branches are named in an internally consistent manner:
   
   a. Stripping off the prefixes "Registered at" and "Visited -".
   b. Stripping off the prefixes "Self Service" and "Self -Service".
   c. Removing "& Library" and "& Librar" from the end of "South Neighbourhood Office".
   d. Removing "Library" from every library branch name.
   e. Stripping off any leading or trailing blanks.

These modifications reduced the list of unique entries for 'visited_branches' from 55 to 38 by collapsing irrelevant or erroneous distinctions.

---

1 See [https://www.python.org/](https://www.python.org/). For this project, we have been using the latest current release, namely Python 3.7.


APPENDIX 07: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PHASE 2

OUR COMMUNITY: GRACEMOUNT, BURDIEHOUSE, SOUTHOUSE

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT 2
## OVERVIEW: TOTAL NUMBERS OF PEOPLE ENGAGED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Engagement Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL WORKSHOP</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY SPOT INTERVIEWS</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE-ARRANGED INTERVIEWS</strong></td>
<td>34 MOSTLY SERVICE PROVIDERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHOTO COMPETITION</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY ONLINE SURVEY #1</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE PROVIDER ONLINE SURVEY #1</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATORY EXHIBITION DISPLAY #1</strong></td>
<td>318 ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT (WRITTEN COMMENTS OR INPUT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSTCARD SURVEY #1</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAKEHOLDER MEETING</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATORY PHOTO EXHIBITION DISPLAY #2</strong></td>
<td>287 BASED ON TOTAL 860 VOTES /COMMENTS, AVERAGE OF 3 PER PERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONLINE SURVEY #2</strong></td>
<td>36 MOSTLY COMMUNITY MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL: 941**
COMMUNITY PHOTOGRAPHY EXHIBITION

Phase 1 of the community engagement for the ‘Our Community: Gracemount, Burdiehouse, Southhouse’ project included a photography competition. This invited local residents, workers and other stakeholders to submit a photograph of their favourite local neighbourhood place, including a caption about why they chose this place and an aspiration for the future of the area.

28 photos were entered into the competition. Entries came from a mix of local residents and stakeholders of all ages, and with various relationships to the Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse area.

Analysis of all photo captions/locations fed into the project, and can be found within the Phase 1 report.

The photos were exhibited as part of a display for one week each within Gracemount Leisure Centre, St Catherine’s RC Primary School and Gracemount Primary School during June and July 2019. These locations were chosen because of their high footfall. This was important so that as many people as possible could view the photos, participate in a public vote for the winner and also fill in a postcard survey available at the display. The exhibition display being situated at the two primary schools also enabled those students who had taken part in the May school workshop (and their parents) to see their photo exhibited and find out more about the project.

A total of 860 votes were cast across all photos at the display as part of a public vote to select the winning photo. Three 9-11 year olds - Sasha, Kiiki and Alisha - from St Catherine’s Primary School won with 146 votes. Their photo commented on the importance of ‘The Dip’ at Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park, the local shops and their school. Their aspirations related to a desire for less anti-social behaviour from teenagers in the park, less litter, and more environmental/‘green’ attitudes.
ONLINE + POSTCARD SURVEY #2

The ‘Our Community’ project’s first phase of engagement established a number of themes and community priorities around which there was general consensus. In addition to these, the project team identified a number of key buildings, services, ideas for the future or considerations that it would be useful to further understand or seek feedback on.

A follow-up survey aimed to clarify and better understand these important issues, opportunities and aspirations. For example, asking in more detail how local stakeholders felt about:

- a possible future community hub,
- their relationship with Gracemount Mansion and grounds,
- which improvements to public streets and spaces should be prioritised,
- how to best enhance opportunities for physical activity,
- how the new St Catherine’s Primary School might add value by offering space or facilities for the community.

An online survey was distributed to all local stakeholders (residents, groups, service providers) previously contacted, as well as those who actively engaged in the first phase of the project. These stakeholders were encouraged to pass the survey on to their local networks, including colleagues, friends and family to encourage as many, and as wide a diversity of participants to provide their feedback. 36 responses were received.

Printed postcard surveys complemented this online/digital engagement to help ensure the widest diversity of people could participate in the project. Postcard surveys were available from the exhibition display showcasing photo competition entries - present in Gracemount Leisure Centre, Gracemount Primary School and St Catherine’s RC Primary School for a total of 3 weeks.

