

## West End Community Council

2 February 2015 at Ashfield, 61 Melville Street, Edinburgh

Present: Jock Miller (Chair), Alan Weddell, Isabel Thom, Ian Robertson, Gordon Renton, Rory O’Riordan, Martha Baur, Gordon Wylie

In attendance: Susan Purnell (Police), Seona Flemming (Police), Katharine Huxter (minutes).

Discussion	Action
<p><b>1. Apologies and welcome</b> Apologies were received from Marco Biagi MSP, Sarah Boyack MSP, Cameron Buchanan MSP, Cllr. Joanna Mowat, Cllr. Alasdair Rankin, Cllr. Karen Doran, Colin Johnston.</p>	
<p><b>2. Minutes of meetings held on 5 January 2016</b> Accepted subject to a few changes.</p>	
<p><b>3. Matters Arising</b> <u>1 September 2015</u></p> <p>JM to write to KS with further details of the ARTWESTART proposals. <b>Outstanding.</b> WECC discussed the proposals. GR suggested a triangular route linking the West end of Princes Street, Haymarket and the North. JM met with a representative of the portrait gallery. <b>Completed</b></p> <p>JM to enquire at Haymarket visit regarding signs for “Alight here for the Gallery of Modern Art.” <b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>6 October 2015</u></p> <p>Cllr JM to investigate whether it is possible to influence the routes on Google Maps. <b>Completed.</b></p> <p>Cllr JM to look for more info regarding conditions on HMOs. <b>Completed</b></p> <p>Cllr JM to chase response as to when Magdala bins will be emptied. <b>Completed</b></p> <p>1/20 Douglas Crescent 15/02691/LBC Cllr JM to investigate why change to a principal room have been allowed under a LBC. <b>Completed</b></p> <p>Jock Miller to contact the chairman of the Old Town CC to offer support regarding India Building at Victoria Street. <b>Completed</b></p> <p>Cllr JM to contact CEC regarding gully clearance. <b>Completed</b></p>	



<p>Cllr JM to investigate why anti-jaywalking fence was removed at St John's Church Princes Street. <b>Still Outstanding – originally taken down because of trams but not put back</b></p> <p><u>5 November 2015</u></p> <p>JM to contact Cllr JM regarding outstanding actions. <b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>1 December 2015</u></p> <p>Phil Noble to confirm whether or not Magdala Cres. will be one-way under new cycle path scheme. <b>Completed</b></p> <p><u>5 January 2016</u></p> <p>6-8 King's Stables Road. Ref: 15/05715/FUL. Need to object by 14 January. IT to make objection. <b>Completed</b></p> <p>1/20 Douglas Crescent. Ref: 15/05499/LBC. AW stating that there was an issue in relation to the earlier application where we had objected as a CC. A report was put on the website that suggested that we had withdrawn our objections. Councillor said that our objections do not carry any weight as we made representation, not as statutory consultees. It was suggested that JM should write to the chief executive of the council for clarification on this. <b>Outstanding</b></p> <p>Proposed plans for new cycle paths: Email received from Terrence Daintith objecting to the plans and expressing concerns about the central parking spaces in Melville Street. JM to make objection. <b>Completed</b></p>	
<p><b>4. Police Report</b></p> <p>Jock Miller (JM) thanked the Police for coming; it's been quite some time!</p> <p>Susan Purnell (SP) reported on any issues arising in the West End.</p> <p><b>Homeless Issues</b></p> <p>There has been a homeless, Afro-Caribbean male sighted frequently around St Mary's Cathedral. He is not a drug-user and is not considered to be a concern. Purely a welfare issue for him.</p> <p>In Charlotte Square/round the back of Indigo Yard there is a business group which advises about homelessness in the area. People rough sleeping isn't breaking the law but the police are still trying to move people along. If they are aggressively begging or causing trouble etc then of course that's a different issue.</p> <p>Rory O'Riordan (RO) asked about those who are housed but travel into town, beg for the day and then go home. SP advised that this is not</p>	



