

Minutes of New Town & Broughton Community Council's ordinary meeting, held via Zoom, on Monday 14 April 2025 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
3	Cllr Miller	Feed back to CEC governance issues with the declaration.
5.a	Cllr Miller	Put S Hodge on live induction event wait-list
7.d	Cllr Jenkinson	Highlight graffiti issues/summit in the next relevant report
7.e	Cllr Jenkinson	Try to obtain more funding and to reduce the wait for renovations to setted streets, explore feasibility for doing more
7.e	Cllr Jenkinson	Meet local residents etc to hear first-hand frustrations about condition of East London St
8.a	M Veranesi	Propose arrangements for workshopping EWH collaborations; supply governance update
8.c	NTBCC	pursue a complaint against the proceedings about 12 Blenheim Place
12	P Williamson	Issue an invitation to new NTBCC members to meet up

Items 1 to 5 were chaired by NTBCC's returning officer, Cllr Claire Miller.

1 Welcome and apologies

1.a Attendance

Mike Birch	NTBCC	Joe McAdam	NTBCC	Bruce Ryan	minutes
Pierre Forissier	NTBCC	Stuart McAllister	NTBCC	Cllr Jack Caldwell	Leith Walk ward
Annick Gaillard	NTBCC	Susan Macinnes	NTBCC	Cllr Jo Mowat	City centre ward
Stephen Hajducki	NTBCC	Masudun Nessa Mitu	NTBCC	Alan McIntosh	<i>Broughton Spurtle</i>
Simon Holledge	NTBCC	David Renton	NTBCC	~13 residents/visitors	
Boyan Karabaliev	NTBCC	Gerald Wells	NTBCC		
Ken Lochrie	NTBCC	Peter Williamson	NTBCC		

1.b Apologies

Fiona Banatvala	NTBCC	Cllr Finlay McFarlane	City Centre ward
Shaun Hodge	NTBCC	Cllr Hal Osler	Stockbridge and Inverleith ward
Nick Reid	NTBCC	Jeremy Balfour MSP	Lothian region
Vanessa Roëves	see below	Ben Macpherson MSP	Edinburgh Northern and Leith
Emma Swift	NTBCC	Angus Robertson MSP	Edinburgh Central
Cllr Margaret Graham	City Centre ward		

2 Declarations of interest

none

3 Announcing community council members as duly elected

The following were declared as members of NTBCC, having been both been elected and signed the declaration.

- Ordinary members: Pierre Forissier, Annick Gaillard, Stephen Hajducki, Simon Holledge, Shaun Hodge*, Boyan Karabaliev, Stuart McAllister, Masudun Nessa Mitu, Susan Macinnes, David Renton, Emma Swift*, Gerald Wells, Alan Welsh*, Peter Williamson
- Local interest groups reps: Fiona Banatvala*, Mike Birch, Ken Lochrie, Joe MacAdam, Nick Reid*, Vanessa Roëves* (but see below)

* *in absentia*

A declaration of acceptance was not received from Vanessa Roëves before the meeting. Cllr Miller will liaise with CEC Governance officers to prepare the require process for co-option at the next meeting of NTBCC.

Richard Price had been nominated but was strongly against the imposition of the declaration, so was deemed to be not elected as a member.

ACTION: CLLR MILLER TO FEEDBACK TO CEC GOVERNANCE ISSUES WITH THE DECLARATION.

4 Confirmation of community council name

The name of the community council was agreed to be New Town & Broughton Community Council.

5 Election of office bearers

There were no other nominations, so the following were elected. (Self-nominations were permitted.)

Role	Candidate	nominated by	Role	Candidate	nominated by
Chair	P Williamson	S Holledge	Treasurer	N Reid	M Birch
Secretary	M Birch	P Williamson	Engagement and inclusion officer	S Holledge	S Holledge

It was agreed that these people will remain in post until the 2025 AGM (June), so that new members can get used to being on NTBCC.

5.a Community council representatives to attend induction event on 26 April 2025 (9:30 morning)

- Because each CC can only send two people to the in-person event, D Renton and M N Mitu were chosen by lot to attend. **ACTION: Cllr Miller to put S Hodge on the wait-list.**
- There will be online events which any new member can attend on 28 and 29 April. Also, a recording of the online event will be shared.