The following pages break down the findings from these surveys around the key themes and questions asked.
The vast majority of respondents would support provision of a community hub (97% approval)

- This is seen as critical for a community which survey respondents felt has big issues (those cited included poverty, drug use/addiction, social isolation), and which many feel has been “forgotten about by Council”.
- One respondent suggested this be called a ‘Wellbeing Hub’, framing the community hub’s intent around well-being in terms of social connection (places to meet / activities), healthy food (cafe, community growing), health/well-being/addiction related services etc.
- The most popular facilities respondents felt a community hub should incorporate were: a cafe (86% support), toilet and kitchen facilities (83%), activities/clubs to suit all ages (83%), meeting space for local organisations/groups (78%), bookable rooms at affordable rates (78%), a community garden/growing space (78%), free WiFi (75%), activities for young people (72%) and a community hall (72%).
- The least popular facilities for a community hub to be combined with were: a high school (only 14% of respondents would support this), followed by a primary school (17%).
- It is worth noting, the answers above may reflect people’s expectations as to what a community hub typically looks like. This should be investigated further.
There is strong support for improvements to local streets / green spaces / public spaces (91% approval)

- The majority of survey respondents would support the following improvements: more litter bins (66% of respondents), improved pavement surfaces and road crossings for pedestrians (both 57%), additional public seating throughout the local streets and public spaces (51%).

- In the comments, respondents specifically mentioned:
  » a need for places for children to play which are free of glass and litter
  » concerns around traffic, and there being too many cars
  » the area having a generally unwelcoming, neglected feel, that gives a bad first impression of the neighbourhood

- Some felt there were enough green space nearby, but that these spaces are poor maintenance/condition (both in terms of Council and user behaviour). Many respondents specifically mentioned litter, dog poo, glass, vandalism, and anti-social behaviour that prohibit use of the existing public spaces, local parks and street environment.

Would you support provision of more green spaces and improvement to existing public streets and spaces?

Yes [91%]
No [9%]

What type of improvements would you like to see?

- Allotments / Community Food Growing
- Community Garden [General Gardening]
- Small local park [Grass, shrubs, trees]
- Connected integrated network of small/large green spaces
- More street trees
- More litter bins
- A public town square
- More public benches/seating throughout streets/public spaces
- Improved pavement surfaces for pedestrians
- Improved road crossings for pedestrians
Those that are aware of Valley Park Community Centre, don’t feel it is used to its full potential.

- **50%** of people weren’t sure about how much VPCC is used, indicating a large amount of the local population unfamiliar with the centre.
- Of those with an opinion about/who know Valley Park Community Centre, a significant majority (94%) felt it was underused. This represented 47% of the overall number of respondents.
- This indicates a lack of both awareness and usage of Valley Park Community Centre. Survey respondents gave reasons for this as including:
  » a lack of desirable activities to attend
  » a lack of promotion (suggestions for leaflets, posters, ads in local papers/school bulletins, social media presence, website, open days, weekly email updates of facilities/rooms available sent to other local services)
  » better navigation/signage needed to make the centre easier to find
  » location in Southhouse puts some people off attending as they don’t want to walk through the Southhouse estate (particularly at night), or over a busy road (Captain’s Road) to get there. No bus route, and distance from Gracemount are also limitations.
  » improved booking system needed (currently people are put off due to difficulties initially making bookings, lost bookings, curtailed ongoing use for their activities despite their expectations they could continue to use spaces).
Local people’s physical activity would be most positively impacted by improving access to existing sports facilities via price reduction as well as infrastructure enhancements to the street environment to better support running and cycling.

• 75% of survey respondents stated that improving streets and public spaces for running and cycling would help increase their physical activity levels. Many commented on a need for dedicated bike lanes and facilities, a reduction in car speed to 20mph to improve feelings of safety when walking/cycling, better footpaths and running tracks, bike storage and showers within work place buildings, improvements to local streets, and prioritising of pedestrian movement over cars within the area.

• 75% of survey respondents were also supportive of reduced/free access to existing sports and recreation facilities or activities. Respondents commented that this would remove barriers to this existing provision as well as reduce health inequality linked to poverty. For example, the Leisure Centre was frequently mentioned as being too expensive for many local people to use. This was seen as exclusive, promoting use by those from further afield whilst remaining inaccessible to local people, with some respondents feeling the Leisure Centre and Council having an attitude of putting profit over community.

• The majority (59%) of respondents also felt a well-maintained new multi-use sports pitch would help support opportunities for physical activity, with some commenting on the importance of this being financially accessible to all.

### SURVEY #2: PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Which of the following would be most beneficial in allowing you to increase your physical activity?

