



# **Tollcross Community Council Notice of Meeting and Agenda**

29<sup>th</sup> November 2017

7pm Tollcross Community centre  
Room 4

Members of the public who live in the Tollcross Community Council area are very welcome to attend our meetings (see map of area on inside back page)

Contact Tollcross Community Council via:

<http://www.tollcrosscc.org.uk/> | [@TollcrossCC](https://twitter.com/TollcrossCC) | [sec@tollcrosscc.org.uk](mailto:sec@tollcrosscc.org.uk)

# **Tollcross Community Council**

## **Agenda 29<sup>th</sup> November 2017**

Tollcross Community Education Centre 117 Fountainbridge

- 1. Welcome & apologies –**
  - a. **AOCB**
- 2. Declaration of interests.**
- 3. Police matters – With local Police Scotland Community Officer.**
- 4. Minutes 27<sup>th</sup> September 2017 –**
  - a. Matters arising.
  - b. Acceptance.
- 5. Tollcross area matters:**
  - a. **Future Licensing** – See discussion paper in monthly reports – RC.
  - b. **Bins** – FA.
  - c. **BID (Business Improvement District) status for the High Street** - AB.
  - d. **Living Wild event Sat 27th Jan 2018** – RA.
  - e. **Community Centre possible closure** – AB.
  - f. **CC Christmas drinks date** – AB.
- 6. Councillors' Comments & Questions.**
- 7. Planning – PB.**
- 8. Licensing – RC.**
- 9. AOCB**

**There is no meeting in December; so, see you all on:**

**31st January 2018**

**At Tollcross Community Centre**

**Tollcross Community Council**  
**Minutes of Meeting of Wednesday 25 October 2017 at 7pm**  
**Tollcross Community Centre, 117 Fountainbridge**

**1. Welcome and Apologies**

**Present:** Andrew Brough (Chair and Secretary), Fiona Allen, Richard Allen, Paul Beswick, Iain Black, Roger Colkett, Michael Lister, Chris McGregor, Liz Summerfield, Ann Wigglesworth. **Police:** none. **CEC Councillor:** Cllr Karen Doran. **Public:** Simon Armstrong, Liam Dickson, J J Mary Hatakka, Jose Noriega, Amanda Novak, Andreas Wilhelm. **Apologies:** Andy Devenport, Katie McGhee; David Liddle; Cllrs Miller, Mowat, Rankin.

The Chair welcomed everyone and declared the October ordinary meeting open.

**2. Declaration of interests – none**

**3. Police Matters – there were no Police present.**

**4. Minutes and matters arising from meeting of 27 September 2017 –**

**Corrections:**

**1. Welcome and Apologies:** Liz Summerfield was not present.

**4. Matters arising: 4. Matter arising – Reports – FoMBL:** ‘Army in the Park’ event: add ‘various opinions were voiced on this matter, but there was no consensus about whether to support or object to this event and the matter did not go to a vote.’

**5. Tollcross matters: a. 35 bus:** For ‘Lothian Regional Buses’ read ‘Lothian Buses.’

**Matter arising:**

**5. Tollcross matters –**

**a. 35 bus:** The Chair had written to Lothian Buses and was awaiting a reply.

**ACTION: Cllr Doran to chase up a reply from Lothian Buses.**

**e. Uber drivers:** the Chair had written to the CEC Licensing Department and had circulated its response. [See Chair’s email of 23 October.]

The Minutes were then accepted as correct. This was proposed by Richard Allen and seconded by Andrew Brough.

**5. Tollcross area matters –**

**a. Lower Gilmore Place: (Ref 17/04243/FUL):** Paul Beswick spoke to the matter of the proposed development and was of the opinion that it was certainly worth challenging: the footprint was too big and left little space for public realm; the mass of the development with an additional sixth floor roof garden was unacceptable and completely contravenes the Fountainbridge Planning Brief and had been criticised by the Urban Design Panel. He added that it was important to remember that the south side of the canal was generally regarded as residential, with the north side accommodating business expansion, and that it was also important to keep the skyline on the south side. There then followed a general discussion about the issues involved, including a matter of concern from tenants of Dunedin-Canmore Housing Association. On the question of how the Planning Department appears only to summarise comments that are placed before the Planning Committee, it was suggested that objections should be made online via the Planning Portal and sent also by letter to the individual case officers.