The following items were chaired by P Williamson.

6 Approval of minutes of 10 March 2025 Meeting and matters arising

It was noted that most actions from the March meeting were complete, except for actions around EWH. (See item 8.a below.) Hence these minutes were approved as-is (proposed D Renton, seconded J McAdam, *ND*)

7 Presentation with questions and answers by Councillor Stephen Jenkinson (Cllr SJ), convener of CEC transport and environment committee (TEC)**7.a List of Potential Questions for Stephen Jenkinson**

See appendix for all the questions NTBCC would like to have asked. Due to lack of time, only the most urgent were asked.

7.b Communal Bin Review

- Cllr SJ: roll-out of phase 6 is in progress, and communications have been sent to the relevant streets. A consultation is in progress so feedback can be gathered. The matter was considered in the city chambers some time ago: this was helpful to the councillor because he was new to the TEC. He has looked at the framework, and got an amendment in place that enables more flexibility in placement of bin-hubs. He admits that the bin system will never be perfect but is aiming for 95%.
- P Williamson: the consultation does not inform people about options, leading to significant upset, and contains misleading materials. CEC has not used a 12-month opportunity to work with NTBCC and residents' associations. Some streets wish to continue to have gull-proof bags (GPBs), other streets wish to have them, and other streets do not wish bin-hubs. There is nothing justifying only two options for refuse collection. NTBCC wishes that the consultation is extended and made better to it ascertains what people truly and portrays all possible options.
- Cllr SJ: lessons have been learned and the process has been refined and improved to an extent, but NTBCC makes fair criticisms. Its written deputation shows that the consultation has not been good enough, and this will be taken on board by CEC officers. The process is iterative. He wants to get to the end of it as efficiently as possible but with a degree of flexibility. It is unlikely that there will be other options, but the cllr will continue to encourage officers to engage in a collaborative way.
- P Williamson: this is about residents' strong concerns about refuse services. CEC needs to work through them.
- M Birch: CEC has spent £10m on this review but there has been little change to recycling. How will this be improved?
- Cllr SJ: so far the review has concentrated on low [population-] density areas. CEC needs to develop solutions for high population density areas

7.c Control of e-bikes

- Cllr SJ: issues are mostly to do with e-bike riders (several members disagreed) and food delivery. There have been several motions to TEC and the full CEC to understand what powers CEC now has and wants in addition.
- A Gaillard: this is not about use of e-bikes but about their size. Why are they allowed on cycle-paths? It is surprising that there have been no injuries yet.
- Cllr SJ: e-bikes of this type are illegal¹, so this is a matter for the police.
- A Gaillard: the police are already overstretched, so what has CEC done? Can licenses be revoked? Cycle-paths should promote active travel [and hence health] but such e-bikes do not do this.
- Cllr SJ: there is no licensing regime – such vehicles are illegal. Hence CEC is requesting its officers to engage with companies, to understand the environment better. CEC does not want motorbikes on cycle-paths or pavements.
- D Renton: if the police and CEC do not have the necessary resources, this should be a matter for the Scottish Government (SG). Is CEC working with SG on this?
- Cllr SJ: CEC is first working with companies to understand how they operate, and so to encourage behaviour-change.
- Both NTBCC and Cllr SJ agreed that they are independent operators, not employees.
- M Birch/S Hajducki: can speed limits be imposed on cycle-paths? If not, new legislation is needed.
- Cllr SJ: e-bikes were not planned for in development of cycle-paths. Legislation has not kept up with technology, so SG assistance (i.e. legislation) is needed

7.d Litter and street cleansing

- Cllr SJ: over the last two CEC budgets, there has been continued focus on street cleanliness. Scores are moving in the right direction but are a long way from where CEC wishes them to be, so CEC will continue to try to improve scores. Scores enable benchmarking against other local authorities.
- M Birch: there is a disconnection between LEAMS² scores and NTBCC's observations. Which streets were audited? Are any of these in NTBCC's area?

¹ Minuter's note: See rules on e-bikes on government website: <https://www.gov.uk/electric-bike-rules>. It is not quite true that some e-bikes are just illegal: there is an approval scheme for non-EAPC e-bikes but they must be treated as mopeds.

