

MURRAYFIELD COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Minutes of Ordinary Meeting
held on Tuesday, 26 June 2018 at 7.30pm
in Murrayfield Parish Church Centre
Chair: J Yellowlees

Present: A Anderson, H Barbour, R Beavis, R Brown, J Forbes, P Gregson, S Holland, H Ross, M Stevens, H Whaley, J Yellowlees,
Ex officio: Cllr Gillian Gloyer, Cllr Frank Ross,
In attendance: 13 members of the public, Rurighd McMeddes, City of Edinburgh Council, Jonny Petrie, Edinburgh Rugby, Stuart Mc Kenzie, SAGS, and Neil McKerrow, Westerlea,
Apologies: N Macdonald, R Smart, D Whitelaw, Cllr Karen Doran, Cllr Scott Douglas, Cllr Claire Miller, Cllr Jo Mowat, Cllr Alasdair Rankin, Jeremy Balfour, MSP, Miles Briggs, MSP, Ruth Davidson, MSP, Kezia Dugdale, MSP, Neil Findlay, MSP, Alison Johnstone, MSP, Gordon Lindhurst, MSP, Andy Wightman, MSP, Christine Jardine, MP.

1. Welcome and Apologies

Apologies were received as above. The Chairman welcomed those in attendance and made special mention of Jonny Petrie, Managing Director of Edinburgh Rugby, Stuart McKenzie, President of the Scottish Allotments and Gardens Association (“SAGS”) and Mr Neil McKerrow of Westerlea.

The Chairman intimated that Pat Clark, biographer of local artist Charles Mackie, had recently broken her wrist in an accident with a cyclist.

The Chairman reported that Rurighd McMeddes, City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project (“CCWEL”) Stakeholder Liaison Officer, and his colleague, Anna Rowell, had presented a paper on the Rejuvenating Roseburn project at the recent Scottish Transport Applications Research conference. He congratulated them on winning the award for the best paper by a young author. R McMeddes thanked MCC for its involvement in the CCWEL process.

2. Order of Business

This was approved subject to the omission of Item 3.

3. Community Policing Report

As there was no Police representative present, this item was omitted.

The Chairman asked for views on the impact of the Rolling Stones concert at BT Murrayfield. The consensus was that there had been no excessive noise and little anti-social behaviour and traffic management had been good. One member of the public complained that the diversion of the buses had not been well advertised.

4. Councillor’s Report

4.1 Before the arrival of Cllr Gloyer J Forbes updated the meeting on Ellersly Road. He reported that the streetscape project was yet to be launched. Of the 10 “quick wins” identified the 6 easiest had been completed. The main outstanding items

are (1) the provision of additional “20 mph” roundels on the road. The decision to install roundels is normally taken by the Transport Committee but it is also within the discretion of the North West Locality team to make the decision; (2) one of the stone walls on the north side of Ellersly Road leans over the pavement and work cannot be carried out near it until it is confirmed, or made to be, structurally sound. The latest estimate for completion of the quick wins is 2 -3 months.

Cllr Gloyer confirmed that she had put down a question to the next meeting of the full Council on 28 June 2018 asking why the quick wins had not been completed after 8 months and whether solutions had been found to the streetscape issues.

4.2 Cllr Gloyer reported that the North West Locality Committee continues to be a work in progress. It is trying to define its capabilities and is meeting on 31 July 2018 to discuss its relationship with the Western Edinburgh Neighbourhood Partnership.

The Chairman mentioned that he had attended the last meeting of the North West Locality Committee, but felt that there was no point in a Community Council representative attending such meetings except by invitation in relation to a specific issue.

4.3 Cllr Gloyer reported that she and Cllr Scott Douglas had attended the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee on 20 June 2018 at which the decisions on the Traffic Regulation Order (“TRO”) and Redetermination Order (“RSO”) for the Roseburn to Haymarket section of the CCWEL had been taken. Their amendment to allow time for discussion of pedestrian issues such as Toucan crossings had been defeated. The objections to the proposed changes to loading and unloading arrangements, which are part of the TRO, will have to be considered at a public hearing, but the Council will be going ahead with those parts of the route not affected by the hearing.

