

**Grange Prestonfield Community Council**  
**Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> February, 2009**  
**Cameron House Community Education Centre.**

Present: Kate Arnott (Chairman), Sue Tritton (Vice-Chair and Acting Secretary), Andreas Grothey (Treasurer), John Palmer, Kirsty Pacitti, Mike Hunter, Myra Reid, Barbara Robertson, David Stevenson, Douglas Fisher (minutes), Joe Henderson, Alastair Pugh, Erick Davidson, Tony Harris, Mansour Ahmadian

In Attendance: Gordon Mackenzie (Councillor), Alan Stewart (C.E.C), Ray Footman (Blacket Association) and two members of the public.

Apologies: Graham Brown, Maureen Edwards

The Chairman A welcome was extended to all present, our first meeting in the new Cameron House Community Education Centre. A particular welcome was extended to our two guests for this evening: Councillor Phil Wheeler, Transport Convener with The City of Edinburgh Council and Lawrence Marshall, Chairman of Capital Rail Action Group. Our guests then spoke on the item below

South Suburban Railway: Councillor Wheeler spoke first and provided background to the discussions that have taken place about reinstating a service on the South Edinburgh Suburban Line. Tavish Scott MSP when he was the Transport Minister, in the previous government, had commissioned a study in 2007 to see if a business case could be made for reinstating a service on this line. The 3 main organizations involved in the study were: the City of Edinburgh Council, the Scottish Government and South East of Scotland Transport Partnership (SEStran). Subsequently SEStran withdrew from the study. The actual study was carried out by Halcrow, a commercial sign and consultancy commercial company who specialise in major infrastructure projects. This study was repeated in 2008 and in both cases it was not possible to make a business case for the proposal. This was still the case when a hybrid option, a tram that could also run on rail lines, was explored. At the very least a subsidy of a minimum of two million pounds would be required to operate the service each year. Councillor Wheeler was of the view that in the current financial climate it would be most unlikely that the South Suburban Railway would be revived. He did however see the merit in keeping this possible development under active discussion and in the public forum.

Lawrence Marshall let the meeting know about his lengthy involvement with Capital Rail Action Group. He stated that if the scheme was reintroduced it would be possible to travel from one side of the city e.g. Portobello through to Haymarket very quickly, and much faster than by any other means of transport. Unlike the current tram project there was no need for track to be laid – it already exists and is used currently for freight and some passenger services moving from the west to the east coastlines south. It would also be possible to have an electric

system that was suitable for a train/tram hybrid system. (The line is not currently electrified but the view was put forward that it would be strange for Network Rail not to electrify this small section of the line when it intends to do this with the lines that border this section of track.) Regarding subsidies Mr Marshall advised the meeting that unlike other areas of Scotland especially the Strathclyde area residents of Edinburgh and its near neighbours did not have much in the way of a local commuter service or subsidy. Extra trains were available to commute into Edinburgh from the west and Fife but no programme existed for residents.

The speakers then took questions. In conclusion the Chairman thanked both speakers for presenting on a topic that is of great interest to many residents in our area.

Minutes of the last meeting: The minutes had been circulated and were a true record of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> of January. This was proposed by Andreas Grothey and seconded by Tony Harris.

Matters arising not covered by agenda: The Chairman informed the meeting that it had been established that the Blacket Association had necessary documentation with the City of Edinburgh Council and is registered as an Interest Group. The Chairman proposed that Ray Footman, Chairman of the Blacket Association joined the community council as a nominated member. This proposal was seconded by Sue Tritton, and Ray Footman was welcomed as a Nominated Member of the council

#### Reports:

Police There was an apology from Lothian and Borders Police. The Vice Chairman handed out copies of the police news letter. This was followed by a brief discussion on whether it was possible to have the same police officer attend our meetings for continuity. All noted that the shift pattern officers follow may make this difficult The Chairman agreed to speak to Inspector Horan on this matter.

Alan Stewart (Edinburgh Council) reported on:-

- A. the Fairer Scotland Resources Meeting
- B. there are funds available through the Neighbourhood Partnership that can give grants up to £5,000 for community projects
- C. It was hoped that within the next 2 to 3 weeks we would hear which projects would be considered for the Roads Funding.
- D. Details of local road works are available at the Traffic Scotland website.