Cllr Doran intimated that she would write to the Planning Department to object to the proposal, as well as to Dunedin-Canmore Housing Association for clarification.

**ACTION: Paul Beswick to submit an objection to the CEC regarding this development and all Community Councillors to submit individual objections by Friday 3 November.**

**ACTION: Cllr Doran.**

**b. Tollcross Community Centre** – Richard Allen, who sits on the Tollcross Community Centre Association, gave a very full report on the situation regarding the issues that the Centre is facing, not least physical repairs to and maintenance of the building. [See his report on the 6 September meeting of the Association, included with the Papers for the TXCC meeting of 27 September.] He stressed the unique nature of the Centre as it is the only Council-owned community facility within the Tollcross Community Council area, and for it to continue to function as a much-loved and well-used facility that serves many groups, it needs a firm commitment from the CEC. There followed an in-depth discussion of the various issues facing the Centre. The Tollcross Community Council is fully supportive of any of the actions necessary to keep the Centre running and does not wish to lose this facility.

**ACTION: Cllr Doran to write to the CEC to seek a commitment from the Council to look after the fabric of the building.**

**ACTION: Following the 26 October meeting of the Tollcross Community Centre Association, Richard Allen to confer with the Chair to pursue these matters with the CEC.**

**c. Scottish Book Trust Fundraising** – Liz Summerfield spoke to the matter of Book Week Scotland which runs from Monday 27 November to Sunday 3 December, and to the proposal of holding a book sale for fundraising for the Trust. It was suggested that the event could be held either in the Fountainbridge Public Library or in the Tollcross Community Education Centre and that she would be happy to liaise over the organisation of this event.

**ACTION: Community Councillors wishing to participate in this event to email Liz Summerfield for more information.**

**d. Short-term lets** – the Chair returned to the question of short-term lets and said that he was to have a meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> November about a proposed public meeting on 29 November, and that he would report back to the group. It was noted that such a public meeting on 29 November would clash with the ordinary November meeting of TXCC.

There was much discussion about the issue of short-term lets and how it effects the city centre and it was acknowledged that the problem requires a legislative response from the Scottish Parliament.

It was noted that there is to be a public community meeting to discuss concerns about commercial holiday letting. [**Monday 6 November at the Stockbridge Church, 7B Saxe Coburg Street, 7 - 9pm**, hosted by Sustainable Communities – Stockbridge.]

**ACTION: Chair to report back.**

**e. Inclusion Scotland** – Liz Summerfield spoke to the matter of TXCC having free institutional membership of this organisation. Fiona Allen proposed that TXCC join this organisation, with Andrew Brough seconding the proposal.

**ACTION: Liz Summerfield to pursue joining this.**

**6. Councillor's Comments and Questions** – Cllr Doran gave a report on her work in the immediate area of Tollcross, highlighting the Lower Gilmore Place proposed development and Thornybauk. She spoke to the matter of the CEC budget and the online consultation that will go live on Monday 30 October and urged people to take part. She would write to object to the proposed development of Lower Gilmore Place and

would also write to Lothian Buses about the 35 bus service and to the Council about the Tollcross Community Education Centre.

There followed several questions to Cllr Doran:

Fiona Allen asked about reviving the CEC information leaflet/map concerning charity shops in the city and the types of fabric, in particular, that they are able to recycle, as well as other ways of disposing of surplus domestic fabrics in order to prevent un-necessary land-fill. She mentioned that duvets and pillows were always welcome by the Cat and Dog Home, and that the A & E department at the RIE was often looking for t-shirts and jogging-bottoms for patient admissions. It also transpired that the PDSA will take duvets and pillows. It was suggested that the Edinburgh Evening News might want to run a feature on this issue.

