

MURRAYFIELD COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Minutes of Ordinary Meeting  
held on Tuesday, 30 March 2021 at 7.30pm  
by Zoom  
Chair: J Yellowlees

Present: A Anderson, R Beavis, R Brown, J Forbes, P Gregson, B Knowles,  
J McDonough, N Oldroyd, E Robertson, M Stevens, H Whaley,  
J Yellowlees,  
*Ex officio:* Cllr Scott Douglas, Cllr Gillian Gloyer, Cllr Frank Ross,  
In attendance: 15 members of the public,  
Apologies: N Macdonald, Cllr Karen Doran, Cllr Claire Miller, Cllr Jo Mowat,  
Cllr Alasdair Rankin, Jeremy Balfour, MSP, Miles Briggs, MSP,  
Ruth Davidson, MSP, Sarah Boyack, MSP, Neil Findlay, MSP,  
Alison Johnstone, MSP, Gordon Lindhurst, MSP, Andy Wightman,  
MSP, Christine Jardine, MP.

1. Welcome and format including co-option of new member

1.1 Apologies were received as above. The Chairman welcomed those in attendance to the third meeting of Murrayfield Community Council ("MCC") in 2021, the main talking point of which would be the consultation on the Council's proposals for Controlled Parking Zones in Roseburn, Murrayfield and Saughtonhall.

1.2 The Chairman proposed, and J Forbes seconded, the co-option of Saughtonhall resident, David Dawson, as an ordinary member of MCC. Of the 12 ordinary and nominated members present 9 voted in favour of co-option and D Dawson was duly elected. The Chairman welcomed him to MCC.

2. Approval of Minutes of Ordinary Meeting held on 16 February 2021 and Matters Arising

The Chairman provided the following updates on items in the Minutes:-

2.1 The Scotsman newspaper had held a virtual hustings event in preparation for the Scottish Parliament elections in May.

2.2 Work had begun on the back pitches at BT Murrayfield.

2.3 The Council had acknowledged the concern raised by a Murrayfield resident over the displaced pillar at Abinger Gardens.

2.4 A German kebab takeaway had opened in Roseburn Terrace.

The Minutes were approved. Prop: J McDonough, Sec: P Gregson.

3. Community Policing Report

The Chairman commented that the latest Community Policing Report confirmed continuation of the themes which had emerged some time ago. Serious violent crime is down and domestic abuse is up. The Police are investigating, and are asking for information on, a serious assault on two males which took place on the Roseburn cycle path on 27 March.

Housebreaking is down but break ins to sheds and garages are up and pedal bikes are often the target. The Police have recently launched Operation Pedal Protect to try to combat this trend.

M Stevens reported that in the Donaldson area there have been a number of recent thefts of catalytic converters from cars. These are sold for between £350 and £400.

#### 4. Councillors' Reports

4.1 Controlled Parking Zone engagement - The Chairman invited Cllr Ross to comment on the recent public consultation on the Council's proposals to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone ("CPZ") in Roseburn, Murrayfield and Saughtonhall.

4.1 Cllr Ross reported that the consultation had been extended by two weeks and had ended at midnight on Sunday, 28 March. The responses will now be considered by Council Officers and any action recommended by them will be put to the Transport and Environment Committee ("T&EC"). If the T&EC approves the recommendations, Traffic Regulation Orders ("TROs") will be required to implement them and there will be a further consultation on the TROs.

Cllr Ross reported that in his 9 years as a City Councillor he had never received as much correspondence on an issue as he had received recently on the proposed CPZs. There was some support for the proposals but the predominant reaction was negative. The two main criticisms were that (1) it was not clear what problem the proposals were designed to solve and (2) the proposals seemed to be a "one size fits all" approach and failed to take into account the unique circumstances of each area.

Cllr Ross said that he agreed with every negative comment which he had received with regard to Saughtonhall. In Corstorphine there is a desire for controlled parking to alleviate a real issue with commuter parking and the residents there were in favour of the "light touch" approach which was put forward 4 years ago and which was introduced in Murrayfield at that time. The current proposals, however, bear little resemblance to that.