## Reports of Office Bearers

Chairman The Chairman, Kate Arnott, intimated that she had attended planning meeting for the Week of Action that affects the Southside Community Council's area, particularly the cleaning up of the area along Nicolson Street to Salisbury Place. She reported on the environmental /cleaning tasks that are scheduled and hoped such a scheme could be rolled out in the future for our area. She also reported on the Neighbourhood Partnership Meeting and the composition of the committee dealing with the Capital Roads Fund. The Chairman plus Jo Scott from The Southside Community Council would represent the community councils in our Neighbourhood. The council was also advised that the City of Edinburgh had held a consultation meeting for the residents of Priestfield and Prestonfield on the possibility of an extension of Controlled Parking Zones into their area. This event had been set up without any notification and consultation with the community council. The meeting was advised by Councillor Mackenzie, one of the elected representatives for the area on the city council, that he had also not been informed of the meeting. A complaint had been lodged by the community council and an apology received.

Treasurer: The Treasurer, Andreas Grothey, gave details of the funds held by the council. There was £767.01. There is an outstanding sum of £60 still to be deducted leaving a projected balance of £707.01.

Discussion took place on how the money in our account could be used as we will get the next grant come the beginning of the financial year. Suggestions made included the purchase of display material, advertising, improving our links with the community. How best to use the monies available will be discussed at a future meeting.

Secretary: The Secretary Sue Tritton intimated that there is a meeting of the Edinburgh Civic Forum at 4.30 on Tuesday the 17<sup>th</sup> of March in The City Chambers. There is also a meeting on Licensing at 10.00am on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> of March and a Council Group Leaders panel on Saturday the 23<sup>rd</sup> of May. Details are available from the Secretary.

The meeting was advised that the Secretary has been informed of the timetable for Community Council Elections that fall in the autumn of this year. This plus our AGM in May will be discussed in our March meeting.

## Interest Groups

### Planning:

Tony Harris had circulated his report. See Annex A. This report covers the following areas: - Household Permitted Development Rights, CEC Engagement with Community Councils Details of an appeal re the refusal of a planning application for a separate dwelling in the grounds of 3 Craigmillar Park and the

Street Naming Workshop he had attended.

Roads and Transport: John Palmer spoke to his report. The City of Edinburgh Council is still working through the responses to the S6 CPZ proposals. He then reported on the CPZ consultation in Prestonfield, details of this are available in his report at Annex B. This section finished with discussion on the continued difficulties around the *bus gate* on Priestfield Road. Would CCTV and signage on this matter have an effect? It was also report that if you looked for directions online to get to Cameron House you were instructed to go through the bus gates. Is this also the case with onboard navigation systems?

Environment: Sue Tritton spoke to the Environment Report that had been distributed, see Annex C.

Communications: Andreas Grothey had run a session for council members on how to access and post on the Discussion Forum and our Website.

Community Council Scheme:

Sue Tritton circulated to the members copies of the City of Edinburgh Council 'Scheme for Community Councils'. It is a long document and she asked that members look at the report and respond with any thoughts within a few days. A response to the council is required by the end of February.

Meeting Dates in 2009: **The next meeting is at 7.00pm on the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2009 in Cameron House Community Education Centre.** Any member of the council wishing to take up the offer from Deidre to show them round the new centre should come along at 6.30pm. There was further discussion on what was the best evening for the community council to meet. The pros and cons of meeting on Tuesdays or Wednesday were discussed but no decision was arrived at. Members should make their views known on this matter to the Secretary.

AOCB and Open Forum:

The Chairman opened the meeting up for AOCB and questions from the public. No items were put forward. The Chairman thanked all for coming and closed the meeting.

Annex A Planning Group's Report  
Annex B Roads and Transport Group's Report  
Annex C Environmental Group's Group Report

**Grange/Prestonfield Community Council  
Planning Group**

**Report – February 2009**

**Members:** Tony Harris, Sue Tritton, Barbara Robertson, Kirsty Pacitti, James Bryce

**Householder Permitted Development Rights – Consultation Paper**

The Scottish Government has issued for consultation proposals to extend the existing rights which householders have to allow some forms of development without applying for planning consent. The key changes are:-

Increasing the limit on such development from 30 to 40% of the curtilage  
Increasing the proportion of the permitted increase from 10% of internal floor area to 50% of the development footprint, as defined, subject to a height limit.  
Relaxing restrictions on roof alterations on rear & side elevations to allow dormers etc.  
Relaxing restrictions on development near roads.  
Introducing new rights covering decking, small porches and alterations to chimneys.