**ACTION: Fiona Allen to pursue this matter.**

**ACTION: Cllr Doran to explore the possibility of CEC reviving its charity shops information leaflet/map.**

Also discussed were the merits and demerits of bottle banks, with Cllr Doran suggesting that the questioner contact either Cllr David Key or Cllr Gavin Corbett to pursue the question of arranging to have a bottle bank installed at Brandfield St; scaffolding on Earl Grey Street which has recently been removed and any regulations regarding the erection of scaffolding and the attendant reduction of public footways; the limit on the size of vehicles that may apply for parking permits and which, because of their size, occupy more than one parking space. Also mentioned was the interesting phenomenon at Melvin Walk, where the recent removal of litter bins has resulted in the area being litter-free!

**ACTION: Cllr Doran to follow up these questions.**

**7. Planning** – Paul Beswick reported on the following matters:

1. The proposed student residence development at Russell Road has been withdrawn
2. Proposed change of use from retail to unlicensed restaurant at 22-24 Home Street – Objection on the grounds of over-provision
3. Proposed change of use from Bookmakers at 25 Lothian Road to restaurant – Granted
4. Proposed change of use from sauna to student accommodation at 91 Lothian Road – no material grounds to object
5. Proposed change of use at former retail unit at 114 Dundee St for new student amenity areas and accommodation – despite the policy of TXCC to protect retail units, no objection
6. Formalise current use of sandwich shop at 115 Fountainbridge (Certificate of Lawfulness (existing)) – Granted
7. Installation of micro-brewery, 4-6 Grassmarket – Granted
8. Pre-application notice –18 Morrison St (former Goods Yard, Haymarket) – 30 November – venue and time to be confirmed
9. Pre-application notice – former 159 Fountainbridge (Vastint/IKEA) – **Monday 6 November, Fountainbridge Public Library, 3.30 – 7.30pm**

**8. Licensing** –

Roger Colkett reported that there were no new applications in the period and explained why he had not submitted an objection to the application for the change of outdoor drinking facilities at Shakespeare's, 65 Lothian Road. There was confusion about the public entertainment licence at the former Museum of Fire and the Licensing Board was seeking to clarify this.

The meeting closed at 8.43pm

**Date of next meeting Wednesday 29 November 2017 at 7pm**

## Cllr Doran action points from October meeting

---

### **Thornybauk - I read this last night - just for your info**

Dear Councillor,

I hope this isn't too late for you.

I am aware of ongoing issues here. The Environmental Wardens have served notice on a business regarding control of waste. Waste and Cleansing have attended to dumped items. We intend to fix the damaged railings.

There was some community interest in the space and I'll explore this in more detail.

Regards,  
Steven

### **Charity Shop Map:**

I don't recall any maps of local charity shops, and would be extremely surprised if it was something that the Council would now take on to produce, even if it did so in the past. Certainly we don't have any plans in South East to produce such maps specifically for charity shops. In our Locality Improvement Plan in the Economy & Employability theme we have an action that relates to working with local traders organisations to improve the local environment and promote a "shop local" agenda, so there may be opportunities there to look at how businesses can work together to promote the local retail and leisure offer in the future (page 15 on the attached Plan).

### **Scaffolding**

A road occupation permit is required before scaffolding can be erected, so there should not be scaffolding erected "ad hoc". I have attached a link to the information on the Council's website which includes a copy of the application and the relevant requirements [http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/1266/apply\\_for\\_permission\\_to\\_erect\\_scaffolding\\_hoardings\\_stagings\\_or\\_access\\_towers](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/1266/apply_for_permission_to_erect_scaffolding_hoardings_stagings_or_access_towers) . If the Community Council has questions about any specific sites they can contact our Transport team at [southeast.locality@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:southeast.locality@edinburgh.gov.uk)

### **Bottle banks at Grove Street/Upper Grove Place/Brandfield Street**

Bottle banks are generally not something that is invited on to residential streets; I can pass this on to colleagues in Waste & Cleansing so they can assess the street as a possible location but if you have any further information about where this request arose from it may be helpful. As you may be aware we have had issues in the past with volumes of holiday lets in Grove Street and the noise and disruption to residents so they may not be supportive of bottle banks being installed.

