

## Minutes of New Town & Broughton Community Council's ordinary meeting, on Monday 11 November 2024 at 7pm

Actions and decisions are **RED ITALIC UNDERLINED SMALLCAPS**. **ND** ('no dissent') means that no-one spoke or voted against a decision.

URLs have been added by the minutes secretary.

### Actions (to be omitted from online version)

Item	Actor	Action
1.c	NTBCC	Share Zoom meeting numbers and passcodes, not just URLs
3.a	NTBCC	To try to make late deputation on EWHT. Failing that, contact CEC planning convenor and/or other cllrs.
5.b	P Williamson	Check whether planning permission was obtained for metal grills on Royal London Building
5.c	S Holledge	Convene ad-hoc groups on the mentioned consultations
6	R Price	Pick up 24/05018/FUL and 24/05030/FUL with NTBCC's planning ctte.
7.c	LLCC rep	Forward guidance relevant to Albany St HMO situation

## 1 Welcome and apologies

### 1.a Attendance

Mike Birch	NTBCC	Susan Macinnes	NTBCC	Cllr Margaret Graham	City Centre ward
Annick Gaillard	NTBCC	Richard Price	NTBCC	Cllr Finlay McFarlane	City Centre ward
Stephen Hajducki	NTBCC	Nick Reid	NTBCC	Cllr Joanna Mowat	City Centre ward
Deirdre Henderson	NTBCC	David Renton	NTBCC	Jamie Robertson	CEC
Simon Holledge	NTBCC	Peter Williamson	NTBCC	~16 residents/visitors	
Ken Lochrie	NTBCC	Bruce Ryan	Minutes secretary		
Stuart McAllister	NTBCC	Cllr Jack Caldwell	Leith Walk ward		

### 1.b Apologies

Fiona Banatvala	NTBCC	Cllr Max Mitchell	Inverleith ward
Cllr Jule Bandel	Inverleith ward	Cllr Hal Osler	Inverleith ward

### 1.c Technical note

To enable CEC cllrs to join via CEC iPads: **ACTION: NTBCC TO SHARE ZOOM MEETING NUMBER AND PASSCODES, NOT JUST URLS.**

## 2 Approval of minutes of October 2024 meeting and matters arising

- Accepted as-is (proposed R Price, seconded M Birch, ND)

### 2.a Matters arising from October meeting

Item	Actor	Action	Status
4.b	Cllr Mitchell	Try to find a deputation to CEC planning about the impact of bollards on conservation areas	Complete – see appendix.
4.b	M Birch/ P Williamson	Compile a list of specific actions about the EWHT issues	Complete
4.d	P Williamson	Write an article for The Spurtle on the forthcoming CC elections	In progress. PW also creating leaflet
6.b	Cllr Caldwell	Share information on changes to STL licensing when possible	complete
7.a	R Price	Put form relevant to amended RBS application on NTBCC website	No discussion

## 3 Chair's report

### 3.a Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan update

- P Williamson: there have been discussions on the plan and oversight group, but progress has been disappointing. It is unclear how the oversight group will operate, what powers and duties it will have. It may only meet annually. How should NTBCC react to this poor situation – perhaps send a deputation to the forthcoming relevant CEC meeting?
  - It is not known when the oversight group will first meet. There is an updated version of the management plan and related action plan but they are both still nonspecific, with hard-to-measure outcomes.
  - A resident: NTBCC should publicise the situation to relevant bodies. The management structure is unknown.
  - Cllr Mowat: the plan is due to be approved by CEC at the Planning Committee on Wednesday.
  - M Birch: the deadline for submitting a deputation was today, but a late one might be accepted. Alternatively, NTBCC can forward comments to relevant cllrs. NTBCC would be remiss if it did not state that there are gaps in the management plan. For example, there is lack of detail on how the oversight group will operate. It is inappropriate for CEC planning alone to approve the management plan because it impacts transport, public realm etc. The report states there are no financial implications but this is clearly untrue.
  - R Price: this should go to full CEC, which would allow further discussion by NTBCC, then a deputation.
  - Cllr Mowat: it would help to petition for a late deputation, and set out concerns to all planning ctte members. It is likely that there will be an amendment reflecting these conversations. It is a valid concern that this is not just a planning matter.
  - P Williamson: there has been no feedback on NTBCC's previous input. We need others' opinions on governance.

