

# **Grange Prestonfield Community Council**

## **Cameron House Community Education Centre**

**18 October 2017**

### **Draft minute**

**Present:** Janet Sidaway (Chair, **JS**), Mike Hunter (Vice-chair, **MH**), Joe Griffin (Secretary, **JG**), Ian Chisholm (**IC**), Graham Dann (**GSD**), Fraser Graham (**FG**), Tony Harris (**TH**), Julian Newman (**JN**), Henry Philip (**HP**), William Reid (**WR**), David Stevenson (**DaS**), Sue Tritton (**ST**), Cllr Cameron Rose (**CR**).

**Apologies:** Andreas Grothey (Treasurer), Doreen Allerton, Maureen Edwards, Eileen Francis, Irene Hood, Ellen-Raissa Jackson, Henry Mulligan, Ian Murray MP.

**Absent:** Philip Murray, Denis Stevens.

**In Attendance:** Two (2) members of the public.

#### **1. Welcome**

**JS** welcomed everyone to the meeting. We had received apologies from Sarah Burns, from the City of Edinburgh Council, who had been expected to make a presentation on developments on the local outcome improvement plan.

#### **2. Declarations of Interest**

**FG** said he was going to be involved with a development and planning application on Priestfield Road, in a professional capacity. He noted that he would therefore have no involvement in the community council process in relation to that, which may be triggered between meetings.

#### **3. Minutes of the Meeting 20 September 2017**

Some comments had been received in writing and the draft amended. **BR** proposed the minutes; **TH** seconded.

#### **4. Matters Arising not covered by agenda**

The community council had not yet received a response from Gilmerton-Straiton community council. It was agreed to give them more time to reply.

#### **5. External Reports**

##### **a) Police Report:**

PC Neil Mackay had submitted his apologies, as he was on leave. In a written update to the chair, he had noted it would be difficult to get the statistics we had discussed at the last meeting, as the Police IT system did not present them in the form requested. He provided information on how to contact the relevant contacts on Neighbourhood Watch matters, which the chair had circulated to GPCC members.

##### **b) Councillor's report**

**Cllr CR** said that he hoped to have copies of maps relevant to the 10 year anniversary of the GPCC for the reception at Council Chambers. **ST** asked about the Council motion supporting the City of Edinburgh remaining in the European Union. **CR** noted that this was beyond the Council's powers.

#### **6. South East Locality Improvement Plan**

**JS** noted that Sarah Burns had shared a written report with the community council. The Council consideration of the plan and associated arrangements had been deferred to 14 November, so was not yet approved. There had been no decision taken to disband neighbourhood partnerships, and therefore the current arrangements were still in place, albeit with no meetings scheduled. **MH** noted that there had been wide consultation, but not with community councils. **TH** agreed: at the most recent EACC meeting, representatives of the Council's Insight and Strategy Team had been criticised for ending one set of

arrangements without finalising the new ones. This was perhaps unfair, if the decisions rested with elected members. **CR** said that there were two issues. First, the local outcome improvement plan. There was a requirement to submit these to the Scottish Government by 31 October. The Council would miss this deadline, but would submit in due course. The second issue was how localities were going to be managed. It was always envisaged that these decisions would be taken once the new Council administration was formed. The approach was to analyse the potential in four large areas, with an elected member leading the work on each. There could be individual local arrangements, but with some things in common across the city – including meeting the Scottish Government commitment to participatory budgeting and other forms of civic involvement. The pace of this work had been slow, but there was real potential for more delegation of powers and decision making to community council level. **JS** noted that Sarah Burns and/or a colleague would try and come to the next meeting.

## **7. Arrangements for 10th Anniversary**

**ST** reminded the community council that this would be from 18h30 to 20h30 on 8 November. **CR** had agreed to give the official welcome to the event (given his close association with the community council: he had been returning officer for all the community council elections). A number of previous members, including former chairs were going to attend, as were representatives from neighbouring community councils. It had been previously agreed that every current member would contribute £20 per head. Photos would be welcome; **CR** would cover privacy considerations in his opening remarks.

## **8. Newington Library**

There was no update.

## **9. Reports of Interest Groups**

### **a) Planning/Licensing**

**TH** had circulated the planning report in advance: there were no decisions required at this meeting.

An objection had been submitted by GPCC on a development on Priestfield Road, following discussion at the last meeting. There had been 18 public comments on the planning portal by the deadline.

The GPCC had previously discussed, and objected to, a potential development at the Hendry & Macdonald garage site at Duncan Street. Following refusal of the last two applications, the community council had now been approached by the site owner, with the offer of a presentation about revised proposals. This would happen at the November meeting.

**TH** mentioned the notification of a telecom mast being erected at Craigmillar golf course, as a permitted development. This followed a change of policy at Edinburgh University, who no longer allowed third parties' materials on their buildings (i.e. in this case at King's Buildings).

On proposed housing on the site of the Blind school, the developer was not yet ready to take forward the formal part of planning process – and was still dealing with historic issues of the site.