### **Camper Van Parking Permits**

"You are not allowed to park trailers, vehicles that carry more than 12 people or those over 2.5m high with your parking permit" This would suggest to me that camper vans could have permits, size dependent.

If the Community Council is concerned that the camper vans fall into these exclusions, if they can forward on as much detail as possible about them and where they are being parked, I can pass this info to the permit team to look into?

### **Dunedin/Canmore**

I wrote to Hazel Young, Chief Executive, Dunedin Canmore

Dear Ms. Young,

As one of the City Centre Councillors I attended the Tollcross Community Council last night.

This was a very busy meeting with a number of residents from the Upper Gilmore Place area.

I have been asked to write to you on their behalf to say that your tenants are very distressed with regard to their future housing in the area. A letter was produced regarding a submission from Dunedin Canmore in support of the Glencairn proposals to demolish Dunedin Canmore properties in Lower Gilmore Place.

The Community Council have asked that some clarity is given to the Community on what Dunedin Canmore plan for their properties in the area in an effort to assure your tenants of their housing.

I look forward to hearing from you.

**Number 35 bus**

I wrote to Jim McFarlane, Chief Executive, Lothian Buses

Dear Jim

I attended Tollcross Community Council last night as a City Centre Councillor.

The meeting was very busy and a number of constituents raised their concerns regarding the change of the number 35 bus and the devastating effect it had on some of the lowest paid members of staff working at the airport.

The Community Council tells me that they wrote recently to yourself and are still awaiting a response.

I have been asked by the Community Council to contact you on their behalf and ask you to respond to their correspondence. Undernoted is a copy of the letter for your ease of reference.

**Electronic Planning Submissions - I wrote to the Convenor of Planning and received the undernoted response.**

Thanks very much for your email. I understand the concerns raised, but you can reassure the community council that councillors have full access to every comment submitted by the public in each planning application. This info is available both electronically and in paper form at the councillors request.

Planning officers take each material consideration from public representations and then give an assessment of how the issues raised impact the determination of the application. This summary is necessary to help the committee understand the issues raised by objectors but also to match those matters against planning policy

I hope this explanation is helpful, please let me know if any further information is required

Best wishes

Lewis

**Pauls letter on our behalf on Lower Gilmore Place planning application**

---

**17/04234/FUL** Demolition of all buildings on site and erection of office (Class 4) and flatted residential development with associated car parking, landscaping and public realm at 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 Lower Gilmore Place, Edinburgh.

**17/04235/PPP** Flatted residential development and approval for building footprint and maximum height at 12, 14-16, 18, 20 & 22 Lower Gilmore Place  
Edinburgh.

**17/04462/CON** Complete Demolition in a Conservation Area  
At 4-11 Lower Gilmore Place, Edinburgh

**Case Officer :** Euan Mcmeeken 0131 529 3989 euan.mcmeeken@edinburgh.gov.uk

Dear Mr McMeechen,

Tollcross Community Council would like to object to the above applications. This objection is for all three applications as they are all linked and for the same site and the applicants have used the same documents for all the applications. We welcome the development of the site for housing. We are also keen to maintain the current view that developments to the south of the canal should be residential in keeping with the residential nature of the area. Our objections are about the oversized footprint of the development, the height, the loss of privacy for local residents, the loss of affordable housing and the failure to address the canal and the pedestrian/cycle aspects of Lower Gilmore Place.

### **1. The Oversized Footprint**

The proposed footprint of the development is too large. The proposed building line abuts the boundary of the site on three sides and on the fourth side it either abuts the boundary or is fairly close.

The Fountainbridge Development Brief (FDB) shows a much thinner building and states that there should be amenity space to the rear and that a development should protect residential amenity. The proposal has virtually no amenity space to the rear; just a small car park. The Urban Design Panel report at the PAN stage suggested that the scale of the proposal was too large and the current proposals have not taken account of that. The panel also stated that the proposal should acknowledge the village-like character of Lower Gilmore Place and that the proposal provides poor amenity space, particularly in terms of overshadowing. Essentially, this proposal is for an over-development and an example of urban cramming.

