



Minutes of the 379th Meeting of the Portobello Community Council held on 25th January 2021 DRAFT

Present: Mike Leeman (Secretary), Craig McIntyre (Co-Chair), Lee Kindness (Co-Chair), Frazer McNaughton, John Cleland, Laurie Berrie (Engagement Officer), Stephen Hawkins (Treasurer), Geoff Lynn, Miranda Hurst, Catherine Etoe, Elaine Murray

Apologies: Esther Clayton

In Attendance: Cllr Maureen Child, Cllr Kate Campbell, Cllr Mary Campbell, Cllr Callum Laidlaw, PC Martin Wood, Tommy Sheppard MP, and 46 Members of the public

379.1 Chair's Welcome & Introductions

Lee Kindness welcomed everyone and there were introductions. Mike Leeman explained how the meeting would work as it was online and if anyone wanted to say something to raise a virtual hand and we would work through the questions and statements.

379.2 Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising

The minutes were agreed.

In regards 378.3 (Sir Harry Lauder Rd to Eastfield safety update) There was a meeting with the council on the long- and short-term strategies for Sir Harry Lauder Road to improve the junction and provide an alternative route for cyclists. Details would be shared at the next meeting of PCC. PCC is seeking an urgent timescale from the council in relation to the safety works discussed at the recent meeting.

In regards 378.4 (Brunstane Road Council Consultation). Lee Kindness summarised the PCC consultation in a deputation to the council ahead of their meeting on 28th January 2021.

In regards 378.5 (Pipe Lane Toilet Facilities Project) Craig McIntyre said nothing major to report apart from a meeting with the council before Christmas to explore any issues that may have an impact on developing and enhancing the current Pipe Lane facilities. It was decided that the scope to possibly expand the footprint of the structure would be allowed. Craig McIntyre and Frazer McNaughton will prepare a further update for the next meeting.

In regards 378.7 (Reimagining King's Place) Not much to update. Frazer McNaughton said that Evelyn Kilmurray at CEC is keen to run an official consultation for Kings Place and then a design exercise can take place. With the recommended continuing of Spaces for People this would enter phase 2, with opportunity for physical change.

ACTION: Put on the agenda for the next meeting

379.2 (a) Police Scotland Update

Martin Wood from Police Scotland was able to join us, so we added before the main meeting. Martin said that things were not too bad. Most calls were around COVID regulation breaches. Police Scotland are taking the approach of discouraging behaviour which is against recommendations and will continue to do this. There was a question from the chair of Brighton and Rosefield Residents Association about gatherings in Brighton Park. Martin Wood encouraged everyone to phone or take note of times and days to report so that the Police were aware of the problem and if were ongoing.

379.3 Town Hall Proposals and Presentations

Lee Kindness gave the background to why the Town Hall was closed and what meetings had been had in regards the August 2019 workshop and when the decision in November 2019 was made to a tender being put up by the council. The process ended with 2 notes of interest. One from Portobello Central (a community led group) and one from Peter Schaufuss who has two other buildings in Edinburgh (Rose St Theatre and St. Stephen's Church). Both proposers were invited to the meeting.



Portobello Community Council

No one from the Peter Schaufuss proposal could make the meeting so Mike Leeman summarised what had been sent through and this can be viewed here <http://www.portobellocc.org/pccpn/2021/01/26/questions-for-town-hall-proposals/>

Jennifer Elliott and Jayne Saywell from Portobello Central then gave a presentation on how Portobello Central had formed, what the group had done to consult with the community, and what the context of their proposal is. The work that has been done and the full proposal that was sent to CEC can be viewed here <https://www.portobellocentral.org/>

They emphasised that they see this as the beginning of a conversation with the community and presented as an honest basis for discussion, they do not see themselves in competition but want what is best for the community.

At this stage Portobello Central feel that a larger consultation needs to be done and to explore the idea of community ownership so they would like to work meaningfully with the community on this.

As such they are going to invite the Finance & Resources Committee at their meeting on 4th March to reject all proposals (including the Portobello Central one) and will call for an asset-based transfer within six months with the community having first refusal.

Mike Leeman explained that the Community Council would ask for the community to send in questions to both proposers which would be forwarded on to them to better understand their proposals.

There were questions from the public around the Peter Schaufuss proposal and what was meant in regards some of the wording and visuals which were unable to be answered by the Community Council as they only had the documents which were shared.

There was input from Cllr. Maureen Child and Cllr Callum Laidlaw around the fact that there would be no further investment from the council in regards capital expenditure and so that something that would appeal to the committee in March is a commitment to work on the town hall.

There were questions around if there was enough demand for several buildings. Members of Action Party who were at the meeting were able to confirm that there was demand.

Catherine Etoe was very keen to ensure that as a community council we were doing as much as we could to ensure the town Hall and get as much opinion as possible.