- Outdoor running trails: 38%
- Improved conditions for running + cycling: 75%
- Outdoor gym/exercise equipment: 22%
- A multi-use games pitch: 59%
- Reduced cost or free access to existing facilities: 75%
Gracemount Mansion, Walled Garden and grounds were considered ‘extremely important’ by most (55%) of those surveyed:

- 76% of those surveyed stated the Mansion, Walled Garden and grounds were either ‘fairly’ or ‘extremely’ important to them.
- Only 6% stated the Mansion, Walled Garden and grounds were ‘not at all’ or ‘not very’ important to them. 18% were ‘not sure’ - presumably as their limited knowledge/experience of this building and its grounds.
- 47% of survey respondents had used Gracemount Mansion in the year prior to its closure, 53% had not. This indicates considerable usage of the building and its grounds if representative of the wider population. Available data on attendee numbers may be able to clarify if this is the case.
- Some respondents highlighted the importance of the Walled Garden and grounds for school-age children, with many citing the value the garden and its volunteers deliver for the community.
- A small number of respondents commented that - when open - the Mansion building itself was primarily used by church-affiliated groups rather than more broadly utilised by the community.
- Many respondents commented on the need for broad-reaching community services to be provided in the Gracemount area, particularly now the Mansion is closed. Some mentioned a dedicated, Council-funded, community development worker post being mandatory to ensure the success of any future community hub for use by a wider diversity of local people, either at the Mansion or elsewhere.
- Survey respondents made strong statements of loss around the Mansion’s closure and impact this has had. Themes included:
  - its importance as a social connector and community space for all ages.
  - there being a lack of alternative places in a suitable nearby location to deliver all the services previously on offer under one roof at the Mansion.
  - the importance of Mansion activities/clubs in providing food as part of these activities - this assisted those experiencing poverty whilst not creating stigma. This was particularly highlighted in connection with children’s activities, where respondents highlighted this was often the only food children had that day.

It’s a beautiful building in a great location with a lovely quantity of green/garden space. It would be a great loss if [...] sold and privatised, unless to an organisation that had to open it to the community.
Respondents generally supported combining community activities with the new St Catherine’s Primary School building:

- Many respondents were supportive of sharing the new St Catherine’s building and facilities with community groups. In particular, respondents commented on the opportunities and value that provision of a meeting space, storage, and catering facilities would offer to local community groups, the church, and other organisations.

- Other respondents were concerned an approach sharing or co-locating facilities was just ‘cost-cutting’ by the Council, who were seen as trying to accommodate too many things under one roof and in so doing them all badly, and not doing the community justice.

- Some respondents were concerned whether a building used primarily as a school would mean community groups wouldn’t be able to access or use the building during weekday day-times, restricting their use. As a result they felt there was value in keeping these buildings/functions delivered separately.

- Respondents named particular facilities that could offer benefit to both school children and the broader community. These are the facilities that could deliver additional value and efficiency through their shared use:
  - public library / learning hub
  - sports pitches (open into the evening for free public use)
  - large playground and green natural spaces (freely accessible outside of school hours)
  - kitchen / catering facilities
  - large hall
  - meeting rooms
  - one-to-one counselling rooms
  - storage space

- However, it was felt crucial that these facilities be free where possible, publicly accessible, and with opening times beyond the school day to accommodate community use.

“St. Catherine’s is a great school that is long overdue replacement. The school needs to be bigger when it is rebuilt. It has to have modern facilities that are fitting of the pupil’s needs. Good playground and natural space with well lit and multifunctional teaching space.”
A community brief sets out the priorities, needs and aspirations of a community. It forms a brief of desired action for the future and points of agreement that the majority of community members who participated would like to see go forward. It can be considered a snapshot in time, and ideally forms the starting point for further engagement.

This community brief summarises key findings from engagement activities as part of the ‘Our Community: Gracemount, Burdiehouse, Southhouse’ project (April-July 2019). The findings will be fed back to City of Edinburgh Council, to help shape future planning of local public buildings and services. This brief should be viewed as an initial guide, from which Council can further engage with the community as they consider, develop and refine various options for the future of the area, its buildings and services.

A ‘sentiments’ section has also been included. This communicates general feelings expressed by the community around key topics that Council may also find useful to incorporate into their thinking.

Please note - this community brief communicates broad themes that have emerged from community engagement activities to date i.e. points of general consensus or recurrent views/statements from diverse individuals. It therefore does not (and cannot) capture all the views expressed by individuals. It should be read with this in mind. More detail, individual comments and in-depth findings can be found in the full report.

COMMUNITY BRIEF: A SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

A sense Council has ‘forgotten’ about the area (examples given include lack of maintenance of the football pitches, Gracemount Mansion prior to its closure, and issues of litter/vandalism), and ‘taken away’ those assets community previously invested in or valued (e.g. Gracemount Mansion).