The developers attempt to use a roof garden (i.e. a 6<sup>th</sup> floor) as an excuse for not providing amenity space at the ground floor but this just makes the loss of amenity of local residents even worse. This argument for filling a site without space around it for amenity space/improved public realm should be rejected.

### **2. The Height of the Development**

The proposal is also too high at five storeys with some structures above this height. The FDP gives a proposed maximum height of 10m at the eaves and 13m at the ridge whereas the proposal is much taller than this. There is a very good case for a maximum of three or four storeys. The Urban design Panel also make the point about it being too dominant and not maintaining the village-like character.

The developers suggest that the height of Fountain Court apartments breached the FDB so they also should be allowed to. This is untrue as that development was approved in 2001 (revised in 2003) so the FDB was approved and amended after these dates (2004/2005) and in particular, with the knowledge of the height of Fountain Court.

### **3. The Loss of Privacy**

The height, along with the footprint, exacerbates the loss of privacy of local residents as does the design of the buildings. As stated above, the Urban Design Panel also consider these aspects as contributing to a loss of privacy and the FDB states that the design should protect neighbouring residential amenity. To have balconies and windows of living space facing the back and overlooking neighbour's gardens is unnecessary and unacceptable. The proposal has windows and balconies facing north, overlooking the canal and these would seem adequate. Furthermore, to have a roof garden on top of the 5<sup>th</sup> floor makes the loss of privacy even worse. The two new residential developments along the canal at Rope Walk and Horne Terrace have addressed these issues with either no windows to the back or small, non-living space windows to the back. In both cases, all balconies and large windows face north to the canal.

Reducing the height, not pushing the footprint towards the southern boundary and creating amenity space at ground level instead of on top, plus removing south facing balconies, would ameliorate all these problems. In fact that is exactly as the FDP envisaged.



#### 4. Affordable Housing and the mix of flats

The essence of Council policy is that such developments should provide 25% affordable housing and in this case it is to be commended that the affordable housing comprises 2 bedroom units. However, the proposal is to demolish 13 perfectly good affordable units and to replace them with 13 units. The fact that there is no gain in the number of affordable housing units seems to be against the spirit of Council policy. It appears to be a method for the developer to minimise the total number of affordable units on the site.

One further point is about the mix of flats. *Edinburgh Design Guidance [p66-67]* expects that in such a development, 20% of the units would be over 91m<sup>2</sup> for families, i.e. 3 or more bedrooms. In this proposal the percentage of all units is 9% and for private units only it is 13%. It further states that there should be direct access to private gardens.

#### 5. The Canal and Local Area

The first planning application in the FDB area (the Arnold Clarke site) was rejected and the rejection was upheld by the Scottish Government Reporter. His main reason was that the development did not address the canal. The point he made was that developers gain financially from having a waterside position and therefore they must make a contribution to the environs of the canal. In this proposal, this idea is ruled out on the basis that the canal is across the road. This is not an acceptable position.

The proposal makes no contribution to the urban realm and the importance of this road with its village-like character. The road is a major pedestrian and cycle route and is part of local and national routes (The John Muir Way). There should be a plan to improve the street with wider pavements and general decluttering. There is no contribution to public amenity and very little contribution to the private amenity (only the roof).

#### 5. Fountainbridge Development Brief

Local people invested a lot of time and effort over the consultations for the FDB and we feel that once that was finally agreed then it should be adhered to. When developments are allowed to ignore the development brief, then locals feel that the consultation was meaningless.

For the above reasons, we ask that this application be rejected unless the issues are addressed.

#### **Minutes of Tollcross Community Centre Association: Wednesday 1 November 2017**

---

Present. Kenny(chair) Brian, Rona, Gandolf, Danny, Richard, Dave Hewitt CLD.

Apologies. None received.