Cllr Ross explained that the recent consultation involved an online survey and residents were advised to respond to that and also contact their elected representatives. He had collated all of the correspondence which he had received and had submitted a summary to the consultation.

Cllr Gloyer confirmed that she had also received numerous emails about the proposed CPZs and most were negative, but over the last 4 years she had also received many emails from residents who felt that parking controls were really needed. The need varied greatly from area to area. At the time when she and Cllr Douglas had both been on the T&EC they had been told that any parking controls which were introduced would be appropriate to each street and she had been in favour of them. She was not, however in favour of parking controls which would force residents to pay for parking outside their own houses in areas where parking is not a problem. She agreed that in most of Saughtonhall a CPZ is not needed.

Cllr Douglas reiterated what Cllrs Ross and Gloyer had said. He had received many emails, the vast majority of which were negative. He also mentioned that there were errors in the maps which accompanied the consultation. He felt that the residents who were against the proposals understood the knock-on effect of a CPZ in transferring the problem to the adjoining area, but many felt that

post-Covid there would be a different environment and this should be assessed before making any changes.

The Chairman pointed out that different leaflets had been delivered to the residents in each affected area with the result that no one understood that the proposals were the same for all. He was aware of concerns over the carrying out of the consultation during the current Covid pandemic and the running of the consultation by a London based agency with little knowledge of Edinburgh. It was a bad sign that the photograph of Edinburgh fronting the consultation website was displayed the wrong way round.

D Dawson summarised the four issues of most concern to Saughtonhall residents as follows:-

- (1) The consultation was seriously flawed because many residents did not receive the leaflets and did not know about it.
- (2) Saughtonhall has many older residents who were not comfortable with an online survey or adept at using interactive maps.
- (3) Many of the questions in the survey were loaded and unfair.
- (4) The pandemic has brought about changes in commuting and shopping and no one knows what the longer term outcome will be. Any changes in parking regulations should await the establishment of the new patterns of behaviour.

D Dawson acknowledged that there are parking problems associated with the tram stop and the Co-op in Balgreen Road, but elsewhere there are no issues. He also mentioned that a local petition opposing the CPZ proposals has attracted 400 signatures.

A resident of Roseburn Maltings informed the meeting that she and her neighbours had received the leaflet for Murrayfield in error and had assumed wrongly that Roseburn was not affected by the proposals.

Another member of the public spoke on behalf of her parents, who are Saughtonhall residents in their eighties. She made the following points:-

- (1) They and many other residents received no notice of the consultation.
- (2) Only those who had already responded to the consultation were notified of the two week extension of the deadline.
- (3) She had read the Parking Review which was published in March 2019 and which disclosed that a survey of parking in Corstorphine had been carried out on three days in November 2018 and one day in January 2019 between the hours of 10am and 5pm. This was flawed in several respects.
- (4) The situation in Corstorphine is different from that in Saughtonhall.
- (5) Parking protocols require a survey to be carried out over a six month period and during the daytime, evenings and weekends.
- (6) The survey concluded that there was more than 50% kerbside usage and classified this as a high pressure area, but did not differentiate between commuter and residents' parking. In an area where few properties have off street parking a high level of kerbside parking by residents is normal and is not a problem.
- (7) The CPZ was billed as a benefit to residents but the introduction of single yellow lines in the southern half of Saughtonhall Drive from the bus stop to Balgreen Road, and opposite, would mean that her elderly father would have to park a considerable distance from his home. With the significant reduction in parking in surrounding streets (double yellow lines and

residents' bays only) and only shared bays (no designated residents' bays) in the southern half of Saughtonhall Drive, visitors to the area would be funnelled to this section of Saughtonhall Drive and residents would have to compete for a space or park some distance away.

