



Tollcross Community Council Notice of Meeting and Agenda

28th February 2018

**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

Tollcross Community Council

Agenda 28th February 2018

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 29th November 2017 –**
 - a. Matters arising.
 - b. Acceptance.
- 5. Tollcross CC area matters:**
 - a. **Memorial for David Rintoul** – Update on funding and date – **LS**.
 - b. **Licensing Forum** - Review of the Forum. – **RC**.
 - c. **Data Protection progression** – **AB**.
- 6. Councillors' Comments & Questions.**
- 7. Planning – PB.**
- 8. Licensing – RC.**
- 9. AOCB**

Our next meeting of **Tollcross Community Council** is:

28th March 2018 @ Tollcross Community Centre

Tollcross Community Council
Minutes of Meeting of Wednesday 31 January 2018 at 7pm
Tollcross Community Centre, 117 Fountainbridge.

1. Welcome and Apologies

Present: Andrew Brough (Chair and Secretary); Fiona Allen (taking minutes); Richard Allen; Liz Summerfield; Roger Colkett; Iain Black; Paul Beswick; Ann Wigglesworth; Andy Devenport.

Police: PC Clark and PC Coulther. **CEC Councillor:** None attended. **Public:** Callum Booth-Lewis; Sorsha Caldwell; Andreas Wilhelm. Apologies: Cllrs Doran, Miller, Mowat. David Liddle, Michael Lister, Chris McGregor.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the year.

2. AOCB - None.

4. Declaration of interests – None.

5. Police Matters – PC Clark. This past month Edinburgh Division has been focussed on solving crimes of violence; hate crimes and protecting visitors and residents. This past month Police Scotland has been striving to work with fairness, integrity and respect.

The past 4 weeks there have been a spate of OLP MV which always happen on Friday nights in the Merchiston and Bruntsfield areas. One person was charged with 3 of the OLP's however there are 63 unsolved crime reports as there was insufficient to link him to the remainder of the crimes (different MO). We are waiting on the results from a blood lift which may identify a suspect for the rest. The CPT have been changing their shifts to do nightshifts at weekends to prevent/detect crimes. It is maybe worth re-iterating the importance of not having valuables on display within cars.

Road Safety Initiatives (Operation Heddle)

- 2 stalls held providing road safety advice at Westside Plaza and Fountain Park
- Patrols conducted at all schools in South West Edinburgh
- 4 static road checks conducted two alongside roads policing
- 19 speed checks
- Push bike patrols to give advice to cyclists and one warned re a light offence
- Regular parking and prohibited turn patrols
- Retail car park patrols to check if there were any valuables on show within vehicles.
- 25 people provided a security walkthrough or advice.
- 15 letters will be sent out to registered keepers giving advice -
- 7 inconsiderate parking notices issued
- 6 vehicles removed due to parking or tax offences (joint patrol with DVLA/parking attendants)
- 36 tickets issued -Three reports to PF (4 no seatbelt, 18 parking offences, 3 mobile phone, 4

HORT1, 1 no insurance, 6 speeding and 3 other)

- 2 drink drivers
- 2 S.165 seizure (no insurance)

ASB/DRUGS Operation Screening

- 32 arrests relating to numerous offences of dishonesties, anti-social behaviour and drugs
- 5 warrant arrests
- 32 stop searches, 24 of those searches were positive
- 20 drug recoveries with an approximate value of £1200
- Approximately £1600 cash seized as involved with dishonesties
- 10 house/shop warrants executed alongside VRU, CID, firearms, dog handlers
- 99 further interventions

Operation Winter City

- Bike theft initiative – CP advice , posters – decoy bike – bike marking
- Party Safe - students
- Business crime prevention
- Community Talks and Crime prevention Stalls
- Licensed Premises visits
- Hi Viz and targeted hotspot patrols

6. Minutes and matters arising from meeting of 29 November 2017 –

Corrections: In section 4, item 5d should be removed. Agreed.