- *ACTION: NTBCC TO TRY TO MAKE LATE DEPUTATION. FAILING THAT, CONTACT CEC PLANNING CONVENOR AND/OR OTHER RELEVANT CLLRs.*

### 3.b Community Council elections and governance update

- No discussion

## 4 Planning

### 4.a Presentation: amended plans for the RBS site (24/04542/PAN) Ediston/Turley

Ross McNulty and Colin Smith reported:

- We are currently summarising feedback from the first consultation, to prepare for the next one (27<sup>th</sup> November between 2.00pm and 7.00pm at Broughton St Mary's Church). Immediately after that will be the pre-application session with CEC, where they will explain how they are addressing feedback.
- Why would the development need purpose-build student accommodation (PBSA)?
  - The previous plans had two build-to-rent (BTR) buildings but currently there is no investment in BTR. We do not want to change the nature of the building but do need investment to cover previous outlays. This would also fund future residential uses.
- What about the minimum quantum for viability?
  - This isn't a relevant question because the buildings' forms will not change. It's about fitting student rooms (~560 thereof) in the existing buildings.
- About office use
  - Despite 4 years of trying there was no interest in offices on this site. This led to the move to residential.
- Future-proofing the PBSA use
  - The current design can be converted for residential use. This will be shown in the designs.
- Impact on local infrastructure
  - We are working within CEC's contributions systems. We did try to provide a medical centre on the site but didn't get the necessary engagement from the NHS.
- Feedback on design and heights
  - The design must be in keeping with what was there previously but there has been discussion with CEC planning on changing the heights at the ends of the site. We will also follow city plan policies.
- Impact on parking and access from Fettes Row.
  - We have reduced the number of access points from Fettes Row, so this should have less impact on parking. This is currently work in progress.
- Impact of value engineering
  - This will cause detriment on the quality of materials and design – it's about simplifying some internal items. We need to ensure designs are buildable and affordable, given that prices have risen by 70% since we bought the site.
- R Price: Please advise about separation from King George V park
  - We'll highlight relevant detail. There will be a definite boundary and a link from the development to the park. The proposed form was changed following advice from Scottish Fire and Rescue.
- A resident: new greenspace needs to be created because King George V park is overused already.
  - We are not extending the park, but are complying with relevant policies within the forthcoming designs. CEC policy requires 20% of the site to be greenspace, and 10m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling. Roof terraces will be part of this, and PBSA is now requiring nearly the same greenspace as residential. For residential, greenspace includes roof-space on the MMR block, along with the courtyard. (This will be a landscaped mix of hard and soft.)
- M Birch: How will to the design changes affect the allocation of affordable housing?
  - The new LDP mandates 35% of residential to be affordable housing. It is hard to obtain housing grant (triggered by social housing) except in other areas of Edinburgh, so the affordable housing will be mid-market-rental on this site. Discussion with CEC on how to implement this is ongoing. There will be over 100 affordable units. Affordable housing on this site will be on a single block, especially if it is to be managed by a single provider.
- K Lochrie: please explain reuse of student building. Will the concrete be [slipform](#)?
  - The in-situ concrete will be in columns and beams. Future-proofing of the PBSA is being considered.
- A resident: What is the lower number of bridges from Fettes Row? We want to keep the existing trees, but the visual representations are not realistic.
  - We agree that the representations are not realistic, and are taking this up with the architect.
  - There was previously a link near the original office. We are looking to have a bridge near this, and another off Dundas St, so we are aiming to reduce from 4 bridges to one.
- A resident: the planned heights are unclear. I believe they should not be greater than the Fettes Row block. Also there has been movement in basement flats so owners will seek reparations.
  - We will show heights more clearly at the next exhibition. There is a change in planned heights towards Dundas St. This topic is being explored through the design review process, so is currently in flux.
- R Price: will under-podium remain as previously planned, leading to more allocation for residents?
  - The weighting goes to residents, and there is no pressure from CEC to reduce underground parking but CEC wants to reduce city centre traffic at the same time as ensuring adequate provision.
- The formal planning application will be submitted after Xmas.

