

Grange Prestonfield Community Council

15 November 2017

Draft minutes for approval at next meeting

Present: Janet Sidaway (Chair, **JS**), Mike Hunter (Vice-chair, **MH**), Andreas Grothey (Treasurer, **AG**), 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**), Maureen Edwards (**ME**), Eileen Francis (**EF**), Ellen-Raissa Jackson (**ERJ**)

Apologies: Doreen Allerton, Denis Stevens

Absent: Irene Hood, Philip Murray

Disqualified: Henry Mulligan (HM)

In Attendance: PC Neil Mackay (**NM**), two (2) members of the public.

1. Welcome

JS welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest

FG reminded the Community Council that he had a professional interest in a pending planning application. He would play no role in Community Council processes relating to it.

3. 20 Duncan Street

The Community Council heard a presentation from Kenneth Dyer of Hendry and MacDonald Garage, and Ken Reid from Kenneth Reid Architects about a new application for student flats in Duncan St. Details would be available on the usual Council website and an application was likely to be imminent.

4. South East Locality Improvement Plan

Andrew Gallagher (**AGa**), Lifelong Learning Service Manager for South East locality at the City of Edinburgh Council gave a presentation.

The 2015 Community Empowerment Act placed obligations on the Council and other CPP partners to plan and deliver services around the needs of communities, and to do so in a way that involved them. The local outcome improvement plans that resulted would replace local community plans, and would have the aim of achieving better outcomes for those experiencing greatest inequality. One advantage was that they would cover the same boundaries for the various public sector agencies involved. For South East Edinburgh there would be five themes – place making; children, young people and families; economy and employment; health and wellbeing; community safety.

There had been extensive engagement with different groups, and in different formats to inform the plan since November 2016, by the Council and other partners. There had also been analysis of a range of different data sets. **MH** asked about a lack of consultation with GPCC. **AGa** said that the GPCC had been at Neighbourhood Partnership meetings where it had been discussed, but accepted there had been a mix up over direct engagement with GPCC.

The next stages for the plan were: presentation for City of Edinburgh Council endorsement on 5 December, and the Edinburgh Partnership on 7 December. Engagement on citywide arrangements for localities would then start in December. **JS** asked for a written update for the next Community Council meeting.

MH asked about the status of the existing Neighbourhood Partnerships. **AGa** said that they will still exist until something comes in to replace them. We were behind in terms of formation of locality area partnerships, because of the thorough discussions about how best to construct them.

JN said it was hard to understand why we had Neighbourhood Partnerships as well as Community Councils. Was there going to be more clarity about allocation of functions between these different layers, particularly if introducing new localities. **AGa** said he hoped to table an update at the January meeting about units. It was a chance to reflect on whether existing arrangements had worked well or not.

TH noted that the whole business had been of serious concern to the EACC, who had had correspondence with the leader of the Council about ending one system without a replacement. They were concerned about what would happen in terms of representation of community councils, particularly given inconsistency of engagement thus far. **AGa** said that the next stage in consultation was conversations with Community Councils about how they will be involved.

JS noted that a committee had been set up to look at the future of Neighbourhood Partnerships and adjudicate where responsibilities should lie. There did not seem to be much transparency in this process. Where there is a proposal, we would be able to feed into the process.

ERJ said the plan seemed too aspirational and lacking in detail about what will happen. What can we do to make this work better than NPs? **AGa** noted that it was a partnership plan – there to deliver the things that can only be done in partnership, and not intended to replace service specific plans. The difference also comprised the legislation, the statutory underpinning. Partners were required to deliver it. Input might be at the level of Neighbourhood Partnership or locality area committee – but communities might have a voice. GPCC may want to have a later discussion, without **AGa** present, about how they wanted to do this.

HP thought that it was an ambitious plan, and wondered how it would be administered? **AGa** said that ward members will be part of the governance framework that oversee the delivery of the plan. Locality area committees or Neighbourhood Partnerships would scrutinise, with input also for Community Councils. The workstreams would deliver the plan.

ST noted that the next GPCC meeting was 17 January. It would be totally appropriate if the report could be with us a week before that, so we could brief our representative.

5. Minutes of the Meeting 17 October 2017

Proposed by **TH**; seconded by **FG**.

6. Matters Arising not covered by agenda

Henry Mulligan had attended one Community Council meeting since being elected, in spite of correspondence from the Vicechair on 22 October (to which he had not received a reply). This level of non-attendance made his disqualification automatic, according to the scheme of Community Councils, and so he was no longer a member of this Community Council. The Vicechair would write to him to that effect.

All agreed that the GPCC 10th anniversary party at City Chambers had been an outstanding success, largely thanks to the hard work of **ST**. We should also send a “thank you” GPCC Christmas card to Alison Dickie’s PA, and Cllr Rose for his excellent speech. **ST** said that she had received £300 in contributions, but had not yet received the invoice from the Council. Once this was received, we would know about the financial position, and the options for using surplus cash.