Matters arising:

- a) Air B'n'B. Efforts are continuing within Scottish Government to strengthen the legislation relating to this problem. **Andrew Brough** will ask Claire Miller to obtain Andy Wightman's briefing note on the matter.
- b) The "Living Wild" event will now be 24 February 2018.
- c) Bins. No further information has been forthcoming on any plans to clean the bins especially those for food waste. There are still considerable problems with public area lighting, the lane at Grindlay Street being particularly troublesome.
- d) Book Trust Book Week Sale. **Liz Summerfield** thanked Fiona Allen and David Liddle for their attendance and donations, other colleagues for their donations also, and Andy Devenport for his transport of unsold books to the Oxfam bookshop. The event itself raised £30.
- e) Concorde, Home Street late opening application. A resident has sent correspondence to the Council but not a formal objection. The hearing will be 06 February. Guidelines will be sought as to the hours permitted for vacating premises after closure.

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

7. Tollcross area matters –

a) Street Assessment. The 220 page document appears to be a “wish list” covering 6 areas, but will be useful to refer to in future for potential improvement projects. **Paul Beswick** had raised an FOI question about the cost of the study; this had been reported at £47,000 but this figure did not include the “matched funding”. It was agreed that TXCC is broadly supportive of the document but disappointed not to have been consulted on taking part in the study.

b) Sustrans are launching a consultation on the proposed cycleway from The Meadows to the canal. Work is proposed to start in 2019. TXCC broadly in favour.

c) ATIK nightclub. **Claire Miller** is following up on the correspondence re. The bins; there is to be a site visit to prove or disprove the issues surrounding storage of the bins. It was also pointed out that since most of their contents will be empty bottles, the problem of unpleasant odours from indoor storage should not arise, as they are only open 3 nights a week.

d) TXCC has been advised of new data protection rules, and that compliance is required by summer 2018. **Richard Allen** agreed to take on the initial stages.

e) Commemorative tree and plaque. The wording accepted by TXCC is as follows;

“David Ian Rintoul - Mister Tollcross
1946-2017

Croupier, Golfer and tireless advocate for Tollcross Community
Rien ne va plus.”

Estimated costs are; £140, tree, £200, plaque. Offers of donations have been received from 3 organisations and some Councillors. **Liz Summerfield** is to steer this initiative, and establish a deadline for donation requests. Since the dedication ceremony will be held when the weather improves, April/May have been suggested. **Andy Devenport** will consult with **FOMBL** if the ceremony could be hosted along with a FOMBL meeting.

8. Councillor's Comments & Questions –

Councillor Rankin had been on the rota to attend, but did not do so. Any questions will therefore, with regret, be sent to his colleagues via email.

In the subsequent discussion, it was agreed that, since this was the last meeting on the current rota, **Andrew Brough** will write and ask Councillors to commit to each attending 2 meetings per year.

9. Planning –

Paul Beswick reported on the following matters:

a) 22-24 Home Street. Change to hot food takeaway. REFUSED.

b) 114 Dundee Street. GRANTED. Originally refused, overturned on appeal.

c) 4-10 Lower Gilmore Place. WITHDRAWN. BUT PPP still in place.

d) 142 Lothian Road. Erection of additional floor. Agreed to OBJECT.

e) advertising drums in Castle Terrace Car Park 2 refused. Ditto 1 in Grassmarket.
7 in other sites. Approved.

f) VASTINT. Comments due by 12 February. Concerns that housing is now “to follow”.

g) 4-11 Lower Gilmore Place, complete demolition. WITHDRAWN.

h) consultation on Developer Contributions; many and various tables, always referring back to trams.

i) New PAN for Lower Gilmore Place on view 15.3-19.00 Thursday 01 February.

8. Licensing – Roger Colkett reported that there were no new applications. A

situation has arisen in which GRBV will be questioning members of the Licensing Board to establish if they have always followed correct procedures.

[\[www.gov.scot/Topics/Government/Finance/spfm/BestValue\]](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Government/Finance/spfm/BestValue)

10. Licensing – Roger Colkett reported that there were no new applications.

11. South West Neighbourhood Partnership. –

Being dissolved, suggested “informal groups “may continue the work. Now being re-convened.

Discussion; there are 2 possibilities – a) create new localities or b) combine new localities with former Neighbourhood Partnerships, the latter acting in an advisory capacity, as they currently do with the Edinburgh Partnership. City of Edinburgh Council has until the end of March to make this political decision.