She concluded by asking for guidance on the next step in resisting the CPZ proposals and asked what steps the three local Councillors were going to take. Cllr Gloyer explained that the proposals will be considered by the T&EC twice. A report summarising the results of the consultation and any actions recommended by the Council Officers will be put to the T&EC. If they approve the recommended actions, detailed designs will be drawn up and submitted to the T&EC. Their implementation will involve TROs which will have to be advertised and will be subject to consultation. She advised that members of the public can apply to present a deputation to the relevant T&EC meeting. The meeting itself will be webcast and archived and the Minutes will be published. Cllr Gloyer reassured the meeting that no parking proposals will be implemented before the end of 2022.

Cllr Ross confirmed that the next opportunity to make representations will be when the Officers submit recommendations based on the results of the consultation to the T&EC. He confirmed that, as a Ward Councillor, he can speak at the T&EC meetings and in the past he and Cllrs Gloyer and Douglas have made a combined presentation to the T&EC. The Chairman reminded the meeting that the three Councillors had co-operated in objecting to the proposed redevelopment of the former Tor nursing home. Cllr Ross added that a minimum of one third of the membership of the T&EC can decide that the proposals should be considered by the full Council.

A resident of Baird Drive made the following further points on the CPZ consultation:-

- (1) The leaflet which residents had received included an invitation to a virtual meeting via Eventbrite, but the wrong date had been given and there was no event on the Eventbrite website. He had had to email Eventbrite to get the joining details. At the virtual meeting residents were encouraged to "spread the word" about the consultation to their neighbours. He felt that that was irresponsible during the pandemic.
- (2) If the CPZ proposals are implemented, many residents will convert their front gardens into off-street parking areas. The negative environmental impact which this will have does not seem to have been considered.
- (3) The introduction of charging points for electric vehicles has also not been considered. When he raised this at the virtual meeting he was told that it is a separate project.

E Robertson reported that she and her neighbours in Henderland Road are in favour of parking restrictions as the number of residents' spaces is inadequate and there is considerable parking pressure from the pupils and staff of St George's School, commuters, people travelling to and from the airport and workmen who leave their cars there and take public transport into the city centre.

A Murrayfield resident raised two general points about residents' parking permits. She was not in favour of the decision to abolish paper permits and substitute electronic registration, as she wished to continue to display a paper permit on her car to inform non-residents who might wish to park in her

street of her status as a resident. She also asked why the book of visitors' permits which she had renewed at the beginning of the year, on the understanding that the tickets would be valid for three years, was in fact valid for only one year. Cllrs Ross and Gloyer confirmed that the T&EC had decided that the new books should in fact be valid for three years, as originally promised. **Cllr Ross undertook to chase up confirmation to this effect.**

N Oldroyd described the parking situation on Murrayfield Road which is used by the staff of Murrayfield Medical Practice and workers on the Tor development. She felt that a CPZ would make the area safer for drivers and pedestrians, particularly the crossing at Ellersly Road, and that the T&EC should be urged to think about safety.

A Saughtonhall resident who is a qualified transport planner reiterated points (3) to (6) made by the Saughtonhall resident who spoke on behalf of her elderly parents. He made the additional points that the Saughtonhall residents, who generally leave their cars at home and take public transport into the city centre, will be penalised for adopting sustainable transport behaviours. As spaces in front of drives will have double yellow lines, the residents' visitors, who can currently park there, will also be penalised. He concluded by saying that the CPZ proposals will create problems rather than solve a perceived problem which does not in fact exist.

E Robertson suggested that planning restrictions could be used to prevent people from digging up their front gardens.

4.2 Allotments for Pansy Walk – The Chairman reported that MCC had collated responses from those on the Council's waiting list for an allotment who might be interested in the proposal to return the works depot at Pansy Walk to its former use as allotments. MCC had received 86 expressions of interest and six letters of support. Edible Estates, an organisation which supports communities to establish community gardens across the city, had also offered their support. Two correspondents had supported the competing proposal for affordable housing on the site.

Cllr Ross said he is pursuing funding to have the site cleaned and is contacting Stuart McKenzie, the Chairman of the Federation of Edinburgh District Allotments & Gardens Association, who had joined the MCC meeting but had had to leave. The two adjoining Community Councils, Gorgie/Dalry and Stenhouse, Saughton Mains and Whitson, are also in favour of allotments. Cllr Ross recommended speaking to the Principal Teacher of Balgreen Primary School who is likely to be supportive of the allotment proposal.