7. External Reports

a) Police Report:

PC Neil Mackay briefed the Community Council. Last month had seen the culmination of an ongoing police operation, with the execution of a misuse of drugs warrant in the area, and the seizure of £9,000 worth of crack cocaine and cash. Two people had been arrested, and Police Scotland were working with Council housing officers on a possible eviction. The public should get in touch by dialling 101 or via Crimestoppers if they had further info

A 49 year old male had been identified for housebreaking in the Grange. **NM** reminded the Council of an anticipated spike in housebreaking at the time of year.

Police Scotland officers had been present in the Meadows and King’s Building on 8 November to promote safe night time cycling.

There had been an increase in reports of thefts from vehicles from Grange and Morningside. Police Scotland advice was to leave nothing inside cars, including money or electronic items.

There had been a large deployment of officers for Operation Pumpkin – around Bonfire night. Some instances of antisocial behaviour had been reported in the area, but nothing compared to the north of city. Nothing had been reported in terms of attacks on the police or the Fire and Rescue Service.

Earlier this month Police Scotland had charged a number of youths with offences such as cycle theft and abusive behaviour. They continued to work with the school and to divert them off the streets.

b) Councillor’s report

Councillor CR had nothing to report.

In response to questions, he advised that the Council had admitted that they were behind in terms of responsive services, eg leaf clearing and street lighting.

ME asked about dim street lighting and whether it had been a pilot. **CR** said that it had been adopted now, to extend through most of the city. The issue was that the white light makes the non-lit areas darker. It did save a lot of money, and was centrally controlled, so could be turned up for special locations. If there was a specific case, people should let **CR** know (**ME** advised Prestonfield Gardens, and **CR** said he would look into it). In response to another question from

ME, CR said that it was possible to change traffic lights settings to deter people from driving through red lights. If someone committed an offence, you can report them to the police but need evidence. The prospect of more cameras was remote.

8. Reports of Interest Groups

a) Planning/Licensing

TH had nothing to report on licensing.

The planning report had been circulated, and decisions were not required at this meeting.

ERJ asked about a new planning application in Priestfield. **TH** said he would study further, and invite comments. There was a long history to this application. **GSD** said that we planned to reach out to the community on it. The closing date was 29 November.

b) Roads/Transport

GSD circulated the first draft of the Priestfield residents' priority parking questionnaire. **FG** noted that survey monkey only allowed 10 questions for free: he would look at alternative options. **GSD** said that the transport subgroup would look at it. He estimated leaflets would be needed for 600 properties. We needed to include Dalkeith Rd residents who fall within the B7 zone. **GSD** was still getting lots of Emails about parking issues.

c) Communications

MH and **FG** said that the new website was still waiting for comment/input – the link would be sent to all. **ERJ** also circulated a small size leaflet from another Community Council as an example of what we could do.

d) Newington Cemetery

TH noted that there had been no recent sub group meetings. **JS** said that there would be dedications of the new tombstones for Joseph van Someron Taylor on 19 November at 11h00.

e) Environment (including Astley Ainslie)

ST said she had no update on Astley Ainslie, as the NHS had not yet replied to her enquiries.

ST had been lobbying Councillors about a continued failure to conduct leaf clearing. This was becoming dangerous. It was suggested that direct complaint to the relevant department was the best approach for immediate action. We should contact Councillors and the helpline to raise the pressure.

9. Reports from Office Bearers

a) Chair's report

JS thanked the sub group chairs. She noted how **JG** had filled in as note-taking secretary when **ST** stepped down as Secretary. He would prefer not to continue that from now on. **JS** invited Community Councillors to have discussions about how best to configure the Secretary role, mindful of the statutory obligations, on which we should consult the Council. **TH, ERJ** and **JG** offered to help. **ERJ** offered to take the minutes in January.

b) Treasurer's report

As of the last statement the balance in the account was £5496.46. £3391.72 had been received from private donations and SCNP for specific projects in Newington Cemetery so the Community Council had £2104.74 of its grant money available.

c) Secretary's report

JG had nothing to report.

10. Reports of Outside Groups

a) SCNP and subgroups

The position had been covered under agenda item 4.

b) EACC

TH had put the notice of the AGM in the circulation file: it was on 25 November from 10h00 to 12h00. Everyone was welcome as an Edinburgh Community Councillor, although if there were a vote there would only be one vote per Community Council. **TH** would be going.

11. AOCB (including items from The Public)

FG noted that he was soon to become geographically ineligible to continue as a member of the GPCC. He would continue with work on the website and questionnaire, prior to a handover.

Date of next meeting: 17 January 2018