12. AOCB –

South West Neighbourhood Partnership. – Andy Devenport suggested being possibly dissolved, suggested “informal groups “may continue the work. Now being re-convened.

Discussion; there are 2 possibilities – a) create new localities or b) combine new localities with former Neighbourhood Partnerships, the latter acting in an advisory capacity, as they currently do with the Edinburgh Partnership. City of Edinburgh Council has until the end of March to make this political decision.

Andy Devenport raised the point that current recycling actually involves material exported to China, which is not necessarily recycled there but frequently ends up as landfill. TXCC members are asked to contact MPs and MSPs for assurances that recycling practices will be improved, and particularly that the new recycling plant to be built (in a coastal location) will follow Danish best practice rather than British minimum legal requirements.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm

**Date of next meeting Wednesday 28 February 2018 at 7pm
Tollcross Community Centre**

Letter to the Consultation on the Planning (Scotland Bill)

As a community council whose members have close links to a range of community groups and the community in general, we will confine our response to the area of Community Engagement. This will, of course, touch on other areas, such as Development Planning. We do, of course, endorse the implied aim of delivering housing in larger numbers in an efficient manner.

We feel that the Bill does not make any improvement to the already poor community engagement from the community's point of view. There need to be changes in the way the community is consulted on LDPs as well as planning applications and a right given to communities to appeal bad planning decisions.

Community Engagement

We do not believe that the Bill furthers the Aim of improving community engagement.

It is timely to review the planning process and determine whether the aims of the previous reforms have been met. The previous reforms made much of aspects of community engagement. Government and local government documents liberally use the term, 'community engagement'. It is appropriate to determine what this means. We believe that it should mean more than the box ticking exercise that it has become.

As a community council, we are 'engaged' at many levels. Consultations take place about Strategic Plans, Local Development Plans, Planning Guidance, Pre Application Notifications and planning applications. With planning guidance stressing community engagement, expectations have been raised about what might be described as community planning. Was it ever intended that communities would have an influential role in determining planning rules and the developments that would be approved or rejected within their areas? Experience in other countries shows that where there is genuine local involvement in planning issues, there is greater public satisfaction.

Community Councils and other local groups are currently very dissatisfied with the planning system and have never felt more disengaged from a system where they are marginalised and planning is developer controlled. We are 'consulted' to a level that we can hardly cope with but still feel that we have no observable effect on planning issues. It is an expensive process for Government, councils and developers to keep up all this 'engagement'. The only measure of its value is whether the community feels engaged. We feel that this Bill does little to change this and alienation will continue.

Pre application notifications (PANs).

One of the rationales for the introduction of PANs was to involve the community more in the developments within their area and to shift the balance of power a little in favour of the community. We believe that this aim has not been achieved. Our Community Council area is undergoing many developments and we have been involved in more than a dozen PANs.

Whilst it is useful for local people to have more notice and to have developments explained to them, there have been no meaningful dialogues other than about very small, cosmetic changes to plans. Even after public meetings showing disquiet about certain aspects of the proposal, no changes have been made by developers. Therefore it is simply an early sight of the application.

An unintended consequence is that it shows the developers what objections local people will make. There are now cases where developers have been able to rewrite their full planning applications to minimise the impact of certain objections. Furthermore, there are examples of very partial reports of the consultations which only the developers write.

Therefore, there is benefit in the PAN system to the developers, but not the community. It is now considered by many community councils that objectors should not engage with the developers at this stage; i.e. keep their powder dry. For these reasons the PAN system needs to be reformed.

Master Plans etc.

There is a good case for master planning so that appropriate uses arise within large development areas. Local groups have spent much time in discussions with planners and developers in order to produce Master Plans and Development Briefs/Strategies. There has been real consultation, enthusiasm and engagement in these processes. These are the only processes that could realistically be referred to as community planning. In all of these cases, at various stages, the criteria set out in the master plans have been abandoned when a planning application doesn't meet them. In almost all cases, it is housing that has lost out to other uses and in no single case has a master plan been even slightly adhered to. It is probably fair to say that the local planning authority appears to have little control either as all it seems to be able to do is react to planning applications with the presumption on approval. This discourages the community from participating. This example shows that the ideal of community engagement causes more resentment than engagement.