## 5 Culture and communities matters

### 5.a Update on the George St and First New Town project: problems, challenges and solutions – Jamie Robertson, CEC

See [slides on NTBCC website](#). Jamie Robertson reported:

- Slide 1: the project is on the cusp of completing designs, and obtaining funding and necessary permissions/consents.
- Slide 2: the project's timeline started in 2014 with an experimental traffic regulation order. Having gone through various stages, the project will seek permission to commence the statutory process in March 2025. This delay from 2024 is due to Sustrans having lost Scottish Government funding, so the project must now apply to Transport Scotland.
  - The project is at the front of the visitor levy (VL) queue, because some revenue is ring-fenced for public realm work, and much VL revenue will be raised withing 500m of George St.
- Slide 3: various motions have been passed. The project will report on these in December.
  - For Cllr Bandel's motion, it will note that CCWEL has now been constructed, so interim measures have been installed on Charlotte Square. Further measures are being installed on St Andrews Square.
  - The response to Cllr O'Neill's motion is in preparation, but it will note that George St plans are well advanced, and construction will start in 2027. However, work on Queen St would need to start from scratch and is not funded, so isn't a practical solution that can be delivered before George St work starts.
  - Hence alternative cycling measures are being developed. Also, a consultation involving options for cycling on Princes St and the Waveley valley is due to launch very soon. The project recognises that George St is a key cycle route for the new town.
- Slide 4: doing nothing is not an option, so there are three costed options.
  - The full, RIBA-standard, option would cost ~£39m.
  - A reduced-scope option would cost between £20m and £30m.
  - A minimum option would cost ~£15m.

Any of these would include around £9m for diverting utilities. We are working with Scottish Water to contain this.

Like-for-like replacement of existing conditions would cost ~£10m, which would come from CEC's resources. However, more ambitious options could attract external funding.

- Slide 5: shows dates, including starting and finishing construction in 2027 and 2029 respectively.
- Slide 6: shows costs and funding. Potential funding sources include the visitor levy, Scottish Government and developer contributions. The £39m option is explained in terms of financial year spend. A full financial plan is due in March 2025.
- Slide 7 is about next steps and calls to action. In other areas, simply removing parking has been successful, but this plan is an investment in a heritage European St. Each £1 of investment is expected to deliver £2 return. The project is grateful for NTBCC and others' help, and will undertake further consultation on the options being developed. Further support will be appreciated.

#### 5.a.i Q&A

- M Birch: is this a transport or public realm project? What are its boundaries? (Spending is needed on cross-streets.)
  - The new transport convenor is focussed on both aspects, but this project cannot be pigeonholed – it also would help with environmental issues and Edinburgh's economy and employment. However, it does report to TEC, and does have a boundary, despite linking to other schemes such as CCWEL and Meadows to George St. Some budget is set aside for cross-streets, but other schemes/CEC teams are taking on 3 of them. We will avoid redoing junctions.
- R Price: given the cost/benefit ratio, why isn't Essential Edinburgh contributing to funding?
- B Ryan: thank you for aiming to not redo things, as has happened to the cycle-land on Melville St when relaying setts.
- D Henderson: I am concerned that there has no (published) traffic modelling just outwith the first new town, so it is not clear where cars can go from Queen St etc.
  - I can share the modelling that has just done.

### 5.b Report on Walkabout (First New Town) – to discuss

See [report on NTBCC website](#). S Holvedge reported:

- I have shared the report with the George St Association, CEC officers and CEC cllrs. The main concern is enforcement of quality utilities work.
  - Cllr Mowat: CEC officers need to reply on a case-by-case basis, but inspections do take place. Some work is done piece by piece, so will eventually be finished properly. However, there are issues which need more chasing.
  - Cllr Mowat: the report should also be sent to Andrew Williams (CEC operational director) and Gareth Barwell.
  - R Price: this is commercial waste, so Essential Edinburgh is part of this picture
  - Cllrs Mowat and McFarlane: CEC is responsible for enforcement and cleansing. Mr Barwell's team can issue fines.
  - Cllr McFarlane: this is relevant to the Waverley Valley/Princes St consultation that is just about to start.
  - P Williamson: we saw that the Royal London building had a lot of rubbish build-up and now metal grills. [I WILL CHECK WHETHER PLANNING PERMISSION WAS OBTAINED FOR THIS.](#)

### 5.c Other consultations

- S Holvedge: NTBCC could submit deputations on the following, and the Waverley Valley/Princes St consultation. [I WILL CONVENE AD-HOC GROUPS.](#)
  - Visitor levy consultation (closes 15.12.24)

- o Edinburgh Future Libraries consultation (closes 25.12.24)
- o Ross bandstand etc (closes 20.12.24)

## 6 Planning matters continued

The following matters were noted:

1. 24/05018/FUL Installation of BT Street Hub & removal of 4 kiosks on Dundas Street (to discuss)
  2. 24/05030/FUL Alterations/new/reinstated openings 25 Carlton Terrace Mews (to discuss)
  3. 24/04750/FUL 30-31 Princes St: Change of use of retail space to hotel use (to note)
- **ACTION: R PRICE TO PICK UP MATTERS 1 AND 2 WITH NTBCC'S PLANNING CTTE.** (Matter 3 seems to be relatively insignificant.)