Cllr Ross added that the Council's Housing Officer had indicated that the proposal for affordable housing is not being pursued at present. The two factors against this option are that the site was originally allotments and it is vulnerable to flooding because it is not behind the flood defences.

4.3 Garscube Terrace and Wester Coates surface repairs – Cllr Ross confirmed that he had inspected both of these locations and agreed that they were not in a good state. He has passed photographs to the Officer in charge and persuaded him to take another look at both roads and re-score them to enable immediate repairs to be carried out.

A Anderson confirmed that the surfaces of Garscube Terrace and Coltbridge Terrace are deteriorating and the speed bumps in the former have holes in them.

4.4 City Mobility Plan – The Chairman reported that this has now been approved. It is linked to the Strategic Transport Review, of which Phase 1 has been completed. Phase 2 will follow after the Scottish Parliament elections and the return to normal workloads after the pandemic.

4.5 Roseburn Primary School – Cllr Ross reported that he is chasing up the introduction of additional safety measures around Roseburn Primary School in line with the measures which have been put in place for almost every other primary school. Officers had said that these measures would have to await the completion of the relevant section of the CCWEL, but Cllr Ross considers this to be unacceptable.

5. Planning and Licensing

J Forbes reported as follows:-

5.1 Application for telecoms mast at Beechwood Mains - Since MCC's last meeting Cllr Douglas had spoken with the Planning Department about MCC's and local residents' disappointment at the process and outcome in this matter. He reported the Planning Officer's explanation that "although the process used does allow for comments to be submitted, the installation of 5G masts is considered as permitted development, so there is no obligation for the views submitted to be taken into account." Further, "with regard to looking at different locations for the mast, the Council does not have the resources or the technical expertise to suggest other suitable locations, or to scrutinise the locations offered by the developer. As a result they are not in a position to challenge the locations offered in the report."

Cllr Douglas did, however, extract an agreement to look into the width of the pavement following MCC's objections. A Transport Officer will take another look at the area and offer a recommendation to the Roads team as to whether a permit for the works to go ahead is granted.

**Cllr Douglas** told the meeting that the promised inspection was due to take place imminently and he **hoped to report back early the following week.**

5.2 37 Corstorphine Road green space and SEPA objections – J Forbes was concerned about the curious correspondence between the DPEA Reporter and the Council Planning Officer on the question of the updated Arup flooding study commissioned by SEPA. Publication of the Arup report has been delayed by a cyber-attack. The DPEA Reporter asked the Planning Officer if she "would be happy for the Reporter to go ahead [on the basis of the applicant's own flood risk assessment] without the benefit of the Arup report". She replied that "it is for the Reporter to make their own decision as to whether the up-to-date report from Arup would be material." J Forbes felt that it was worrying that no one appears to be making a case for awaiting publication of the Arup report before deciding whether the proposed development at 37 Corstorphine Road can be approved. Also worrying is the DPEA's remark that they are "under some pressure from the applicant to proceed without the Arup report."

Cllr Douglas shared J Forbes's concern. He said that he had asked the Planning Officer for clarification on these points but was not optimistic about receiving a satisfactory reply.

**The Chairman** suggested that Planning Aid Scotland might be able to give advice on this point and **undertook to email contact details to J Forbes.**

5.3 132 Balgreen Road – MCC had been asked to look at the planning application for two semi-detached houses on a very small plot at 132 Balgreen Road, at present the garden and garage of the existing house immediately to the south. The proposed houses will be small, 56 sq m each, perhaps starter homes, which would be welcome, but shoe-horning two houses into such a tiny plot seems undesirable. As of 30 March 35 comments had been lodged, 7 opposing and 28 in favour of the development. There was some scepticism about the source of the favourable comments. J Forbes reminded the meeting that MCC does not normally take a position on developments of this scale, unless a broader community interest is at stake. Cllr Ross explained that, if there are 6 or more objections, the application has to go to the Planning Committee. He suggested requesting a Councillor to ask where the letters of support originated.