##### 1. Minutes of Last Meeting and Matters Arising.

Minutes of previous meeting we agreed prosed Kenny seconded Brian.

Matters arising:

- a) TX Youth Group, finance instruction now in place and implemented.
- b) Meeting with council and school reps postponed until 2 November 17 @ 12:00
- c) Blinds still to be repaired (ongoing – possibly included when other minor repairs are effected)
- d) A letter has been received from CEC to state that will take responsibility for maintenance of the new front door.

##### 2. Business Matters.

2.1 Finance Report. The financial report showed monies available after deductions and for committed expenditure, copy attached.

2.2 Report & Accounts Preparation. All information is now with the accountants for preparation of the annual accounts, expected week commencing 6-11-17.

2.3 Annual General Meeting. AGM Calling Notice to go for 6 December 17 @ 19:00 (committee 18:30)  
Brian to prepare notification and minutes. Agenda to include an item for discussion on the future of the TX community Centre.

3. Funding Request.  
None received.

4. Requests for Centre Lets.  
None received.

5. Building Management.

5.1 Toilet refurbishment. Dave will finalise the quote for the disabled toilet refurbishment then to go ahead. [Post Meeting Note. Cll Officer Liz Horan. Facilities Management, has confirmed that the Cll. Will arrange and meet the cost of the Disabled toilet]

5.2 Dave will get an updated quote for the front door replacement and this will then go ahead (providing the update is not too much greater than original).

6. CLD Staffing.  
An Agency staff has been recruited to cover office work on Wednesday/Thursday and Friday.  
[Post Meeting Note. The Agency staff left after first day]

7. AOCB

7.1 The door to Room Three has been fitted with a new combination lock without consultation. The Committee felt this reduced the security of the Room because of the likelihood of the Code being given to many more people than would have access to a key. The original lock is to be reinstated.

7.2 Gandolf is to get a first aid course paid by the Committee.

7.3. Room 1 Door and Room 2 Blinds. A joiner to be employed to repair the door and replace the blinds.

7.4. Agreed to write to the ALP Association confirming our view that Room 3 is the ALP Project Base and they have primary use of the Room. It can however be used for appropriate Lets as determined by the Committee.

7.5 Agreed a budget of £100.00 to repair the Canal Basin bird.

DONM: AGM WEDNESDAY 6th DECEMBER 2017

**Richard Allen.**

**Notes on meeting with Euan McMeeken, Case Officer for LGP development** 3.11.17

---

Some of the comments are mine and not Euan's

1. His aim was to talk about community engagement. He agreed that the PAN process was pretty much a waste of space but it is the developer's remit and not the council's and they cannot really call the developer a liar (saying 'generally supportive' in their report) over their report but don't really take much notice of it. They have had loads of objections and nothing in support.
2. The status of the FDB. It is a material consideration.

3. Amenity Space Standards. He thought it would be in Design Guidance and did not mention HOU 3 of the LDP. HOU 3 allows exceptions anyway.
4. Affordable Housing. He thought there may not be any on the site. It is Housing and not Planning which will look at the figures (provided by the developer) and may decide that 13 units would compromise the viability such that a sum would be paid to the council for affordable housing off site. This loophole has provided billions to developers in London and the loss of thousands of affordable homes. Bear in mind affordable homes are not affordable – e.g. they are about 80% of market rent. A 3-bed affordable flat on the Quartermile site has rent of over £900 pm (£ 15000 a year before tax).
5. The incomplete Sustainability Form. I pointed out that we have a right to comment on this when completed. He agreed and will get back to me on that.
6. Window to window distance is 18m min.
7. He was generally in agreement that the footprint was too big, the building too high and it breached the FDP and would hope to get the developer to change it before the committee (not optimistic though). He might go for a refusal recommendation but it was not unusual for developers to go to the top.  
He has not really started work on it yet.
8. Overlooking. A bit complicated because the council rules don't like single aspect flats (windows on one side) as this is poor amenity for the flat dweller. So, a bit of a conflict of amenities here.
9. It is a major application because it is in a very large site of major development (all around) and it provides pre-consultation. They can deem it whatever they like really. (Not from today's meeting).
10. Sunlight and Daylighting. I did not bring this up as they won't start work on the application yet.
11. I felt he had the same concerns as us but time will tell.