The Chairman explained that he, the Secretary and J Forbes had met Cllrs Gloyer and Douglas ahead of the Transport and Environment Committee meeting to discuss the main issue of concern to MCC which was the freedom and rights of pedestrians, in particular the proposed mixed use crossings for pedestrians and cyclists. MCC took issue with the fact that the report to the Committee had stated that Toucan crossings are widely used across the city, implying that they are, therefore, a good thing. MCC considered that they are not necessarily suitable for the two locations proposed.

M Stevens confirmed that in its submission on the TRO and SRO the Donaldson Area Amenity Association had specifically raised the issue of the loss of pavement involved in the installation of the Toucan crossing proposed for West Coates near Stanhope Street.

H Whaley acknowledged that the mixed use crossings do involve pedestrians and cyclists interacting on the crossing, but pointed out that the same would be true for either end of alternative crossing arrangements. Requiring cyclists to dismount was not an option he favoured.

4.4 Cllr Gloyer reported that the Education, Children and Families Committee had met the previous week to consider the south and south west schools review. The merger of Currie and Wester Hailes High Schools is not going ahead, nor is the change to the catchment area for Roseburn Primary School. Any changes to catchment areas have to be decided by the full Council. The locations of the new schools to be built in the west of the city have not yet been decided.

In answer to a question from P Gregson Cllr Gloyer confirmed that the Council would have to vote to abolish the Neighbourhood Partnerships and has not done so. She explained that the Neighbourhood Partnerships used to decide on the allocation of Council funds and their decisions were implemented by Council Officers. The decisions on allocation of funds are now taken by the Locality Committees which are composed of elected Councillors. There is a question about how the Council funds are to be divided among the Neighbourhood Partnerships in each Locality.

5. Approval of Minutes of Ordinary Meeting held on 1 May 2018

These were approved. Prop: M Stevens, Sec: H Ross.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. *Cost of graffiti removal*

At the previous MCC meeting PC Euan Sinclair had undertaken to look into whether the cost of removing graffiti applied by supporters of Hibernian Football Club could be recovered from the Club. In his absence this question was held over.

6.2. *Motorbike parked on pavement*

M Stevens reported that following the last MCC meeting he had emailed a photograph of the red motorbike which is often parked on the pavement of West Coates to the Police, who had identified and spoken to its owner. The motorbike had been removed but had later re-appeared.

6.3. *Map of benches along North Edinburgh Path Network*

As promised, Cllr Douglas had emailed a copy of this map to the Secretary.

6.4. *Extension of Controlled Parking Zone to Roseburn*

Cllr Douglas had enquired whether the Council would be prepared to re-visit the possibility of extending the CPZ to Roseburn, the residents having turned down this proposal a few years ago. He had emailed the Secretary to the effect that he had been advised that the Council would not do so. Cllr Gloyer confirmed that this is also her understanding of the Council's position.

6.5. *Tor planning application*

J Forbes informed the meeting that Mr Neil McKerrow of Westerlea had coordinated the lodging of objections by neighbours to the planning application for re-development of the former Tor nursing home. Mr McKerrow explained that the main grounds of objection were (1) the inappropriate and insensitive design of the new buildings - a large block between two listed buildings; and (2) failure to achieve the required standards of amenity - the proximity to existing buildings would have an adverse effect on their daylight. Mr McKerrow asked whether MCC would be prepared to press for a hearing in due course. J Forbes considered that that was a question for the future. He reported that following objections by MCC and the Cockburn Association the developer had revised the original plans. A stable block which was to have been demolished will now be retained. The height of the new north block has been reduced from six to five storeys, but both new blocks are still too high and/or too close to existing buildings. MCC had objected to the loss of a number of important heritage trees, but there has been no revision in this respect. MCC remained of the view that the proposed development will degrade the essential character of the West Murrayfield Conservation Area and J Forbes had submitted further objections to the revised proposals. MCC does not necessarily support or object to

individual planning applications, but in this case the interest of the community is in alignment with the views of the local residents.