² <https://www.keepsotlandbeautiful.org/local-environmental-audit-and-management-system-leams>

- Cllr SJ: I do not know. This area may continue to be a priority.
- P Williamson: there was a graffiti summit in January 2024: a forum for understanding what is being attempted. However there has been no feedback since then. Could this summit be restarted?
- Cllr SJ: I WILL HIGHLIGHT THIS IN THE NEXT REPORT. The team is now focussed on it.
- A member of a nearby CC: please commit to funding from the transient visitor levy (TVL) being extra spending.

7.e East London Street (ELS)

- Cllr SJ: CEC has a large budget for roads. Setted streets are part of this but CEC can only afford to renovate one such street per year. A proposed amendment last month to change priorities, and hence move ELS up the list did not pass. Nor did an amendment to use TVL revenue to increase progress through the list. I WILL TRY TO OBTAIN MORE FUNDING AND TO REDUCE THE WAIT FOR RENOVATIONS.
- A Gaillard: Frederick St is tarmacked. (Cllr SJ replied that this is temporary – this street is on the renovation list.)
- Cllr Mowat: it is pointless raising expectations by engaging with residents over tarmacking etc until there are funds to undertake such work. By the time such funds are available, there may well be different residents [i.e. other opinions].
- M Birch: (1) why did you vote against the motion to increase the priority of the replacement of setts in this street which had cross party support among City Centre ward councillors? (2) Why is CEC determined to keep this street setted when parts of it are tarmacked?
- Cllr SJ: I had early sight of the relevant amendment but other amendments were also submitted, so it had to be part of the consideration of the capital investment report. I was responsible for ensuring this report, which sets 12 months' investment, passed 'relatively intact'. I did seek consensus on this amendment but could not satisfy a majority. I WILL CONTINUE TO EXPLORE THE FEASIBILITY OF DOING MORE. It may not be possible to change the order but it might be possible to renovate 2 streets per year.
- A resident: in the meantime, why are heavy vehicles using ELS? Can there not be a restriction?
- Cllr SJ: there has been engagement with Lothian Buses (LB), which has worked to minimise numbers of buses using ELS to access Annandale bus station. LB has stated that no further reductions can be made. Regarding impacts on ELS, it will receive some emergency repairs but the main work will come from the capital investment budget.
- K Lochrie: can CEC not just forbid uses of ELS by buses?
- Cllr SJ: it could but it will not because the bus station is in Annandale St.
- M Birch: there is an alternative route. I reiterate: why is CEC determined to keep ELS setted, when it is ¾ tarmacked?
- Cllr SJ: each street is in the setted streets policy. Most setted streets are in the old town and city centre. The condition of each has been scored.
- M Birch: I re-iterate: why is CEC determined to keep ELS setted, when it is ¾ tarmacked?
- Cllr SJ: it needs to be a setted street.
- M Birch: will you attend a meeting of local residents etc to hear first-hand the frustrations?
- Cllr SJ: I AM ALWAYS HAPPY TO MEET PEOPLE. I HAVE AN OPEN-DOOR POLICY.

7.f George Street and First New Town Project (GS-FNT)

- M Birch: what is plan B in case this project cannot be funded?
- Cllr SJ: CEC is good at creating planning documents but not so good at delivering on commitments, so there is now an unrealistic number of projects. I asked for capital investment proposals and a realistic list of priorities for a 10-year window. Officers have done this, and TEC members have scrutinised the outputs. There will be a report to TEC next month to decide what does and does not proceed at this point.
- Cllr SJ: I have a high level of confidence.

7.g Public Realm Design and Maintenance

- M Birch: why has the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance (EDSG) not been subject to the same review and consultation processes as other Planning Guidance?
- Cllr SJ: tactile paving was debated at the last TEC meeting. This topic might come under transport or might come under environment so it is hard to get the relevant level of scrutiny, so maybe TEC should have more skin in this game. Hence I have engaged with CEC's planning convenor. I have set up Edinburgh's accessibility commission which should help with EDSG matters – this is work in progress.
- M Birch: please respond to questions about Picardy Place (PP).
- Cllr SJ: I am at PP quite often. It still has a great deal of potential but currently it looks a bit unloved/half-baked.
- S Holledge: the trees were dead before they were planted.
- B Ryan: SG's former director of budget and financial strategy (DBFS) informs me that even SG cannot guarantee funding for future years of multi-year projects, so how can you be confident that it will fund such projects in future years?³
- A resident: we might assume that such projects will be funded but then find that halfway through the funding disappears. Have the Holyrood parties got a grip on transport?
- Cllr SJ: in general they do. CEC is quite well placed compared to other local authorities because it is in a good position to apply for the funding that is and will be available. CEC [along with other LAs] is competing for funding, and should