<p>illegal and so no action can be taken. These issues are social not criminal. RO also asked about begging by a cashline. SP reassured him that these people would be moved on as it could be considered aggressive begging. Crime – not bad at all. There was one break in on Haymarket Terrace in a third floor student flat. Sound complaints have become more frequent and there is no council team managing this anymore.</p> <p>High winds/weather – there have been some breakages and dangerous falling.</p> <p>Seona Flemming (SF) reported on Licensing issues</p> <p>When incidents take place in clubs and pubs, etc, SF will look at the licensing aspects of the incident and decide whether the premises are meeting their licensing objectives.</p> <p>There are not considered to be ant problematic licensed premises in the West End.</p> <p>Only time for concern is when there are football or rugby matches on, as people who just want to cause disorder go to the quiet pubs trying to cause problems.</p> <p>There is a new venue in Shandwick place called Please Don't Tell – it is currently open until 1am but has applied for a 3am license which it will most likely receive.</p> <p>The police have set up a 'pub watch' in order to share information about who is where and who might be causing issues.</p> <p>RO commented on the Rugby on Saturday and the potential for drinking the streets. SF advised that drinking in the streets is permitted so long as it's not in a designated area and those in question are not causing a disturbance.</p> <p>There is also Hibbs v Hearts football match on Sunday but there will be significant police detail so there shouldn't be any issues.</p>	
<p><b>5. Neighbourhood Partnership</b> Nothing to report.</p>	
<p><b>6. Councillor's Report</b> No Councillors present</p> <p>Ian Robertson (IR) reported on the boundary changes and locality teams; change to 4 localities 4 out of 6 of the neighbourhood managers are being made into locality managers.</p>	



<p>Council boundaries are now aligned, the services (Police, NHS, Fire Services, etc) are more joined up. Move based on the Christie commission – ‘power to the localities’. West end borders should stay the same.</p>	
<p><b>7. Correspondence</b> Gordon Renton (GR) - Morrison Street. This street is becoming a main artery and at one point the street is very narrow. At the top, there are railings to feed people across the road. GR proposes to widen the pavement to avoid danger here. We should also have a traffic light sequence so that everyone crosses at the same time – moving people through the area as quickly as possible.  SF also commented that the railings are broken in one place.  GR argued that the railing is less important than the number of people, which is now getting dangerous.</p>	
<p><b>8.1 Financial Report</b> No outstanding debts.</p>	
<p><b>8.2 Planning</b>  Isobel Thom (IT) presented Planning Convener’s report.  Douglas House/Belford House. Ref: 14/04512/FUL. IT went along 27.01 and permission was granted. AW worries that there should be more pitched roofs in the development. IT commented on the street view and how it will be affected by the new development; however we can only look at the sky view. This is a gap in the policy.  Donaldson’s School 1B West Coates. Ref: 15/04553/FUL/.4/LBC. The substation is still remaining but permission is not required.  Charlotte Baptist Chapel, 204 Rose Street. Ref: 15/04404/FUL. There was some discussion as to whether Historic Environment Scotland should be considering the first application (hotel by the London company). Now calling them serviced apartments but Historical Scotland have not been consulted. IT commented that the only difference to us would be the possibility of party flats. GR thinks we should discourage this. Second application is for the Rose Theatre – a performance centre with teaching facilities. IT explained that there are two applications because if the first doesn’t get planning permission, they won’t buy the building; but they have first refusal. GR commented that there may be a conflict of interest for councillors around approving certain applications because of how much money they would bring in (eg hotels). IT commented that this is not a planning consideration.  6-8 King’s Stables Road. Ref: 15/05716/CON. Still waiting on an acceptance.</p>	