Local Development Plans

LDPs should certainly be retained as they give a guide to the public and developers alike but their preparation and form need revision. That the Bill would remove Strategic Plans and using the NPF means that the LDPs will be more centralised and less influenced by local concerns.

LDPs have changed over the years to become much more permissive. They have become heavily laced with qualifying words like acceptable, unacceptable, appropriate, inappropriate, excessive, attractive and nearby. This leads to a loss of clarity, little certainty for the public and developers and leads to the possibility of more disputes and appeals. LDPs should be returned to exactly that; plans we can all buy into and not vague guides.

A lengthy process of public consultation is undertaken when producing LDPs but there is little public confidence in this consultation. The draft plan with its preferred options is presented and, not surprisingly, these preferred options do not change despite a vast consultation. The public should be involved in writing the draft and not just when the 'settled will' of the planning authority has been presented. This process mirrors the involvement of the public with planning applications when they only become involved when the developers have settled on their plan.

Role of Community Councils

National legislation and local rules, give Community Councils a quasi-statutory role in the planning process. It supposedly involves the CCs representing public opinion. However CCs have neither the financial resources nor mechanisms in place to genuinely obtain majority views for all their local people on all the issues on which they are consulted, particularly in the short time frames allowed. The national rules allude to consulting with the population but local councils have interpreted this as simply consulting CCs as a very easy option. CCs need to be given more resources and time if they are to fulfil these responsibilities.

Equal Rights of Appeal (ERA)

That the Bill does not include this is, we believe, a serious failing. It is right that developers can appeal a planning decision if they feel it is an unsound decision. The problem is that there can be no independent scrutiny of unsound approval decisions. Where ERA is used in other countries, there is evidence that better decisions are made so that few appeals are necessary and those appeals that are made have a high success rate showing that the decisions did need scrutiny. A system could be devised to prevent vexatious appeals and to minimise delays and workloads. Appeals panels could be local and use only written evidence. The introduction of ERA would be a big confidence boost to communities and the public at large.

Balance of power in planning

All the planning guidance, plans, rules and engagements are only steps on the way to the final issue for local communities and that is what developments take place or not in their localities. The planning system is heavily weighted in favour of the interests of the promoters of development rather than in the interests of the public as a whole or of local communities. There is a real feeling that the balance between local communities and other stakeholders needs to change in favour of communities. In a healthy society, communities have a say in the development of their area. The Bill misses a great chance to achieve this rebalancing there should be more legal status to Master Plans and more involvement in preparing plans and planning applications. Introducing equal rights of appeal with appropriate safeguards would also help this rebalancing. There is an obvious need for scrutiny of some of the poor decisions taken by planning authorities. This change to the Bill would be the biggest single means to help restore confidence in the planning system.

Paul Beswick

Letter re new glass level behind old Woolworths.

**Erection of additional office floor with adjusted elevational details and plant area.at 142 Lothian Road
Edinburgh EH3 9BQ
17/05827/FUL**

Case Officer Carla Parkes 0131 529 3925 carla.parkes@edinburgh.gov.uk

Dear Ms Parkes,

Tollcross Community Council would like to object to this application.

At the time of the original application we were concerned that the building was too high as it did not conform to the building line of the adjacent listed building. We felt that it dominated this listed building. We certainly do not think that adding another floor on top would be advisable as this would make the building even more dominant and would be two floors+ above the building line. It is clear that the original application went for the highest building that the developers thought would be given consent.

Furthermore, we feel that approval of this application would be a bad precedent. Were it to be approved, then almost every developer would apply for more floors when building was underway.

Paul Beswick

Copy of text from Deputation at Governance Risk and Best Value Committee.

Delegation to Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee 20th February 2018

Background

2.1 The Licensing (Scotland) Act 2005 ('the Act') requires local authorities to establish a 'Local Licensing Forum' under the provisions of the Act. Whilst Licensing Boards have been in place as separate legal entities for many years, Licensing Forums were created by the Act. However both are independent of the Council and its structures. The Act does not provide any mechanism by which the Council could exercise governance over the Forum.