It was decided that MCC would not take the matter further.

5.4 14 Coltbridge Terrace – A Anderson had brought MCC's attention to the planning application for a detached garden room in the rear garden of 14 Coltbridge Terrace, which backs on to Coltbridge Avenue. The site is located in the Coltbridge and Wester Coates Conservation Area. The proposed garden room will not be visible from the public street, but some neighbours have expressed concern about the height of the proposed structure (2.7 metres).

As of 29 March, 2 comments had been lodged, 1 opposing and 1 in favour.

It was decided that, as there is no threat to the essential character of the Conservation Area, MCC would not take this matter further.

## 6. Traffic and Transport

6.1 Ellersly Road – The Chairman reported that there has been no change here in that funding from West Edinburgh Neighbourhood Partnership for a pedestrian crossing is awaited and the design of the crossing will have to await the completion of other projects.

6.2 Spaces for People – H Whaley reported on the virtual Q & A session with the Council which he had attended on MCC's behalf. He explained that at present all the Spaces for People schemes are temporary. The Council is consulting (until 5 April) on whether to remove the schemes, try them in a different form or make them permanent. If the schemes were made permanent, they would be redesigned using different materials and would be the subject of further consultation. The only scheme within the MCC area is the one at Crarae Avenue. As it has not been in place long and the schools have only just returned, MCC has insufficient feedback with which to contribute to the current consultation. He recommended that MCC encourage residents to contribute their own views to the consultation.

H Whaley had also shared with MCC a recent email sent by Stewarts Melville School to the parents requesting that they park more thoughtfully when dropping off or picking up their children. The email showed that the school is aware of the problems caused by parents but takes little action. He felt that, once things return to normal after the pandemic, it would be worth MCC writing to the three local private schools to reinforce the message that action needs to be taken.

Cllr Douglas reported that local residents are very much against the Spaces for People scheme on the south side of Queensferry Road which involves a segregated cycle lane. Residents can no longer parallel park and reverse into their drives and disabled drivers cannot park on the single yellow line. The Spaces for People team have been told that this scheme is dangerous.

6.3 Roseburn Terrace bus stop – The Chairman reminded the meeting that the eastbound bus stop on Roseburn Terrace has been moved temporarily. N Oldroyd reported that the Edinburgh Travel Twitter account said Scottish Power were to carry out disconnection works. As she had seen no workmen on site, she had contacted SP Energy Networks and was waiting for an answer. N Oldroyd asked who should be contacted if road markings are not reinstated after works have been carried out. Cllr Gloyer advised notifying the Roads Department and local Councillors. She pointed out that utility companies are obliged only to reinstate what was there before the works were carried out, not improve it.

A local resident asked why the bus stop had had to be moved so far. N Oldroyd thought that this was to avoid the parking bays on Roseburn Terrace and tailbacks from the traffic lights.

## 7. Friends of Roseburn Park

B Knowles reported as follows:-

7.1 Western Playing Fields drainage works – These have started, no issues have been identified and the works are on schedule.

7.2 Walking Guide – Thanks to Rosie Bell a walking guide to the Park will be published soon and will be available on the websites of both the Friends of Roseburn Park (“FoRP”) and MCC.

7.3 New benches and BBQ slabs – FoRP have obtained Community Grant funding for three new benches and five barbecue slabs, which will be installed in early May.

7.4 Drinking fountain – Plans for refurbishment of the drinking fountain are progressing.

7.5 Trees – 15 or more trees along the Water of Leith path which lie between the edge of the Park and Pansy Walk and which are either dead or in poor condition are to be replaced by the Council, who have appointed a Project Manager to liaise with FoRP and MCC.