<p>1/20 Douglas Crescent. Ref: 15/04600/FUL. We are not statutory consultees with regards to listed buildings (only planning permission). AW commented that this has been handled appallingly. The report that was issued was factually incorrect in a number of ways: It reads that the flat is 1<sup>st</sup> floor when it is a ground floor/basement flat. The year reads 1994 but it is 1964. It mentions the insertion of the staircase when it is actually the original stone staircase. We were also not aware that the whole supporting wall was going to be torn down and the original fireplace removed. This was again raised with councillors and they seemed supporting but before they could ask for a review, a decision was made. AW commented that listed buildings not being protected on the inside. The principal rooms should be protected and here we are talking about a principal dining room.</p> <p>2F 20 Eglinton Crescent. Ref: 15/056737/LBC. Similar thing but third floor and the mantel is modern (keeping insert and building cabinets on top so could be reinstated if needed).</p> <p>GF 20 Coates Gardens. Ref: 16/00246/LBC/..7/FUL. Talking about taking away a whole room and risking loss of character – is this also a similar situation?</p> <p>IT commented that although it is not a statutory requirement, the Council should insist that these listed building applications should have photographs of what they are talking about so we can make a proper, informed judgement.</p> <p>GR raised concerns about crossing lines with regards to telling people what they can and can't do to their own homes, but AW argued that some buildings only listed because of their insides and their original features within.</p> <p>Martha Baur (MB) commented that there is an issue regarding conservation ingeneral (eg gardens disappearing too). Quite simple, the Council needs to be upholding conservation and listings</p> <p>5/20 Drumsheugh Gardens. Ref: 16/00040/FUL. IT visited Mr Robson. There are Concerns of Use to an office. All are in agreement and objection has been lodged.</p> <p>85-87 Shandwick Place. Ref: 15/05789/CLP. JM commented that we would prefer a boutique hotel to a hostel but GR suggested they are the same thing with a different name.</p> <p>85-87 Shandwick Place. Ref: 15/05790/LBC. IT informed us that only one page of before and after drawings with very little detail was offered up. We do not know how many original features exist. It is a listed building, with the rooms still laid out in the original fashion. This would</p>	<p>JM asked that AW draft him a letter to send to the Chief Executive and copy in Historic Scotland.</p> <p>Object for both 20 Eglinton and 30 Coates Gardens as we must be consistent.</p> <p>IT to make objection and ask the case officer for more detailed information.</p>
--	---



<p>be a complete gutting taking place. There was never permission for it to be a hostel so we can certainly object.</p>	
<p><b>8.3 Communications and Publicity</b> Nothing to report.</p>	
<p><b>8.4 Environment and Transport</b></p> <p>New cycle paths - the submission has been put in and followed up by GW. Many are up in arms about this and have signed a petition, but there is also a petition for the whole thing to go ahead. We have complained. However, although the whole thing is unwarranted and expensive, we do still support cycling. RO commented that there is no guarantee that cyclists will use the path, as they just cycle where they want. They are unlikely to cycle a longer distance just to stay off main roads.</p> <p>RO brought up shared parking spaces; there was a division in the council as to whether to be for or against.</p> <p>Gordon Wylie (GW) commented that there was nowhere for tradesmen or visitors to park but residents have to come first, while JM mentioned that there are lots of yellow lines which could have cars on them, which GW reminded us are for safety purposes.</p> <p>GR commented that this is a way of making more money for parking but he objects to this as he already pays for parking.</p> <p>RO also brought up Sunday parking, about which everyone is in agreement. We have objected but we haven't heard back. Continued objection to putting restrictions on Sunday parking - we all want the hours extended</p> <p>RO mentioned an acquaintance of his who has a second house and is paying full council tax but not being given a parking space. GW and JM agreed that if he finds out more information and has something official such as a rejection of a parking permit, we might be able to do something.</p> <p>There was discussion around the lack of parking in Edinburgh. GW suggested underground parking developments, but IT commented that this is unlikely in Edinburgh due to the geological constraints.</p>	
<p><b>8.5 Liquor/Gambling Licensing</b> Nothing to report.</p>	
<p><b>8.6 Civic Licensing</b> Nothing to report.</p>	
<p><b>9.0 AOCB</b> JM reminded the council that elections are coming up in September and October. WECC is only allowed 10 community councillors (and needs a minimum of 5); there was some debate around this, and about the desire for all</p>	



<p>applicants to submit a CV, rather than only if there are too many applicants.</p> <p>GR commented that there is no sense of community in the West End so it is hard to have a community council – struggling to get members. There was some discussion around promoting community and getting neighbours to come along and join.</p> <p>There was some discussion around the Council's stand on the submission of documentation as IT was required to submit an answer in a word document, to which she took objection. IT put forward a query about the Council's stand on accessibility of information/legislation, and received a response saying writing a letter and handing it in would also be an option. There was general agreement that the Council should take documents in any form.</p> <p>IT reported on Douglas Crescent Residents' Association. They have been trying to have improvements for many years and have been generally supported by WECC. The road is sandstone covered tarmac from 1984 and was meant to be redone in January last year. This was postponed to this January, but IT found out recently that it will not be in this year's budget after all. IT has sent a letter on behalf of DCRA, objecting and asking why William Street has been given new paving. There was discussion around the email that IT sent to councillors and Ian Black who is handling it. WECC will say to councillors that they are disappointed with this state of affairs.</p>	
<p><b>10. Date of the next meeting</b> 1 March 2016</p>	