2.1 But neither does the Act specifically exclude the Council from exercising governance of the Forum.

2.6 All reports in relation to the Forum have been dealt with by Council, as none of the existing executive committees have the Licensing Forum within their remit.

2.6 Is there any reason why none of the executive committees has the Licensing Forum within its remit?

2.7 The Regulatory Committee deals with all Council licensing functions which do not include liquor or gambling, as these functions are regulated under separate statutory regimes and fall within the remit of the Licensing Board. As the Licensing Board is a separate legal entity, the Council cannot include the Forum within the Board's remit. As the Forum has specific functions in relation to the Board as set out in the Act, such a remit would conflict with statutory requirements.

2.7 I'm not sure that I can follow the relevance or the logic of this paragraph.

Current Licensing Forum

3.8 The remaining five seats not specifically allocated to a representative listed in paragraph 3.5 above were filled by volunteers. For example, a member of the Friends of the Meadows has attended the Forum for a number of years.

3.8 Volunteers?

How were people informed that they could volunteer? If I had known in 2012 I would certainly have volunteered.

How were the volunteers chosen - did the number of volunteers just happen to magically match the number of vacancies?

What did FoMBL have to offer that outweighed the concerns of several community councils with very large numbers of licensed premises in their respective areas?

3.9 In order to encourage community and other interested parties to attend and participate, the constitution allows third parties to attend and speak but not to vote. This arrangement has helped widen access to the Forum. For example, a number of community councils send observers to Forum meetings to allow them to raise relevant points.

3.9 As far as I know, this arrangement has never been publicised not even to community councils.

Review of Forum Membership and Constitution

3.10 Early in 2017 it was identified that this distribution of membership was no longer fit for purpose as:

- Community Planning structures were changing; and
- Historically it had been difficult to recruit a community representative from the East and West Neighbourhood areas.

3.10 More to the point, the basis for the current membership was pretty opaque. Nobody that I've spoken to knew that anyone was there as a member of FoMBL.

3.11 Any change to the make-up of Forum membership requires amendments to the constitution, and it was therefore decided to review that document at the same time. As required by the constitution, the Council's Regulatory Services Manager initially consulted the Convenor of the Forum, attended several meetings of the Forum during 2017 and consulted the membership on:

- Changes to the constitution; and
- Proposals on how the future membership would be distributed.

3.11 Although not a member, I have for the past several years attended most meetings of the Forum; occasionally as a deputy for one of the members, mostly as a member of the public. The only form of consultation was that Andrew Mitchel sent his proposals to the Forum members. Whether they were

invited to comment, whether they did so, or whether any comment they may have made was taken into account I have no idea.

3.12 Members were asked to consult with the groups they represented, e.g. Neighbourhood Partnerships and local community councils, and to provide written feedback or comments. A series of written comments were received and, where possible, the comments were adopted. If not, an explanation was provided as to why they were not accepted and direct feedback was provided.

3.12 I am a member of the City Centre Neighbourhood Partnership. Nobody consulted us on either the constitution or the basis for membership.

3.13 In addition to consultation with the Forum membership, further consultation was undertaken separately with the Edinburgh Association of Community Councils to ensure that the wider community council membership in the city had an opportunity to provide feedback. Finally, stakeholders were approached for comment, including colleagues responsible for community planning and the Chief Social Work Officer.

3.13 Presumably the rationale for consulting the EACC was to avoid having to consult with individual community councils but there is no obligation on any community council to join the EACC and many of have not done so.

On behalf of TXCC either the Chair or I usual attend EACC meetings. Neither of us has seen any sort of consultation on these matters via the EACC.

My overall feeling on the so-called consultation is that at best only lip service was paid to the concept and that in practice no real attempt was made to seek or incorporate the opinions of interested parties.

WHY WASN'T THE CONSULTATION HUB USED?