**Paul Beswick.**

#### **Temporary on-street Advertising Structures Stakeholder Workshop 13 November, City Chambers**

Centred around the following three basic questions:

1. How accessible, safe and attractive do you think Edinburgh's [shopping] streets are for all users?
2. What do you think about the vision and how could we deliver it so that everyone benefits?
3. How can we best engage with traders on understanding and implementing the vision, and how could traders advertise their premises more effectively without the use of temporary on-street advertising structures?

This workshop was convened in response to the Council administration's commitment (Delivering a Sustainable Future) to seek to reduce street clutter to improve accessibility in public spaces and to strengthen and create good places for all.

Paired with each of the above questions were the following statements:

1. We know that a high quality public realm encourages greater levels of footfall and increased demand from traders to locate into these spaces.
2. We need to work together to balance the needs of all users of our streets. The vision sets out why maximising the walkability, safety and attractiveness of our streets will benefit all users.
3. We need to work with traders on helping us deliver the vision and we need to provide support on maximising the advertising potential of their premises.

The overall vision for realising this strategy has been proposed as follows:

‘The City of Edinburgh Council is committed to ensuring that the city’s streets are walkable, safe and attractive for all users. We will work together with the users of our streets to reduce street clutter so that they are places which balance the needs of all users and are accessible and welcoming for everyone’.

To achieve the vision, the Council proposes to implement city-wide restrictions on all temporary on-street advertising structures. The Council will work with traders and other key stakeholders to achieve this and seek to identify alternative ways to promote business premises.

A city-wide restriction on temporary on-street advertising structures would have a significant impact on improving the walkability and amenity of our streets. A city-wide approach is fair as it ensures that same restrictions apply to all areas.

The approximately thirty attendees – coming from Community Councils, Traders’ Associations and several BIDS – discussed each of the three key questions in three break-out groups facilitated by Council officials, who reported back to the full group at the end of each discussion.

There emerged from each of the discussions a large, general amount of agreement over the need for the Council to reduce street clutter and to create ‘places that balance the needs of all users and are accessible and welcoming for everyone.’

It was noted that to do so, the Council would need to ensure that all stakeholders were fully involved in the development of policy – not just traders.

The general feeling of the groups, from the feedback from the break-out discussions, was that a city-wide ban on all A-boards and all other forms of temporary on-street advertising such as ground based ‘feather’ flags, stationary bicycles with adverts attached, box boards, etc, would be preferable to the currently proposed city-wide restrictions; that all advertising should be by means of hanging signs and shop window displays; and that measures need be taken to reverse the creeping privatisation of the public realm.

Representing TXCC at this meeting were Iain Black, Roger Colkett, and Michael Lister, with Richard Allen representing Fountainbridge Canalside Initiative.

**Michael Lister**

## Discussion paper on proposed changes to Edinburgh Licensing Board's Policy

---

Three things we might want changed / improved.

### 1. Areas of serious special concern

No application for a new premises licence in Tollcross has been refused by the Board on these grounds, not even the Caley Picture House despite its licensed capacity of 915 people.

We could ask for Tollcross to be designated an area of over-provision, but the area of serious special concern was based not on the TXCC area but on an Intermediate Data Zone plan extracted from the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics website: <http://www.sns.gov.uk/Simd/Simd.aspx> which no longer seems to exist. In any case, the Area of Overprovision specified in the Board's current Policy document identifies the streets concerned (Grassmarket, Cowgate, Cowgatehead, George IV Bridge, West Bow, West Port, Candlemaker Row, Merchant Street, Blair Street, Niddry Street, Niddry Street South, Victoria Terrace, Victoria Street, India Buildings, Blackfriars Street, Forrest Road, Teviot Place, Bristo Place). We'd need to identify the streets within our area to be similarly designated. Which should they be?