A feeling that the services located within the central Gracemount area only partially benefit local residents.

» The Leisure Centre was often given as an example of a facility sited locally but felt to primarily service those from further afield due to its pricing structure that excludes some local residents (often described as promoting profit over community).

» Similarly, there are perceptions that those working within the SE Locality Office are professionals from outwith the local area, commuting and using local streets for parking. This was felt to exacerbate parking pressures, as well as not prioritising training of local people for these employment opportunities.

A strong sense of loss around Gracemount Mansion closing, but a recognition that the renovation costs likely prohibit its reinstatement. The Mansion’s central location, multiple services under one roof, welcoming feel, and significant community involvement are missed, as these features have not been reproduced in the re-distribution of services elsewhere.

Strong support for Gracemount Walled Garden and grounds, and the therapeutic, social, skills development, healthy food education, and play opportunities this provides local people, particularly school-age children.

Concerns about future pressure on local services due to significant new housing being built nearby.

A strong sentiment that Gracemount, Burdiehouse and Southhouse are distinct, separate neighbourhoods. Services provided in Southhouse (e.g. Valley Park Community Centre) are not seen as being for Gracemount residents. This territoriality should be considered for future decisions about building/service location and their target population.
NEEDS
- In order to improve community use of local services, issues around location (disconnected neighbourhoods divided by busy roads), cost (which restricts access for some users), and awareness (better promoting existing services/activities) would have most impact.
- In order to improve community use of existing buildings/physical facilities, issues around maintenance (e.g., ensuring football pitches in useable condition, basic repairs to Walled Garden structure), affordable access (e.g., to the Leisure Centre) and extended opening (e.g., evening free public access to school sports pitches/playgrounds) could be considered.
- Several new physical spaces or improvements are needed:
  - an intergenerational social space to spend time/meet others.
  - a new St Catherine’s Primary School building asap
  - a ‘proper’ library with library staff, more activities, better book selection, and welcoming atmosphere (not a waiting room for other services).
  - a larger playground to replace the playpark near Tesco.
  - significant improvements to the street environment for pedestrians, runners and cyclists to promote uptake of these free physical activities (cycle lanes, running tracks), enhance pride of place (pleasant pedestrian environment), and enhance accessibility for less mobile residents (pavement condition, pedestrian crossings, drop-kerbs).
  - more suitable, dignified, and available rooms to meet privately with Council staff at the SE Locality Office.
  - additional seating/trees/planting/bins within the central Gracemount local shops/plaza area to provide a pleasant place to sit, eat food and meet others.
- Some needs relate more to services or systems:
  - an improved booking system at the SE Locality Office
  - improve ease of accessing GP appointments
  - greater provision of affordable/free activities for all ages, with particular focus on 12-15 year olds, as well as activities welcoming regardless of age (intergenerational)
  - training and skills development for local residents to enable increased local employment within delivery of local services.
- Other issues require broader, more holistic solutions:
  - address litter, broken glass, vandalism issues resulting in poor condition of existing green spaces, public streets and spaces.
  - address issues of crime, poverty, drug/alcohol misuse.

PRIORITIES
- A community hub that provides a mix of community functions under one roof. A place to meet, socialise, and access services, that is welcoming to all ages and economic backgrounds, integrates a community development worker role, and prioritises facilities including a cafe, toilets, kitchen, meeting space for local groups, bookable rooms at affordable rates, free WiFi, and a community garden.
- Free activities and a dedicated space for young people (particularly 12-15 year olds), including long-term funding provision for dedicated youth worker staff. One solution for this to be achieved would be via a standalone youth centre but which links into other relevant local services which can be assessed from the same building.
- Addressing the future of Gracemount Mansion and grounds. This requires a short-term solution to ensure further deterioration, anti-social behaviour and vandalism do not cause damage or injury, and a long-term plan that ideally retains the community function of this space in some respect, including support for the Walled Garden group. It is important to the community that any future plans be respectfully communicated in terms of timescale, plan of action and rationale.
- Design and construction of the new St Catherine’s RC Primary School as a priority to ensure it can accommodate increasing demand for places given the new housing currently under construction. Facilities to be prioritised include a separate dining and activities hall, break-out spaces for learning activities, sufficient storage space and high quality outdoor play area.