Revised membership

3.14.1 In addition to the Health Board representative, the Chief Social Work Officer will be asked to nominate a representative from health or social work. It is suggested that this will be an officer from Edinburgh Drugs and Alcohol Partnership;

3.14.1 the correct title of the organisation referred to here is "Edinburgh Alcohol and Drug Partnership",

3.14.3 The six community representatives will be drawn principally from revised community planning arrangements • One from each of the four localities (North West, North East, South West and South East). • One representative from the City Centre ward - this suggestion came from a number of sources and it made sense to include this given the concentration of licensed premises in the City Centre. • One representative from the Edinburgh Association of Community Councils.

3.14.3 Why should the EACC have a representative on the forum? A significant number of CCs don't choose to be part of the EACC and in my experience the EACC rarely manages to speak with one voice on anything significant.

3.15 It is recognised that Community Planning structures are still under consideration and have yet to be approved by the Council. It was therefore proposed that existing community representation should continue until new structures are agreed.

3.15 This proposal is only acceptable if Community Planning structures are fully established without delay (looks like a forlorn hope at present). If that isn't going to happen within at most 2 months, the existing arrangements need to be rationalised now (new convener – required by the Act to be voted for at first meeting of each year; membership anomalies should be rectified – e.g. on paper at least, Merchiston CC has two representatives on the Forum, albeit one (I think) deceased and one "additional", presumably a "volunteer"; FoMBL shouldn't have a representative on the Forum.)

3.16 Once revised community planning structures are agreed, a representative will be nominated. This representative will be accountable to the area that they represent. Support and advice will be provided, if required for recruitment and selection or in the event of a vacancy. It would of course be appropriate for an area to nominate an existing representative. The clear intention is that each area will nominate their chosen representative to provide a direct link between the community and the Forum. This would of course be kept under review, should community planning structures evolve or if any concerns arise.

3.16 It's not at all clear how an "area" (or even a Locality) will nominate a representative – will there just be a single nomination? If so, by whom and on what basis? Will the representative be voted for? If so again who will be able to nominate them and who will be allowed to vote for them?

Governance

6.1 The Local Licensing Forum is independent of the Council and governance arrangements therein.

6.1 Maybe I'm missing something but, if the Local Licensing Forum is independent of the Council (and governance arrangements therein), how can the Council comply with the requirements within Schedule 2 of the Act, (Which relates to Local Licensing Forums) for example that:

(4) The other members are to be individuals appointed by the relevant council *on such terms and conditions as the relevant council may determine.* (my italics)

(5) In appointing members of a Forum, the relevant council *must seek to ensure so far as possible that the membership of the Forum is representative of the interests of persons or descriptions of persons who have an interest which is relevant to the Forum's general functions.* (my italics)

Appendix 1 FORUM MEMBERS AS AT 7 DECEMBER 2017

2. Licence Holders and Persons with Relevant Interests

2. Who selects / nominates/ appoints the Licence Holders (and Persons with Relevant interests) and who decides how that should be done? NB The Act uses the phrase "holders of premises licences and personal Licences" the reference to persons with relevant interests is presumably derived from para (5) of Schedule 2 of the Act – see my comment on 6.1 above – so, are all these eight people licence holders?

6. Community/residents:

6. Since there are at least two vacancies, probably more (one has told me that he no longer wants to serve – I believe he is seriously ill; another, I've heard has died) and, according to paragraph 3.10 of the report, historically it has been difficult to recruit a community representative from the East and West Neighbourhood areas, perhaps some additional "volunteers" should be co-opted. Perhaps the Governance Committee (who else?) should decide on what basis that should be done.

Appendix 2 City of Edinburgh Licensing Forum Constitution

This is very largely a cut and paste job from the 2012 version (Appendix 3) it would have helped the amended sections had been highlighted.

4.2 (one of the terms of reference of the Forum) To respond to consultation exercises undertaken by the Board and the Scottish Executive.

4.2 Scottish Executive should be Scottish Government.

6.3 Residents' representatives will be appointed to represent each of the four Community Planning Areas (one for each area) and in addition one representative shall be appointed to represent Ward 11 (City Centre). • South East • South West • North West • North East • Ward 11 (City Centre)

6.3 This seems to suggest that there will only be 5 residents as members of the Forum. Are there to be only 5 Licence holders too?