Elaine Murray was concerned that the community council was being asked to agree to back something (a pause in the decision) that we did not have sufficient input from the public on.

Craig McIntyre felt that the two proposers really needed to be able to get together and discuss further, something that Jennifer Elliot was also keen to see happen.

Frazer McNaughton Felt that we (as a community council) did not have enough information to make a consultation and felt that seeking a three-month delay would be better.

Mike Leeman pointed out that CEC had specifically asked the community council to gauge opinion and if we did not do this in time for the committee that there might not be another chance for the community voice to be heard.

Elaine Murray asked if any of the councillors could tell us if the 4th March meeting and decision could be postponed. This was a question of their opinion and not for them to ask for a postponement.

Cllr. Maureen Child expressed a view that she did not see the advantage of a pause or delay and as the two proposals came from a community and commercial perspective there was nothing wrong with exploring if the two parties could work with each other. She also pointed out the meeting has already been delayed from February. Her opinion was that she would like to support a community led approach.

Lee Kindness, conscious of time asked that we agree that we put out a basic question as a consultation on what individuals thoughts were on each proposal, being careful not to pit them against each other. This could then be fed as a deputation to the report which would be going in front of the committee.

ACTION: Notice to be put up regarding questions to be submitted to each proposer. Mike Leeman to forward these on. Short consultation/survey with wording to be agreed to be run by the Community Council on the general publics view of each proposal which would be submitted as a deputation to the committee report.



379.4 14 Bath Street request for Consultation

Lee Kindness gave the background that this was a new proposal but seemed more an update of a technical survey but largely the same as the previous application (which was rejected by council planning officers). Mike Leeman said that we have been asked as a community council to gauge the community feeling and have secure a two week extension to comments to allow this.

Craig McIntyre read out a statement from Friends of the George

“It is disappointing that the owners and would be developers of The George have resubmitted their previously rejected proposals to the planning department for substantial demolition. Friend of The George and our advisers will now scrutinise the latest reporting on the condition of the building and provide comment on the conclusions reached by the applicant and their consultants as well as our own current assessment of the viability of repair and retention based on the reported condition of the building.”

It was agreed that a new consultation would be run and fed back to the planning Team

ACTION: Design and Run the Consultation in order to feed back a community view by 22nd February

379.5 a Treasurer's Report

Since approval at the last meeting the treasurer has transferred the £3.50 shortfall to the Traders' Account. There have been a couple of payments made, firstly £ 297.72 to McRobb signs for the repair to the interpretation board and secondly £ 56.68 to Cardoness and Lewis for hosting the web site. We have now received £197.72 from Zurich Insurance to settle the claim for the repair to the board. We also have received a £ 50.00 cheque from Portobello Amenity Society for their half-share of the insurance excess which is still to be banked. The account balance is currently £ 1,898.27.

We have been notified that £ 342.00 is to be returned to the Traders' Account from the Winter Wanderland as donations raised by the project covered most of the cost. At present this account stands at £ 863.32.

Thanks were given to Jennifer Elliot of Action Party for organising the Winter Wanderland and how successful those who participated felt it was.

379.5 c Planning

It was noted that there has been a PAN put in for a Seafield site and that an open meeting was being held by Manse, the applicants, on Thursday 28th January.

Frazer McNaughton summarised the work that has been done so far by the four community councils that border on Seafield and that they were taking a co-ordinated approach to ensure that any application is considered as part of the whole plan for the area. To that end there was not support for this PAN. Craigentenny and Meadowbank Community Council are not engaging with any until there is a planned approach to development.

ACTION: Put onto the website a summary of what the joint community councils have been doing.

379.5 d Councillors

Cllr. Kate Campbell said that there was going to be a meeting with the ward councillors and Spaces For People team about Duddingston Road SfP programme and then it was likely a public meeting would take place which she asked the community council to publicise.

Cllr. Callum Laidlaw hopes to have more news on Kings Place for the next meeting.

Cllr. Mary Campbell asked the community council would be at the locality meeting on Thursday 28th January. PCC had had no correspondence about this so Cllr. Mary Campbell would investigate the lack of notification.

ACTION : Promote the public SfP meeting re Duddingston Road once we have details.



379.6 AOB

Laurence from Portobello Older People's Project gave background to the Older People's Project and the fact that they meet at the Baptist Church on the High Street. He wanted to raise that there is a real problem for them with not being able to park their minibus outside of the church due to the bollards in place for spaces for people. They have been in touch with the councillors and SfP team but nothing has been able to be done as yet.

Cllr. Kate Campbell said that all SfP projects were in review and the best mechanism for feeling back is to email the Spaces for People team on spacesforpeople@edinburgh.gov.uk

Meeting finished at 21.33

The next meeting is Monday 22nd February 2021

DRAFT