J Forbes confirmed that the application is still awaiting assessment. There are 35 objections. He felt that, if the planners approve the application, it would be important to get the Planning Committee to consider it and perhaps carry out a site visit. Cllr Gloyer stated her willingness to request a site visit.

6.6. *33 Pinkhill*

Cllr Ross confirmed that this planning application had been refused. He was aware that the Chairman of Corstorphine Community Council had been trying to engage with the developer without success and he surmised that the developer intends to have the application referred to a Reporter.

7. CCWEL draft Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order

Rurighd McMeddes, CCWEL Stakeholder Liaison Officer, reported that the Transport and Environment Committee had approved the draft TRO and RSO but the objections to the proposed changes to loading bays are to be considered at a public hearing and all objectors will be invited to attend. Objections to the draft RSO have to be adjudicated by the Scottish Government but there is no requirement for a public hearing on them. The Scottish Government could, however, include them in the TRO hearing. Those objections which do not require a public hearing have been set aside. No part of the project can be constructed until the RSO has been determined, but that decision could be quite quick if the RSO is not included in the TRO public hearing. Objectors will be given 16 weeks' notice of the public hearing. He might know the date of the hearing by the next MCC meeting on 14 August. After the hearing the Reporter will make a recommendation. In practice the Reporter's recommendation is almost always accepted by the Transport Committee. R McMeddes thanked Cllrs Gloyer and Douglas for their efforts in reflecting the views of the community.

He confirmed that no part of the project will be constructed ahead of the final decision unless it fulfils a function in its own right, such as a section of new cycle track linked to the existing north west cycle network.

The Chairman commented that the Council's responses to objectors to the TRO and/or RSO had included a final paragraph about a public hearing and withdrawal of objections which some had found threatening in tone. R McMeddes apologised and explained that it was necessary to set out the statutory procedure clearly. There had been no intention to threaten and no expectation that objections would be withdrawn. Objectors will be invited, but are not required, to attend the public hearing.

M Stevens asked whether the Council is interested in factual inaccuracies in its responses, in particular, the assertion regarding the proposed Toucan crossing near Stanhope Street that it would benefit the children and pensioners living in that part of the Donaldson area. He explained that there are only around 12 children living there and many more pensioners living in the sheltered housing who do not cycle and who, far from benefitting from a crossing shared with cyclists, are in fact intimidated by the prospect. J Forbes supported this contention describing the Council's argument as "Alice in Wonderland logic". R McMeddes stated that removing the Toucan crossing would not have been in accordance with Council policy.

H Whaley reported that the **Active Transport Forum** had recently published a **report** and **undertook to email it to his fellow Community Councillors**. He

mentioned that Humza Yousaf, MSP had moved from Transport to Justice and Michael Matheson is the new Transport Secretary.

In answer to a question from P Gregson R McMeddes confirmed that objectors will be allowed to speak at the public TRO hearing.

8. Rejuvenating Roseburn update

R McMeddes explained that he had hoped to launch the public consultation on the Rejuvenating Roseburn project by now, but the workload generated by the public consultation on the draft TRO and RSO had prevented this. He expected to do so in the autumn and would consult MCC over the summer on what form the consultation is to take. A further consultation on the project had just been carried out with the pupils of Roseburn Primary School who had all been sent a questionnaire to complete with their parents. It was important to do this now because Primaries 1, 5 and 7 had been consulted at the start of the project and the Primary 7s would be leaving the School at the end of June. He reported that there was strong support for the project from the children and a willingness to be involved in looking after any new greenery planted as part of the project.

The Chairman commented that the four planters on the Old Coltbridge were looking good and thanked the Secretary for her work on them.

9. Edinburgh Rugby's plan for Murrayfield back pitches

The Chairman introduced Jonny Petrie, Managing Director of Edinburgh Rugby, who had already held an informal meeting with local residents which S Holland had attended and reported on briefly by email.