N Oldroyd suggested that outdoor gym equipment would be a welcome addition to the Park. B Knowles replied that the improvement plan for the Park had included a proposal to use the old children’s play park for this purpose. P Gregson explained that FoRP had made significant progress with this proposal, which was estimated to cost £16,000, but the residents of the nearby sheltered housing had objected strongly and requested a wildlife garden instead. FoRP had conducted a survey which revealed 54% of respondents in favour of an outdoor gym and 45% against. The level of opposition meant that the Council were unlikely to adopt the gym equipment for maintenance and the proposal had been dropped. P Gregson said that if the Council stop maintaining the existing play equipment, FoRP will try to revive the plan for an outdoor gym.

In relation to Item 7.1 H Whaley raised the issue of the contractor’s vehicles crossing the busy shared path through the Park. He felt that the contractor



should be doing more to safeguard the users' safety. **J McDonough undertook to email him the contractor's contact details.**

#### 8. Treasurer's Report

8.1 The Treasurer reported that MCC had spent nothing in the past month. The money earmarked for the two micro projects – the Peplow plaque in Devon Place and the milestone plaques at Beechwood Mains and the former railway bridge at Roseburn – had not yet been spent, as the plaques could not be produced until Roseburn Shoe Repairs reopens.

8.2 J Forbes reported that he had just filed applications for Listed Building Consent ("LBC") for the milestone plaques. The Roseburn bridge is listed, but the milestone itself is not, whereas the Beechwood Mains milestone is listed, but the wall in which it is embedded is not. J Forbes had discussed the situation with J Riddell and they had decided that the best course would be to apply for LBC for both plaques. The applications had involved a great deal of work, the majority of which had been done by J Riddell. There was no fee for the applications. They hoped to be told that LBC is not required.

8.3 The Chairman took the opportunity to remind the Councillors that the plaque on the south side of the New Colt Bridge at Roseburn, which details the history of the bridge, is obscured by a bin and that J Riddell and MCC had requested that the bin be moved.

8.4 The Treasurer stated that MCC's current financial year ends on 31 March 2021. He reported that MCC began the year with cash reserves of £1280.93. The only income was the annual grant from the Council of £843.20. Operating expenditure of £231 was lower than usual because fewer costs had been incurred in renting meeting rooms and copying documents. There was a surplus of £612.20 resulting in a closing balance of £1893.13.

8.5 The Chairman again invited suggestions for micro projects costing around £250.

#### 9. Social Engagement

9.1 R Beavis reported that he had had an extensive and very productive telephone discussion with Jill McNair of the Murrayfield Grapevine magazine. She was very enthusiastic about extending the coverage of community news and was willing to advertise community events free of charge, particularly if they were promoted by MCC. No fee would be charged for the design element of an item. Jill McNair was keen for sports clubs to advertise in the Grapevine free of charge.

9.2 The Chairman reported that H Ross, who manages MCC's website from afar, had reiterated his view that MCC needs someone to manage its Twitter feed proactively. R Beavis said that FoRP have discovered an expert in social media who was going to give a presentation to FoRP the following evening. This expert might be a useful contact for MCC too.

#### 10. Any Other Competent Business

10.1 The Chairman intimated that Corstorphine Community Council is going to split into three separate Community Councils in order to better represent the diverse communities and developing areas such as West Craigs within its boundaries.

10.2 The Chairman advised that MCC's meetings would continue to be conducted online until at least the summer.

N Oldroyd suggested that when physical meetings in the Church hall resume, MCC should consider live streaming them on Facebook Live in order to encourage younger people to take an interest.

10.3 With reference to Item 4 P Gregson asked the three Councillors to email the links to the Officers' Report on the CPZ consultation and the relevant meeting of the T&EC. **Cllr Ross undertook to email the links to the Minutes Secretary.**

10.4 The Chairman reported that he had agreed that Steve Kerr, the Chair of the Edinburgh Association of Community Councils, should attend the 11 May meeting of MCC so as to present the Edinburgh Partnership working group recommendations on improvement action to further strengthen community planning in the city.

**11. Date of Next Meeting: Tuesday, 11 May 2021**

Subsequent meetings: 29 June, 31 August 2021.

Minutes approved at meeting of 11 May 2021.