ASPIRATIONS
- For an inspirational flagship eco-school, wellbeing centre, catering college or other entity to be based at Gracemount Mansion. This would raise the profile of Gracemount, making it a place to be proud of, whilst also delivering positive employment, training, educational and/or environmental benefits to local residents and community.
- The Walled Garden Group have aspirations for use of the Stable Block within the grounds of Gracemount Mansion for a community cafe linked to the garden produce, food education and skills.
- Gracemount Community Church own a parcel of land to the north-east of Gracemount Drive, upon which they plan to build a church incorporating a cafe and meeting/activity space. There may be opportunities to co-ordinate and cooperate as both their, Council’s and the Walled Garden group’s plans develop for new local buildings/services/community spaces to ensure these do not double up unnecessarily.
- The engagement identified a number of broader local issues that impact on the condition of various neighbourhood places, sense of community, and local people’s use (or not) of the services already provided. These included litter, vandalism, crime, anti-social behaviour, territorialism and gangs, drug and alcohol misuse, and poverty. Addressing these issues formed a recurrent theme and dominant local aspiration.
Our Community:
Southhouse, Burdiehouse & Gracemount

APPENDIX 05:
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 2

THURSDAY 25TH JUNE, 4.30PM – 6.30PM
This workshop was part 2 of 2 engagements which took place on 30th May and 25th of June respectively.

The workshop, delivered by design studio Andthen, took twelve participants through a series of creative and interactive tasks to explore opportunities for improvements to how and where services are delivered in the local area.

In this workshop we discussed the significance of the closure Gracemount Mansion as a community hub and created visions for an ideal community hub. The workshop concluded with a discussion about the best way to involve the local community in shaping the future of the area.

The ideas and insights produced during this workshop culminated in a report presented to the City of Edinburgh Council.

Activities:

PRESENTATION OF ISSUES RAISED SO FAR
Discuss issues and prioritise.

SIGNIFICANCE OF GRACEMOUNT MANSION
What has been lost since it’s closure and discuss hopes and fears for it’s future.

IMAGINING AN IDEAL COMMUNITY HUB
Understand what a community hub is, what role it needs to play in the community and how that could be achieved.

NEXT STEPS
Discuss the best way to have an ongoing conversation with the community about the Our Community project, it’s aims and their role in the decision making process.
GRACEMOUNT MANSION

The Mansion was a flexible community led space, where dedicated staff built an open and welcoming atmosphere.

While there is an acceptance that the building in its current state is not fit for purpose and that renovation is not a likely course of action, there is a clear preference for the land not to be sold off and for the building to be recovered in some form.

KEY FEATURES OF A COMMUNITY HUB

— Creating a sense of ownership, through flexible organisational structure.

— A welcoming atmosphere, provided by consistent friendly faces.

— An easily accessible place, to know and be known.

— A place that deals with social issues, creating a sense of wellbeing.
What is a community hub?

- A place that feels cozy, lively, warm and welcoming
- Place to learn
- Place to gather
- Multi-service, multi-generational

- Opportunity to enhance each other's activities (communicate)
- Need to be known, personal touch, hot start
- A place where you are known, noticed, can get help
- Open to growth and change
- Place to trash (autonomy)
What does a community hub need to do for your community?

- Community Hub as the fabric holding the community together
- Need a model which allows communities to thrive
- Affordable spaces and classes
- Going to necessary services, give opportunities to find out about other activities etc.
- Information provision, + can find out other info (extends boundaries)
- Day + evening access
- BE SAFE
- SOMEONE to connect to
- SOMEONE to manage it / be central contact point
What types of activity should take place here?

- Physical activities
- Solve problems
  - Housing
  - Support
  - Friendship
- Social contact
- Warmth
- Food
- WiFi
- Cheap meals
- Meditation
- Learning
- ESOL
- IT skills
- Music
- Dance
- Gardening
- Activities for multiple ages simultaneously
  e.g. Mom does Zumba, kids at soccer and Rainbows
- Cost effective
- Free classes
What kinds of spaces does your community hub need?

- **Adaptable to future changes**: E.g., computer rooms.
- **Welcoming spaces**: Places to connect, feel at home.
- **Informal marketplace**:
  - Informal services
  - Connection to formal activities
  - Community, sustainability
- **Quiet rooms/library**
- **Space for one-off community events**
- **Community cafe & cooking space**
- **Loads of space**
Where should it sit geographically?

- ST CATS NEW BUILDING AT GRACEMOUNT MANZION?
- ECO SCHOOL @ MANZION
  - CLIMATE PILOT PROJECT?
  - LOCAL PUPILS
- BUILD AN EXTENSION TO LEISURE CENTRE OR HIGH SCHOOL?
- GRACEMOUNT MANZION NEW ECO-SCHOOL + WALLER GARDEN?
- YOUTH CENTRE WITHIN IT CAT GROUND ONE DEMOLISH?
- COMMUNITY HUB ATTACHED TO SCHOOL NOT USED BY PEOPLE GO TO SCHOOL?
- FEEL SEPARATE

CLOSE TO LEISURE CENTRE
Do you live, work or use a local service in Southhouse, Burdiehouse or Gracemount?