J Petrie then gave a presentation on Edinburgh Rugby's recent application for planning permission to create a new small stadium on the back pitches at BT Murrayfield with an artificial pitch, four stands made of flexible infrastructure for 7,800 spectators (2,000 covered standing, 5,800 covered seating) and new energy efficient LED floodlighting, which would involve less light spillage. The development site is less than 2 hectares. He explained that Edinburgh Rugby would continue to use the existing main stadium facilities such as bars, hospitality suites and parking. He handed out copies of the presentation at the meeting. Details of the planning application are on the Council's planning portal. The application was open for public comment until 3 July 2018.

J Petrie explained that Edinburgh Rugby had been using George Watson's facilities at Myreside, but these were not ideal from the point of view of club identity, match atmosphere or generating demand for tickets. The timing of the planning application had been influenced by (1) the completion of the flood prevention works which had reduced the risk of flooding of the back pitches, (2) the creation of the national Sports Performance Centre at Heriot-Watt University's Riccarton campus which meant that the back pitches were required less often for training and (3) the improved financial state of Scottish Rugby.

A decision on the planning application is expected in August 2018. If approved, the development will be begun in October 2018 and, as it is not a complicated build, should be completed in April/May 2019 in time for the start of the 2019/20 season in September 2019. The build compound would be in the Saughtonhall car park and no new access would be required.

J Petrie anticipated that 13 or 14 matches would be played in the new stadium per year. The annual match against Glasgow would continue to be played in the main stadium.

J Petrie said that he was aware that the future of Murrayfield Wanderers was a burning issue locally. He stressed that Edinburgh Rugby's development plans and the end of Murrayfield Wanderers' lease of the back pitches were not linked. Murrayfield Wanderers had known for years that their lease was going to come to an end. It had been extended but would run out at the end of August 2018.

In response to questions from A Anderson, P Gregson, the Secretary and members of the public as to why Murrayfield Wanderers cannot continue to use their existing clubhouse and share the new facilities with Edinburgh Rugby, J Petrie explained that Wanderers' use of the development site over a number of years had caused problems with the running of an international sporting campus. He stressed that Edinburgh Rugby did not "chuck out" Murrayfield Wanderers in order to do their development.

P Gregson explained that the local community does not want Wanderers to build a new clubhouse in Roseburn Park. The Chairman intimated that R Smart, who could not be present at the meeting, had suggested that Wanderers look at the Mary Erskine site at Ravelston which houses the National Cricket Academy.

H Ross asked if there was going to be an increase in on-site parking and was told by J Petrie that there is adequate existing on-site parking for crowds of 7,800. He confirmed that pop up bars may be provided for matches in addition to the existing hospitality facilities.

S Holland expressed surprise at the level of concern over Murrayfield Wanderers. In relation to Murrayfield Wanderers' plans for Roseburn Park Cllr Ross said he understood that Wanderers had not submitted a planning application to build in the Park or applied to Edinburgh Leisure to lease the pitches there. Cllr Gloyer had received different information from Euan Gillies of Wanderers.

The day after the meeting Cllr Ross emailed the Chairman to confirm that he had checked with Senior Officials and been told that (1) no planning applications have been received from Murrayfield Wanderers in relation to Roseburn Park (or indeed anywhere else), and (2) although Murrayfield Wanderers are having discussions with Edinburgh Leisure, nothing has been confirmed for the use of the pitches at Roseburn. Discussions are centred around having one rugby pitch.

10. Roseburn Park update

10.1 On the subject of Murrayfield Wanderers H Ross of the Friends of Roseburn Park ("FoRP") reported that: (a) rugby would recommence on the west side of the Park from September, mostly on Saturday and Sundays, though training would be at Saughton Park's facilities; and (b) there would be a planning application for a new clubhouse, either on the footprint of the white buildings in the Park, or on its western edge near the ice rink car park. This would include a community cafe and offer other community facilities. It was likely that FoRP would object to this and invited MCC to consider the matter also. FoRP's initial thoughts included: that it was doubtful that the Council could legally offer any form of title for a building in the Park; that it was absurd on completion of the flood defence scheme to immediately build on the wrong side of the defences; that the proposal would amount to the introduction of licensed premises in a public park; that servicing such a building would introduce extra traffic into the Park, possibly onto a cycle path and safer route to school. FoRP also had a more general concern that such a development would serve over time to unbalance the current mix of uses of this small park. In general discussion it was noted also that minor refurbishments by Wanderers to the existing buildings were planned for temporary use as changing

and storage facilities. H Ross said that some of the pre-planning feedback had included that an application for a single site had to be submitted (not alternative applications for two sites) and that account must be taken of existing facilities in the sense that the scheme should include the removal of redundant buildings. A member of the public asked what DAFS Cricket Club thought of this and H Ross said that they intended to share the prospective new Wanderers facility. A member of the public asked if it was legal to install licensed premises in a public park. Cllr Ross said that there were precedents. He also noted that SEPA might object to building on the designated flood plain.