### 6.a Other planning matters

- R Price: all 4 Christmas markets have been approved for various numbers of years.
- R Price: it is over the top writing to Cllr Day about the Bailey Gifford plans. NTBCC has made its point ad nauseam.
  - o M Birch: there is a recommendation to be considered at the Development Management Sub-Committee to grant permission for this work.

## 7 Licensing matters

### 7.a STL evidence session with Regulatory Committee (to note)

No discussion

### 7.b Licensing Board/Forum meeting about overprovision (to note)

No discussion

### 7.c Unlawful use of HMOs for homeless accommodation (to note)

- A Gaillard: this item resulted from an emergency discussion at a recent [EACC](#) meeting. Typically, HMOs in NTBCC's area are used for student accommodation but there is now an application for a 42-occupant HMO on Albany St. it is not clear to me which class-use is relevant – see [screen-shot explaining class-uses](#) – but I believe this property would need class 7 (hotels and hostels) permission.
  - o Cllr Mowat: there isn't a simple answer to this question.
  - o Leith Links CC representative: it depends on the property's use before the change to HMO. Change from normal residential to HMO would definitely need planning permission. CEC might argue that change from hotel/hostel to HMO but, given the nature of the future occupants, I believe this change would require permission – and am checking with Scottish Government.
  - o S Hajducki: I understand that both an HMO licence and planning permission are needed because a hotel is not residential. HMOs need the right numbers of kitchens and registered landlords: no such registration has been applied for in this case. This change is not in the interest of the area.
  - o A Gaillard: there is no information of capping occupant numbers, but there are bedroom-size regulations. Plans show removal of kitchens and common areas to make more bedrooms. The site is not on the relevant register, so floor plans are not yet available. (It may appear on the register soon.) Neighbourhood notification is limited.
  - o LLCC representative: I will forward relevant guidance. Applicants must provide floorplans, but these are not published. Inspectors measure rooms but their findings are also not published. CEC is currently housing ~700 people in ~30 unlicensed premises in Edinburgh. 20% of this capacity is in LLCC's area, including 5 large premises
  - o R Price: HMOs are class 9 but this site must have class 7 permission, so why is it applying for an HMO license?

### 7.d Current applications

There was no discussion (due to lack of time) of the following:

- Alcohol licensing - Variation 537555 for ESF outside the Omni, related to Planning 24/03724/FUL currently awaiting decision
- Civic licensing – STL 538256 at 10a Blenheim Place (EH7 5JH)
- Civic licensing – LHC ?????? at 6 Picardy Place (EH1 3JT)
- Civic licensing – HMO ?????? at 39-47 Albany Street (EH1 3QY)

## 8 Transport and environment matters

- See [report](#).

### 8.a Street cleaning petition

M Birch: There are no recommendations for further action in the report to the Transport and Environment Committee on this topic. NTBCC could support this petition because this matter affects many of our residents. (There was discussion but no decision whether NTBCC should submit a deputation.)

## 9 Any other business

- None

## 10 Appendix: Cllr Mitchell's response about deputation to CEC planning about the impact of bollards on conservation areas

Dear Mike,

Thank you for your email and indeed for the CC's patience. The workload at the moment has been tricky.

There is a deputation [online here](#) from the deputation based on the Motion of my and Joanna's former colleague Cllr Rose. The wording is available [online here](#) along with links to the written deputation and the amendment. My main reason for raising this was that a woman at the CC mentioned the posts in the carriageway and the impact on the WHS/conservation area/s. The Chief Planning Officer responds to some of the concerns, so thought it might be of interest, though it was 3.5 years ago so I couldn't fully remember the content.

I hope that is clear. Any questions, please do get in touch.

Best wishes,

Cllr Max Mitchell

DRAFT