If so, we want to hear from you.

#Our Community
Southhouse, Burdiehouse and Gracemount

www.edinburgh.gov.uk/ourcommunity
## DATA WORKSTREAM PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Data and Design for Property Planning project

Created by Sally Kerr, City of Edinburgh Council and Edinburgh Living Lab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Data Workstream activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Tools/Documents</th>
<th>Other stakeholders</th>
<th>Time involved</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project Principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although this guidance is specifically for the data workstream, the project needs to put in place shared principles for the project’s operation at the start. This is to ensure that roles are clearly assigned, communications for each workstream are agreed, project approach (e.g. design led, user centred) are agreed, and all those in the project are aware of these principles, their role and their commitment. For the data workstream the primary principles must be followed: data used in the project (and which is non-personal) should be published alongside the project recommendations/final report. Services should review any data issues that are identified with a view to improving data management. New practices introduced should be agreed with the Council Data Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develop data 101 customised presentation</td>
<td>This presentation is for the first workshop (see 3.) – to help stakeholders understand what they will need to do. The presentation should be customised to the area. A guidance document should be provided with this.</td>
<td>Data lead</td>
<td>Skills checklist to identify suitable Officers Presentation 101 Guidance document (include points on formats, licensing, GDPR, Council policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 wks (initially)</td>
<td>Improved stakeholder awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Early Landscaping</td>
<td>This should happen as early as possible in the project. The Project team, which should include relevant service areas working or planning to work in the</td>
<td>Data lead/Project lead/Partner resource</td>
<td>Survey to support landscaping. This can be virtual, interview, call. <strong>The survey must be co-designed by the CEC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 wks</td>
<td>Shared project awareness and outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specific project city area, will have a meeting, 1:1 interview, and calls to identify first data, current and planned activities including any engagement and relevant stakeholders. This is to ensure there is a consistent approach to the project and understanding of the scope and any inter-dependencies.

| 3. | **Identify data stakeholders and call a workshop** | The first workshop is to bring together relevant data and owners. As part of this workshop a data 101 short presentation should be included. | Data Lead | Each participant will be asked to provide a short presentation on their work. Draft Data Register/Data Mapping exercise / Data source list | Incl. prep & post. 1 wk | List of data and owners |
| 4. | **Follow up on workshop – engagement and data gathering** | All stakeholders must provide their list of data to avoid project lag. The Data Officer will be contacting all owners, sourcing information about data, identifying any problems e.g. quality or/and access, and taking action. The Data Officer will support owners to help them provide data and seek assistance from ICT/Data team as required. **This is an iterative process – it will require the Officer to have discussions, reviews and meetings with owners** | Data Officer | Draft data register: Must include: log of all data sourced & received, work carried out prior to sharing, who receives data, its use, improvements, date published for project, or/and deleted by partner | 2 wks | List of data and owners; first data sets provided |
### 5. Data gathering and collation
This will be an intensive period of activity sourcing and preparing data for the project. It will be iterative.

The data that is gathered needs to be listed in the Data Register and stored locally on a Council server. Any personal data that is relevant to the project requires a DPIA. These should be completed by the data owner, but with assistance from the project data team. As part of this process Council or partner data needs to be reviewed initially for format, quality and accuracy by Council Officers/Data Officers.

**Criteria & Data cleansing tools (to be defined)/ External drive/**

**Agreed secure process for sharing, storage, publication**

| 6 wks | DPIAs, updated Data Register, Data sets gathered |

### 6. Data sharing process
The University (or other partner) needs to have access to the data that has been gathered for analysis. An agreement is required with the Council to do this. This can be a data sharing agreement that covers all project data. A process for sharing the data also needs to be agreed. In a live situation some data may be shared through CEC Mapping and Open Data Portals, or if non-sensitive can be shared on an encrypted drive.

**Data Officer/Partner resource**

| 4 wks | Collated data sets shared with partner |

### 7. Initial Analysis
The project partner (University or other) will carry out initial analysis based on the priority questions to be answered in the project. The Partner will provide high level

**Format?**

| 3wks | Initial analysis, clear findings to inform thinking on Phase1 and informed by findings from engagement Phase1. This phase can ask for more information, raise related questions, suggest |
initial findings to identify gaps in data, initial outputs, further work. For this to be produced as efficiently as possible the data must be provided in a machine-readable format, and with an appropriate licence as well as other requirements as specified by the partner for the project.