Other changes are being introduced on height restriction and to standard conditions to prevent overdevelopment as a consequence of these relaxations, which will apply only to existing dwelling houses and generally not to flats or buildings containing flats. The intention is to reduce the cost of planning applications to householders and to planning authorities.

Existing householder permitted development rights are in general already withdrawn in conservation areas and within the curtilage of listed buildings and it is not intended to change this situation, so that these areas and properties will continue to be excluded from these relaxations as at present. Therefore, the effect of these relaxations within the GPCC area will be limited, as about 50% of the build up area has conservation area status and the rest of the GPCC area contains significant numbers of buildings with flats, but the relaxations should be of benefit to some householders without serious detriment to their environment.

The consultation period expires on 13 March 2009 and there is a questionnaire which can be completed to support or suggest changes to the proposals. Full details are available via the Scottish Government website <[www.scotland.gov.uk](http://www.scotland.gov.uk)> following links via “publications” to the above title. Any queries from CC Members about these proposals, I will try to answer or obtain a response.

### **CEC – engagement with Community Councils**

Following last month's report there has been a further letter dated 2 February from CEC requesting completion of a questionnaire by 27 February about the forthcoming planning changes. New arrangements, expected to take effect before the end of the year, have been placed before the Scottish Parliament, covering pre-application consultation, pre-determination hearings, neighbour notification etc. The relationship between CEC Planning, Neighbourhood Partnerships and Community Councils still seems to be very much a "work in progress".

### **Appeal Decision on Application 07/01568/FUL - 3 Craigmillar Park EH16 5PG**

This planning application was for a separate dwelling in the grounds of this villa, together with an application for change of use of the villa from guesthouse to dwellings with suitable alterations. The application was controversial and the CEC Development Management Sub-committee approved the change of use and villa alterations, but refused the additional dwelling. This refusal was appealed and the Appeal Reporter has upheld the decision to refuse the additional dwelling citing reasons which may well have a wider applicability for similar conservation area applications.

### **Street Naming Workshop**

Not a planning issue, but reported here for convenience. This event, arranged by the South Central NP at the Eric Liddell Centre on 27 January, was attended by representatives from Tollcross CC, Merchiston CC and GPCC and given by the CEC Street Naming Team. The intention is to create a "bank" of suitable local names to use for new streets which can be put forward for final approval, which process also involves local ward councillors. This is an opportunity for anyone interested to research a suitable name, which should commemorate a local person, event or place, and which in the first instance should be put forward with supporting justification to the NP Development Officer via our GPCC NP Member. There are naming rules to follow and these are attached.

Tony Harris  
Planning Group GPCC

## Street Name Rules

1. New street names should try to avoid duplicating any similar name already in use in a town/village or in the same postcode area.
2. New street names should be easily understood over the telephone in the event of an emergency (they should be easy to spell and pronounce).
3. The adoption of names having no more than three syllables should be avoided where possible.
4. Names should have little scope for ambiguity in the spelling of the name.
5. Use of punctuation such as commas, apostrophes, full stops, hyphens, slashes etc, should be avoided.
6. The names of living persons, or very recently deceased are not permitted for street names.
6. Use of a person's first name should be avoided in street names, unless additional identification is necessary to prevent duplication or confusion.
5. Use of abbreviations is not permitted (except for St for Saint)
6. We will not adopt any unofficial 'marketing' titles used by developers in the sale of new properties.
7. Historic practices which have resulted in many streets in close proximity being assigned the same name but with a differing suffix is no longer acceptable.
8. Similar sounding names from those already in use is not permitted e.g road bridge street or broad bridge street

**GRANGE PRESTONFIELD CC  
Roads and Transport Report, 18/2/2009**

**CPZ: S6**

I met Andrew Walker, CEC Transport Officer, at the Prestonfield CPZ consultation. He informed me he was still working through the responses to the S6 consultation. A report would go to the May meeting of the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment committee.

**Prestonfield / Priestfield CPZ Consultation**

An exhibition of the proposals was held at Prestonfield Primary School on Wed 11<sup>th</sup> February. It was reasonably well attended with approximately 50 people there. The process is the same as with S6; if those who respond to the consultation now are in support, then CEC will come forward with a definite scheme for statutory consultation, to which they have to ask for objections.

The scheme is to cover from Peffermill Road to the south to Marchhall Road in the north. It seemed very much a standard scheme, mostly residents' permits with few shared use.