The Chair asked about the timing of the prospective planning application and future meetings. H Ross said that Murrayfield Wanderers had thought that FoRP's next meeting on 26 July would be too early to discuss a planning application, and that the FoRP AGM might be slightly late. He thought that it was possible that the next MCC meeting might be well-timed in this respect. Finally, H Ross noted that it was clear that Murrayfield Wanderers showed at least awareness of the detail of external opinion regarding their proposals.

10.2 On other matters H Ross reported that: (a) there was a new FoRP newsletter available; (b) the MCC-part-funded carved tree bench was complete and paid for and was awaiting Council installation (Cllr Gloyer observed that it was beautiful); (c) the trial separation of cyclists and pedestrians in the Park was under review; members of the public could have their say in an online consultation (H Whaley noted that the consultation was closing that evening) and that there was some concern that the officers had not ruled out extending the separation scheme the length of the Park; (d) the play park contractors had been appointed, though H Ross remained unaware of any start or finish date; (e) there were a number of beds and planters in need of maintenance and FoRP were looking for any volunteers to help maintain these; (f) the annual cake-making and fun event (Family Fun Day) will be on Sunday 2 September 2018; (g) FoRP had applied for Fields in Trust status and had investigated the possibility of Tree Preservation Orders; and (h) FoRP's plans to turn the existing toilet block into a cafe were suffering from a lack of builder interest in the scheme.

P Gregson added that consultation had revealed a preference for outdoor gym equipment on the site of the old play park. The Council were happy to design this. If they also agreed to adopt it, it would be up to FoRP to raise funds for it. Finally, P Gregson related the sad news that Ian Shiels had died. Ian was a stalwart of Murrayfield DAFS Cricket Club and the founder of FoRP and had attended several MCC meetings on behalf of the Cricket Club. The Cricket Club planned a memorial bench and tree in the Park.

Cllr Gloyer said a member of the public had suggested that the new monkey puzzle tree had been planted too close to existing trees. B Knowles clarified that Council officers had been responsible for the siting and planting of the trees.

11. Pansy Walk - future use of former allotments

The Chairman introduced Stuart McKenzie, President of SAGS, who had had one of the allotments in Pansy Walk in the late 80's but had been moved off it in 2003 at the start of the CERT project, which later gave way to the Tram. The Chairman explained that the Council want the site, which is currently used for the storage of tram materials, to be used for housing.

Cllr Ross expressed the view that, given the demand for allotments across the city, it should be restored as allotments. He felt that the site is too noisy for housing

having a railway line at the front and a school behind. The site, which could accommodate 40-50 allotments, is still designated as green space. MCC would have to write to the local Councillors to voice the community's desire for allotments and give the Councillors a mandate to contest the proposal for housing.

S McKenzie made the point that, as designated green space, the site is protected and cannot be used for housing without Scottish Government consent. He explained that the Council does not have the funds to build new allotments and has introduced a scheme under which, if spare land is identified, the Council invites the local community to form a group, obtain grants and build the allotments themselves.

A Anderson suggested a community allotment on part of the site.

H Ross said that the primary objection is to building on designated green space.

The Chairman concluded that there was a consensus against the use of the Pansy Walk site for housing and **undertook to write to the three City Councillors.**

12. Other Planning and Licensing issues

12.1 *Proposed extension of two gardens in Baird Grove*

The Chairman explained that two neighbours in Baird Grove have approached the Council to buy a strip of land adjoining the Water of Leith to enable them to extend their gardens to the flood defence wall. He was aware that the Water of Leith Conservation Trust was against this proposal because it would impede the unified management of vegetation.