For this to be produced as efficiently as possible the data must be provided in a machine-readable format, and with an appropriate licence as well as other requirements as specified by the partner for the project.

| Tasks Phase 2 | 8. Phase 2 workshop | The Phase 2 workshop will present the findings from the Phase 1 workshop and investigate questions to be answered, prioritise the work, availability of data and sources. This will be collated for action. | Data Lead/Project Lead/Data Officer | Survey/Data Register/mapping exercise | Project team and stakeholders | Incl. prep & post. 1 wk |
| | 9. Data gathering | The initial findings from Phase 1 may recommend sourcing other supporting data to inform Phase 2 or to drill down into findings in more detail. **This work will be iterative and require meetings and comms to identify the data** | Data Officer | | Data Owners | 3 wks |
| | 10. Data collation | The data for Phase 2 that is gathered needs to be listed in the Data Register and stored locally on a Council server. As with Phase 1 any personal data that is relevant to the project requires a DPIA. These should be completed by the data owner, but with assistance from the project data team. As part of this process Council or partner data needs to be reviewed initially for format, activities to improve findings (and identify where there were challenges to aid future data management in the Council) | Data Lead and Data Officer | Data cleansing tools/External drive/ | | Data sets required to inform and improve the project

Data sets gathered | DPIAs, updated Data Register, Data sets gathered |
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Data sharing process</strong></td>
<td>This should follow the same steps as Phase 1.</td>
<td>Data cleansing tools/External drive/</td>
<td>CEC Data owners, partner Data Lead and resource</td>
<td>3 wks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Analysis</strong></td>
<td>The project partner (University or other) will carry out analysis based on requirements for Phase 2. Findings should follow agreed formats and be accessible for audiences.</td>
<td>Partner/Data Lead</td>
<td>Data tools</td>
<td>3 wks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Data Publication</strong></td>
<td>Data that has been used on the project and can be clearly cited in the final report should be published with the report. This can be published in more than one location e.g. Council website and Open Data Portal.</td>
<td>CEC and Partner Data resources</td>
<td>Web tools</td>
<td>3 wks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Report</strong></td>
<td>Final data activity is to feed the data findings into the full Project report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 1: Define the challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Workstream</th>
<th>Design Workstream</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Begin identifying datasets and documents held within the Council that might be relevant to the brief  
  - Baseline data: Planning, Roads, Cycle Infrastructure, Parks, Libraries, People Survey, SIMD, etc.  
  - Documents: Locality Action Plan, Local Development Plan, etc. | Create a brief that defines the Property goals for the project  
  - What are the specific opportunities for change?  
  - What are the priority issues that must be addressed?  
  - What are the key questions that the Council would like to have community input and insight on?  
  - Where are the greatest potential cost savings?  
  - Who are the internal and external stakeholders in this process?  
  - What are short- medium- and long-term expected impacts?  
  - Define Property KPIs | Preliminary data catalogue  
  Project brief - Property perspective Stakeholder map  
  Draft Engagement Plan |
| Identify relevant data from other services  
 Continue internal data gathering | Expand the brief to include interactions between Property and other services  
  - Host a meeting to introduce the project  
  - Collect input from services that are implicated in potential changes to Property  
  - Define other services’ KPIs  
  - Form a working group to meet at key stages in the project | Updated data catalogue  
  Updated project brief - Property and Council stakeholders perspectives  
  Preliminary project timeline and activities  
  Internal working group of service managers, data holders - also Strategy and Insight? |
| Work with comms to prepare an official document and communication channels to introduce the project.  
 Discuss the comms review process and identify which activities will require comprehensive approvals. | | Public-facing project summary  
 Project website and comms channels |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set the next meeting with comms to take place after the community co-design team has been formed.</th>
<th>Form a community co-design team  ● Initially present the project to as many community stakeholders as possible  ● Create a role description for team members that outlines the plan, timelines, methodology, and expected participation  ● The team should be a mix of community stakeholders who are interested in the project, see it as relevant to them and join the team voluntarily  ● Define community stakeholders’ KPIs</th>
<th>Data catalogue first draft  Data sharing agreements  Community co-design team with clearly articulated roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete preliminary data gathering, collation and sharing  Carry out initial data analysis to identify opportunities, plans, priorities, upcoming changes, etc.</td>
<td>Incorporate initial data analysis into Community Profile - discuss whether certain areas need further investigation  Continue exploratory data analysis based on KPIs and priorities of all project stakeholders. Identify data analysis that can contribute to evaluating KPIs.</td>
<td>Begin developing a first draft of the community profile in partnership with the data workstream  ● Who are the stakeholders?  ● What are the best channels and methods to reach people?  ● What do we already know about community values and priorities?  ● What initiatives / activities are currently happening / planned to happen (by the Council or other organisations)?  ● What issues have been identified from the data workstream?  Complete the project brief to include community perspectives  ● Carry out 1:1 interviews with the community co-design team and key community stakeholders  ● These should reflect the values and priorities of Council stakeholders, the community co-design team, and other community stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 2: Validate the challenge and imagine possible solutions / futures