The City of Edinburgh Planning Committee had considered a Housing Land Audit and Delivery Programme – to determine what housing sites were available in Edinburgh and how delivery is matching up to that. This more sophisticated approach from the committee was welcome – with the conclusion that there is adequate supply for next 5 years, and it is delivery that is not keeping pace.

There was further training on 31 October on planning for community councillors, relating to changes to listed buildings and conservation areas, including on how street names are decided.

**TH** had had notification on the Calton Hill draft management plan. The community council shouldn't comment, but individual councillors might be and wish to comment directly.

**HP** said that he was concerned about a proposal for a minimum standard of parking in design guidance. **TH** noted that it had been consulted on: most community councils did not like it and GPCC had objected.

**ST** noted lots of building work underway at St Thomas Road and Fountainhall Road. There was a concern about damage done to the pavements. She would email **TH** the details, and he would follow up.

### **b) Roads/Transport**

**GSD** said he had emailed all community councillors about parking issues at Priestfield, and the ongoing issues with residents' priority parking in the B7 zone. **JS** noted that a few community councillors had worked hard to organise a public meeting, with a venue and date agreed, but Council officials were not able to commit themselves to an evening meeting. **GSD** said that this was still a possibility, once more data had been gathered.

After lengthy correspondence with Council officers, **GSD** was trying to decide how best to carry out a local survey/questionnaire. There were two options, not necessarily mutually exclusive. 1) a paper questionnaire or 2) using an online tool, such as "survey monkey." Various views were offered, and the following points raised: the need to reach as many people as possible; to not exclude people who would not engage digitally; the need to avoid more than one response from individuals; any potential issues relating to the storage of responses and responsibilities under data protection legislation. The community council agreed that we should give people option of paper or online, and ask them to include their postcode. It was also agreed to restrict coverage to the B7 zone. The content and format of the questionnaire would be delegated to the transport sub group.

**JS** suggested we could progress in later months to a more general survey of local residents to find out their interests.

A member of the public asked about a related issue, i.e. any regulations governing use of cones outside her house, to reserve space for tradesmen undertaking works. **CR** said that there were no enforceable regulations here, but it was possible to apply for a TTRO. He would be happy to help offline.

**ST** noted that (acting under Grange Association auspices) she was meeting a Council official for a revised plan about crossings on Grange Road. She would ask about any plans to contact the community council.

**ST** also raised the issue of disabled parking bays in her street being removed once they were no longer needed. She had pursued the relevant procedure – to no satisfaction yet. She would pursue offline with **CR**.

### **c) Communications**

**FG** gave a presentation on the website refresh, which was well received. He had used a free tool, which among other things, adjusted the template to respond to different devices. **JS** requested access to look at it offline and that would act as a prompt for us to provide feedback and input. **ST** said that we need to be careful about how describe local interest groups. In minutes we should refer to sub groups, rather than interest groups which risks confusion.

**MH** noted how **FG** had also got Facebook working effectively, and he (**MH**) has been adding material. **ERJ** was also mobilising a GPCC Twitter account.

### **d) Newington Cemetery**

102 visitors had been recorded on Doors Open day – there had probably been more on the day. Large number of volunteers, leading and supporting different events, including **ERJ** on a nature trail; **TH** talking

about Commonwealth War Grave internee James Brown; and **JS** talking about JVS Taylor, as an example of the cemetery's great diversity.

The next Committee meeting was on 11 October – **JS** had stepped down temporarily as secretary of the group. **ERJ** was taking the notes of the meetings, with Barbara McNaught and **TH** doing secretarial links in between. Committee meeting had talked about Doors Open Day, future events and meetings, committee roles, and strategic objectives. **TH** also mentioned geophysics studies on the catacombs and the studies being undertaken which are free to the Council.

#### **e) Environment (including Astley Ainslie)**

**ST** said that developments in relation to the Astley Ainslie were proceeding very slowly. NHS Lothian had appointed the consultants who were developing a masterplan for the site. The timescales were not clear, including when the next meeting would be. Organised walking tours of the site in the autumn had been very well attended.

**ST** also called for more leaf sweeping to be carried out on local streets.

### **10. Reports from Office Bearers**

#### **a) Chair's report**

**JS** thanked those working hard on the community council's business. She noted that the more work could be done through sub groups, the more we can focus on strategic issues at plenary meetings. We can set up new ones if there is an interest, or people should feel free to join. We would recirculate the membership lists.

#### **b) Treasurer's report**

**AG** (not present) had nothing to report.

#### **c) Secretary's report**

**JG** had nothing to report.

### **11. Reports of Outside Groups**

#### **a) SCNP and subgroups**

These groups had not met – as covered earlier in the meeting.

#### **b) EACC**

**TH** said that the EACC had met on 12 October – with a presentation from development plan team on housing land audit. EACC have set up sub group on health and social care integration, which is something GPCC might consider discussing as well. The EACC AGM is on 25 November, starting at 10h00. This was open to all community councillors.

### **13. AOCB (including items from The Public)**

None (although **FG** raised the point covered under declarations of interest, above).

**Date of next meeting: 15 November 2017**