6.5 A Licensing Standards Officer, a person nominated by the Health Board, a representative nominated by the Chief Constable and a person nominated by the Chief Social Worker will be appointed as members of the Forum.

6.5 The suggestion in para 3.14.1 of the report that the health or social work nominee will be an officer from Edinburgh Alcohol and Drug Partnership could usefully be quoted here as an example of what would be appropriate.

7.1 At its first meeting and at the first meeting in each calendar year the Forum will elect a Convener from its members. Any member of the Forum may stand for election as Convener. The Convener will hold office until the first meeting in the following year unless he or she resigns or is dismissed.

7.1 Given that the Convener has a casting vote it would be transparently fairer if the chair alternated yearly between licence holders and residents.

7.4 If the Convener is unable to attend a meeting of the Forum, he or she must send his or her apologies to the Community Safety Senior Manager. The Convener may nominate a substitute to express views on his or her behalf. The Forum should nominate another one of the usual members to chair that meeting.

7.4 Community Safety Manager seems an odd choice. What's the rationale for this?

8.3 All Forum meetings will be held in public and will be open to the media.

8.5 Dates and times of meetings, the agenda, and any connected papers will normally be issued by email or by post (if a member so requests) to the Forum members in advance of the meeting.

8.6 Forum papers will be posted on the Council website. This will include agenda, minutes of previous meetings, and other materials relevant to the Forum's operation.

8.3, 8.5 and 8.6 If Forum meetings are to be genuinely public the dates of meetings need to be uploaded to the Council website (and perhaps announced more widely too) at least 2 weeks in advance – in fact why not schedule all the next years meetings at the last meeting of each year?

8.7 The minimum number of members present for any meeting of the Forum is eight. If this minimum does not attend, the meeting will be adjourned to a later date.

8.7 According to Schedule 2 of the Act, "The quorum for a meeting of a Forum is one half of the number of members (but in any case not fewer than 3)". Eight would only be the minimum if the size of the forum were restricted to sixteen. This paragraph should stick to the wording of the Act.

8.10 A note of each meeting will be submitted for approval at the next meeting.

8.10 A draft note of the meeting should be circulated to the those who attended the meeting requesting prompt notification of any correction and the note corrected as required should be uploaded to the council website within 4 weeks of the meeting.

13.2 Should members of the public wish to speak at a Forum meeting then they should indicate notice of attendance a week before the meeting; and will be given a maximum of five minutes to address the Forum, or otherwise at the discretion of the Convener.

13.2 This will only work if our suggestion regarding paras 8.3, 8.5 and 8.6 is adopted.

Roger Colkett

Minutes of Tollcross Community Centre Association

Present. Richard Allen(chair), Brian McGill, Rona Brown, Gandolf, MD Noor Alam, Gina McGaughan, Dave Hewitt CLD.

Apologies.

Kenny Owenson,Danny Highnett,Anne Wigglesworth,Allan Barton

1. All welcome and introduced.

2. Minutes of Last Meeting and matters arising

Minutes of previous meeting agreed, proposed Brian seconded Gandolf

3. Business Matters.

a) Finance Report. None : report to be forwarded later by Brian

b) Draft Guidelines for Community Centres this is to be discussed at a special meeting on Monday 19 February 2018 .

Dave to provide response from council teams and Unison

4. Funding request. No requests

5. Requests for Centre Lets.

A request from the Green party for amonthly let at non commercial rate was agreed

6. Membership requests. None.

7. Building Management.

a) Toilet refurbishment.: There was no further development Brian to followup with CEC

b) Front Door: There was no further development Brian to followup with CEC

c) janitors house

the youth group have requested that they be able to “do up” a room in the janitors hse this has been referred back to CEC for verification and information about site potential hazard

8. CLD Staffing.

Dave gave a run down of the current operational dispositions of council employees regarding the center:

9. AOCB : none

10 DONM: 7th March 2018 @18:30hrs (special meeting as above)

Richard Allen.