### Data Workstream Design Workstream Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Workstream</th>
<th>Design Workstream</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present initial findings from data analysis for reflection and insight</td>
<td>Organise a planning workshop with Council stakeholders and the co-design team</td>
<td>Final project brief with data findings incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify how data work can help to evaluate KPIs</td>
<td>• Review project brief</td>
<td>Project activities timeline and plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following up on planning workshop, begin investigating priorities and issues</td>
<td>• Discuss initial data findings</td>
<td>Data visualisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop visualisations to be used in engagement activities</td>
<td>• Identify and reflect on assumptions about what the project will achieve</td>
<td>Finalise engagement activities plan, including data engagement activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design data engagement activities to integrate into project activities</td>
<td>• Collaboratively agree final project brief and KPIs, including priorities and issues that need to be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decide how the project will be communicated with the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ What decisions are being made?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ Why those decisions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ What is the background / context (findings from community profile and initial data analysis)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ How will community input influence those decisions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ What are the questions that need to be asked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ What are the stages of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>◦ What are the opportunities for participation and how will these be followed up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare a timeline and plan of project activities, working closely with the co-design team to understand how to design and plan the activities to fit within the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine the internal and external communications strategy and begin publicising project activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comms materials for publicising activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-design team should become the main communication channel to ensure that information reaches community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GUIDELINES: DATA AND DESIGN PROCESS**

## Part 2: Implement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Findings from first round of engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluate response to data visualisations and initial data findings      | Carry out engagement in a way that reaches as many people as possible (consult with Edinburgh Partnership / Community Engagement team about this). Involve the co-design team as much as possible without placing excessive demands on their time.  
  - Presentations at community group meetings  
  - Presentations / booth at community events and in public places  
  - Workshops with schoolchildren  
  - Online survey  
  - Spot interviews  
  - Interactive display  
  - Postcards |                                                                                                  |                                        |
| Data exploration and analysis of issues raised during engagement activities| Workshop to analyse and reflect on findings with Council stakeholders and community co-design team, prepare for phase 2  
  - Future visions: Draft master plan showing the interaction between building and service futures, placemaking and community participation / engagement  
  - Identify engagement methods for feedback on / input into master plan draft  
  - What can we prototype? How might we prototype it? | Placemaking master plan, including buildings, services and community participation with data findings incorporated  
Prototyping concepts - including data products (?) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Workstream</th>
<th>Design Workstream</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1: Prototyping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data exploration and analysis of issues raised through master plan feedback</td>
<td>Collect master plan feedback and input</td>
<td>Report on master plan feedback, including data findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and testing of data product prototypes (where possible)</td>
<td>○ Master plan displayed in various places in the community for people to comment on - something like a large wall display that they can write on.</td>
<td>Data product prototypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Mini-engagement events hosted around master plan - spot interviews, postcards, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Master plan presented at community group meetings and community events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Online survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Use of any other engagement methods / communication channels identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any creative ways to use data technologies to collect feedback on prototypes? E.g. sensors on public benches, people counters, chatbots, etc.?</td>
<td>Host prototyping events - draw on community co-design team to bring people together to create practical prototypes - park benches, a visionary ‘walk’ through the future community, pop-up spaces and activities, etc.</td>
<td>Prototypes designed and (if relevant) set up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing data work incorporated into new master plan</td>
<td>Reflect on findings and incorporate into new master plan</td>
<td>Updated master plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organise a community event where prototypes are ‘launched’ and input to master plan is discussed - this should be an interactive event for the whole family (bouncy</td>
<td>Prototyping festival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
castles??) and could possibly be aligned / co-organised with community organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 2: Conclusion / Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan communication methods, channels and activities going forward with the community co-design team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Communication with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Council communication with the co-design team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly communicate to the community what decisions will be made and when, how their input was incorporated, when and how they will have opportunities for further input, when changes will be made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication plan |