Opinion seemed to be evenly divided:

- People from Prestonfield did not see the need for it; it is not a particularly high car-owning area and they do not suffer from commuter parking.
- People from Priestfield were however much more in favour; although numbers of them do have off-road parking, they still suffer from commuter parking.

The views of one of those attending are worth quoting in full:

- "From personal experience and my own observations, I would imagine that commuter parking directly affects residents more at the top-end of Priestfield Rd and in the Kilmaurs, Kirkhill Rd, Prestonfield Gdns./Rd streets. That is to say, in streets that are very close to the A7/Dalkeith Rd and (being terraced or tenements) have no off-street parking. Most, if not all, of the properties further down Priestfield Road (and in the Crescent, Avenue and Gardens) have off-street parking options. This assumption is backed-up by the split in opinion that seemed to be evident at the drop-in surgery – those living closer to the city-centre were in favour of the CPZ extension, while those on the fringes of the proposed zone were against it."
- "Streets closer to the city centre/Dalkeith Road could be Permit Holder parking areas, while those on the fringes of the proposed extension zone could be single yellow lines prohibiting parking first thing in the

morning. (Single yellows of this nature might also be more appropriate in parts of Prestonfield.)”

- “The streets mentioned above could be treated as part of the proposed S6 rather than as a distinct area J associated with the south Priestfield and Prestonfield areas that do not share the same problem.”

The argument for putting controls in place in Prestonfield is to prevent displacement of commuter parking from Priestfield. The problem with putting in only the minimum necessary to prevent this is the cost involved; as no income is likely to result the Council could not afford to do this. We however would argue there may be solutions to this by having some 9 hour shared use bays in the area and cutting down on signage – the area is very enclosed with few entrances and exits.

Other issues: A number of residents of Priestfield Road complained about the ineffectiveness of the bus-gate, speeding drivers particularly at the bend in the road and the number of coaches going back and forth to Prestonfield House Hotel in the evenings (4 trips each). This is evidence for the proposal we made for speed bumps.

### **Capital Road Proposals**

No up-date

### **Mayfield / West Savile Terrace**

No up-date.

John Palmer  
Roads and Transport

### **Environmental Report for 18<sup>th</sup> February 2009**

Members: Sue Tritton, Myra Reid, Maureen Edwards, Barbara Robertson, Andreas Grothey

### **Environmental Forum 2 – 28<sup>th</sup> January 2009**

Sue Tritton, Barbara Robertson, Maureen Edwards and Kate and Bert Arnott normally attend these meetings.

Angus Murdoch (CEC) gave a presentation on Waste Management and Recycling in the city. Edinburgh's recycling rate is now over 30% - making it one of the best performing cities. But the aim is to reach 50% by 2012(?). He said that there is no problem in getting collected material recycled at present although the price for some materials had dropped; the continuing market for recycled materials is partly due to the separation of materials at collection. There is still a ban on siting glass recycling containers in residential areas (because of the noise problems). Some tenemental areas are now being provided with individual blue and red boxes. It is intended that the collection of plastics will be extended to include plastic boxes as well as bottles. There are now collection bins for batteries in the Civic Amenity sites and the Council is investigating providing bins for low-energy light bulbs.

Kathy Evans said that the "Week of Action" to clean up the area from Nicolson Street to Salisbury Place will take place from 16-20 March. Kate Arnott is on the Working Group for this project. Ironside Farrar (consultants) has been approached by the Council to produce an "Environmental Improvement Plan" for this area and full consultation is planned for late March. There is, at present, no further funding identified but it is hoped that some improvements could be funded from Community grants. Again, it is hoped that any proposals can be extended into our area.

The next meeting will be a joint meeting of Forums 1 and 2 – partly to decide how the Capital Roads Fund should be allocated (allocation meeting is April 29<sup>th</sup>). Kate Arnott and Jo Scott (Southside Community Council) have submitted a motion to the next Neighbourhood Partnership meeting for proposed voting rights for the Capital Roads Funding projects (Councillors 8 votes, Forum 1 and 2 members 8 votes each, Housing Area Board 3 votes).

**Dates of Future Meetings (normally held in Nicolson Square Church 7-9pm)**  
**Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2009 (Joint meeting with Forum 1 – Venue tbc)**  
**Wednesday May 27<sup>th</sup> 2009**

*Sue Tritton*  
*16<sup>th</sup> February 2009*