Friends of The Meadows and Bruntsfield Links

Minutes of Meeting of Trustees on 20 February 2018 at 5.30pm in The Golf Tavern

Present: Iain Black, Sarah Tolley, Neil Roger, Alison Service, Heather Goodare, Joan Carter, Jim Orr, Alec Mann, Andy Davenport, Yusef Samari

Donal Farrell, the new manager of the Golf Tavern, met the Trustees to talk about his plans for benches and refreshments on the edge of Bruntsfield Links.

The Meeting was chaired by Jim Orr, Jim was welcomed as Treasurer to the Meeting.

The Minutes of the last meeting and the Minutes of the EGM were read and approved. Matters arising:

A plumber has inspected the Old Fountain: Joan will persevere in getting a report. The status of drinking fountains in the Council to be researched. #Joan

The damaged bench has not been replaced; the Parks Authority to be asked if Fombl can dedicate a new memorial bench to Robin Morris #Alison

The Council has decided to name a path after Muriel Spark; Melanie Main to be reminded to include Fombl in the celebrations #Heather

The Sick Kids development plans: Fombl Trustees support Joan in raising the issue of inadequate provision for rubbish bins on the site. This is a serious issue with regard to potential litter in the park. #Joan

Treasurer's Report

Jim is working on the accounts with a view to submitting them to the charity regulator by 31st March. Draft accounts and update available. Online banking has been set up.

Volunteer Coordinator's report

The January working party removed cages around grown trees, and plans to introduce a new wildflower meadow in March.

Cages must be removed carefully using Andy's wire-cutter, so they can be re-used.

A group of corporate volunteers will need managing on 17 & 19 or 24 & 26 April.

Litter around the croquet pavilion is a perennial problem; the Croquet Club members to be asked again to help keep it under control. #Heather

Projects Leader Report

Neil circulated an updated list of projects, which he is busy implementing; the Council has not yet confirmed the extent of the funds allocated for FOMBL projects. £3500 remains of last year's £17800.

A set of railings has been painted with excellent results – to be rolled out.

-A Point for the Agenda at the next meeting: 'Looking Ahead,' to include provision for a railing maintenance budget.

-The lack of accessible toilets was raised: Cameron Rose to be contacted again about drainage plans and a feasibility report. #Alison

-A memo about recent toilet closures to be circulated. #Sarah

- Sarah emailed Councillor Lesley MacInnes on 20 Sept and 19 Oct 2017 on behalf of Fombl, and sent a postal invitation to the Autumn gathering. No reply to date.

Other points on the agenda

-Orienteering posts. Fombl does not support this proposal; proposer should apply to the Council to use regular small triangles fixed to existing features. # Sarah

-The provision of a FOMBL membership card is currently being investigated. Please ask your local retailers/groups if they would support it. #Sarah

- Sarah reported that the community garden has been given lots of reconditioned tools by the SPS, as well as loppers for Fombl volunteers.

- Fombl is keen to erect a shed (a non-permanent structure) near the Council shed, to be shared between the community garden and Fombl. Parks approval needed.

-The Sick Kids development may involve another opportunity to meet the developers; some modifications to the design have been agreed. Fombl to be updated. # Joan

-OSCAR requirements. Heather has completed a questionnaire. The OSCAR logo to be included on the website. #Philip

It was agreed that Fombl should adopt a vulnerable persons protection policy and study an up-to-date document (EVOC website) # Sarah

New data protection rules about membership details to be complied with #Alec

Spring Gathering

Agreed title 'The future of park management'.

Speakers – Alan Bell (Greenspace Manager), Val Lawrie (Community Payback Orders), and Yusef Samari (Biology research student). Projector needed.

Publicity, arrangements, etc. #Sarah, Heather, Philip

AOB

-Yusef reported on the Soundscape project which will install 6 audio devices in trees in the Meadows to capture ambient sounds.

- Alec proposed naming a path after General Maczek – next year, possibly.
- Andy reported that a pair of (stone?) unicorns, the Jawbones and bandstand parts are at risk as their storage site is up for sale. To be investigated. #Andy, and others
- The Meadows Festival will ban non-recyclable packaging this summer!
- Heather is putting the Fombl Spring newsletter together; contributions are needed.

Date of next meeting: 27 March at 5.30 pm - proposed new date Wed 14 March.

Iain Black

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. **Community Centre Liaison** – 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.