Cllr Gloyer added that the proposal to sell the one metre strip of land had come from Darren Wraight at the Council. The Council would need to have access to the flood defence wall for inspection and maintenance.

J Forbes made the point that what is unusable land to some is a valuable example of vegetation diversity to others. He was worried about setting a precedent for the destruction of natural habitats.

It was decided that **the Secretary would write to the Council on behalf of MCC to object to the proposed sale.**

12.2 *Proposed development at 37 Corstorphine Road*

J Forbes informed the meeting that MCC had been granted a short extension to the imminent deadline for commenting on this planning application which was for the demolition of the existing 1840's villa and redevelopment of the site with a 4 storey block of 20 flats. As of that morning 32 objections and one letter of support had been submitted.

The owner of 37 Corstorphine Road identified himself and stated that there were now 22 letters of support. He explained the background to the planning application. The flood prevention works had resulted in the eastern part of his garden being cleared of trees and the topsoil replaced with boulder clay. No new trees can be planted because the roots will affect the flood defence wall. During the works the Council had established a two-way vehicle access onto Corstorphine Road and built up the ground with whin aggregate, which is unsuitable for growing trees. He felt that the flood defence wall allowed beneficial development. The bottom end of his garden is now a natural riverbank and, while he still owns it, he has no access to it. The character of the garden has changed. He stated that the 1840's house is not listed and is not in a Conservation Area. It was evaluated by Historic Scotland 10 years ago and was not considered worth listing. He was confident that the detail of the proposed development could be improved and the scheme approved.

J Forbes objected that the developer had tried to pack too many homes into a small site, the development did not fit with the character of Murrayfield and involved

the demolition of the existing house. He felt that development of the garden part of the site might be acceptable.

The owner of 39 Corstorphine Road explained that his house is “C” listed, as are the two neighbouring properties, and the proposed development would change the whole look and character of the area. He said that the flood prevention scheme had ruined all of their gardens, but the Council has an obligation to reinstate the gardens and that is not an excuse for inappropriate residential development. He complained that the site would be overcrowded with an enormous building overshadowing the adjoining houses and the significant increase in residential units would cause more traffic. In summary all of the objections to the Tor development apply to this one, apart from “B” listing. He and his neighbours are not against all development but want a lower building and less density.

A member of the public informed the meeting that she had objected to the planning application because of the increase in traffic which the development would entail. The owner countered that he thought many of the new residents would use public transport.

H Whaley pointed out that Edinburgh is growing at the rate of 1% per year and building new homes in the city rather than on the outskirts gives people the opportunity to use active travel options.

The Chairman suggested that a site visit by the Planning Committee would be appropriate. He proposed that MCC lodge an objection and pursue a dialogue about the form which any development might take.

Cllr Gloyer expressed her willingness to request a site visit.

It was agreed that **J Forbes and the Secretary would draft an outline objection on behalf of MCC.**

12.3 Advertising signs at 2 Murrayfield Gardens

A resident of 54 Murrayfield Gardens related an incident in which she had been obliged to step into the road round a van parked on the pavement adjacent to 2 Murrayfield Gardens and on stepping back onto the pavement had narrowly avoided being hit by a speeding cyclist on the pavement. J Forbes suggested that she contact the contractors whose advertising signs are attached to the fence at this location.

It was understood that the signs, for which there is no advertisement consent, had been put up with the owner’s permission and would remain until the contractors finished on site.

13. Other Traffic and Transport issues

There were no other traffic and transport issues.

14. Any Other Competent Business

14.1 The Chairman reported that Scottish Water had finished their work on Haymarket Terrace but their Portakabins had yet to be removed.

14.2 The Secretary reported that Rosie Bell’s walking guide was nearing completion and the owner of Roseburn House had offered to provide a photograph of it.

15. Questions from the Floor

There were no further questions from the floor.

16. Date of Next Meeting: Tuesday, 14 August 2018

Subsequent meetings: 9 October and 4 December 2018.

Minutes approved at meeting of 14 August 2018.