### 2. Audible music

We could either ask

- a) for the policy to be changed back to "amplified music from those premises **to be inaudible** in residential property" from "amplified music... **shall not be an audible nuisance** in neighbouring residential premises" or
- b) for the previous policy to be reintroduced just for licensed premises in residential tenement buildings. My preference would be for b); it's a reasonable compromise to address a genuine problem whereas a) would antagonise the music lobby for no good reason.

### 3. Public health

There are 5 objectives identified in the Licensing Act:

- preventing crime and disorder
- securing public safety
- preventing public nuisance
- **protecting and improving public health**
- protecting children from harm

We know that Edinburgh, no less than Scotland, has a serious public health problem caused by the overconsumption of alcohol. Figures from NHS Health Scotland show that enough alcohol is sold for every adult in Scotland (that includes all those who don't drink at all) to drink over 20 units every week. We know that the only two things that significantly affect levels of alcohol are price and availability. Price is now being addressed by the Scottish Government. And availability? Well, more than 70% of alcohol sold in Scotland is bought from off-licences; so, that's where availability needs to be limited. I suggest we ask the Board to make the whole of Edinburgh an area of over-provision of a those off-licensed premises where alcohol is sold in the same shop as food and other normal household goods. Such places lead to the normalisation of alcohol – from childhood on we're so used to seeing it sold alongside bread, milk etc, we've come to see it as just another item on our shopping list – and such places also promote impulse buying of alcohol – we go in for one or two things on our way home and spot our favourite tipple with £1 off and there's another few alcohol units we wouldn't otherwise have consumed.

Roger Colkett

**Tollcross Community Council Councillors:** Fiona Allen, Richard Allen, Paul Beswick, Iain Black Andrew Brough, Roger Colkett, Andrew Devenport, Chris McGregor, Liz Summerfield Ann Wigglesworth.

**Tollcross Community Council Responsibilities:** **Community Councils Liaison Coordinator** – Liz Summerfield, **Planning** – Paul Beswick, **Licensing Forum** – Roger Colkett, **Media monitoring** – Liz Summerfield, **Health** – Chris McGregor, **Built Environment** – Michael Lister (co-opted), **Fountainbridge Canalside Initiative** – Richard Allen, **Licensing** – Roger Colket, **Edinburgh Civic Forum** – Roger Colkett, Michael Lister (co-opted), **Meadows' Festival** – Andy Devenport, Liz Summerfield, **Friends of the Meadows and Bruntsfield Links** – Iain Black, **Canalside Festival** – Richard Allen, **Edinburgh Old Town Development Trust** – Roger Colkett, Michael Lister (co-opted), **Fountainbridge Steering Group** – Richard Allen, **Canal Management Committee** – Richard Allen.

**Tollcross City of Edinburgh Councillors:**

Tollcross Community Council is covered by 3 Wards for Edinburgh Council (Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart, Morningside and City Centre). Since the boundary changes for the 2017 Local Elections we are now 95% or so covered by the City Centre Ward and will be mostly working with our City Centre Councillors.

**Ward 9 Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart** Gavin Corbett (Green) Andrew Johnston (Con) David Key (SNP)

**Ward 10 Morningside** Nick Cook (Con) Melanie Main (Green) Neil Ross (LibDem) Many Watt (Lab)

**Ward 11 City Centre** Karen Doren (Lab) Claire Miller (Green) Jonna Mowat (Con) Alasdair Rankin (SNP).

**Tollcross MSP's:** **Edinburgh Central** Ruth Davidson (Con). **Lothian Regional List** Jeremy Balfour (Con), Miles Briggs (Con), Kezia Dugdale (Lab), Neil Findlay (Lab), Alison Johnstone (Green), Gordon Lindhurst (Con), Andy Wightman (Green).

**Tollcross MP's:** **Edinburgh East** Tommy Sheppard (SNP) **Edinburgh South West** Joanna Cherry (SNP).

**Tollcross Community Council area:**

Members of the public who live in the Tollcross Community Council area are very welcome to attend our meetings.