³ From a further conversation with former DBFS: SG budgets are set annually, so SG cannot make cast-iron commitments for future years, so *in extremis* future funding may not materialise. See <https://www.parliament.scot/chamber-and-committees/the-scottish-budget-process>. However, it is more likely that funding levels are trimmed than not supplied at all. It would be nonsensical for fundees not to be able to rely on SG's stated intentions, even though it is technically possible for SG to withdraw such 'commitments'.

carry on with this. My expectation is that SG funding will continue but CEC also has to plan for the situation improving. Do nothing isn't an option!

7.h Other Issues

No discussion

8 Chair's report

8.a Edinburgh World Heritage Trust (EWHT) and Interface Group meetings

- P Williamson and M Birch have met with EWHT's acting director (Megan Veronesi). It was agreed that EWHT, CCs and residents' associations will have a workshop around collaboration on overseeing and protecting the EWH site.
 - *ACTION: M VERONESI TO COME BACK WITH PROPOSED ARRANGEMENTS.*
 - *ACTION: M VERONESI TO SUPPLY A GOVERNANCE UPDATE.*
- P Williamson: a permanent director is being sought. There are other senior-level vacancies at EWHT. The chair was on sick-leave for a significant amount of time but has recently returned to work.

8.b Planning Guidance Consultation – NTBCC response

[NTBCC's submission](#) is now on its website.

8.c Planning Local Review Body Decision – 12 Blenheim Place

- A Gaillard: this site is between Toppings bookshop and Royal Terrace. It is beside the former Bank of New York and has never been part of Greenside parish Church. Trees here were cut down in 2017 because some were unhealthy. A planning application was made for a modern house with 5 bedrooms but the plans showed a bunker-like design, mostly facing the church. NTBCC and EWHT objected to the application, and the planning officer had recommended refusal, while HES was neutral. An appeal against the 'delegated authority' decision succeeded under somewhat contentious circumstances: the convenor was only elected at the start of the meeting. The vote was tied, so the convenor had a casting vote where he voted to support the appeal (i.e. that planning permission would be granted, against the planning officer's recommendation and against the 'casting votes should uphold the status quo' convention – in this case to not support the appeal. NTBCC was not treated as a statutory consultee.
 - Cllr Mowat: this was because NTBCC needed to communicate during any public consultation that it intends to act as a statutory consultee. NTBCC could submit a complaint about the local review body being run badly
 - A Gaillard: hence there are limited options for actions: do nothing, formal complaint to CEC, seek judicial review, appeal to public ombudsman. Of the 'do something options, formal complaint would be the easiest. Because planning permission has now been confirmed by this decision, construction can now start. There is no option to get the decision-making meeting re-run, so this cannot provide a temporary stay.
 - A resident: a judicial review about bin hubs contributed to a good resolution, and netted media attention. The decision breaks the 'set-back' principle in the New Town. CEC has an obligation to preserve and conserve, but is not living up to these in this case. Citizens will donate money to welcome causes, and this may be such a cause.
 - A Gaillard: it is not possible for NTBCC to pursue a dual-route complaint strategy. CEC standing orders may be deficient, or mislead members on how they are to be applied.
 - M Birch: had the convenor been trained on how to fulfil this role?
 - PW: NTBCC will first pursue a complaint against the proceedings, seeking reversal of the decision, and contesting the casual way the decision was taken, and seeking explanation of how this casualness came about. *AGREED ND*

9 Licencing matters

See also [convenor's report on NTBCC website](#). All points made by A Gaillard unless otherwise noted.

9.a Licensing Board

9.a.i [Licensing Applications & Standards – Feb 2025 statistics](#)

See report

9.a.ii [Overprovision – additional consultation](#)

This consultation is open to 4th May. It will be used to decide whether the whole of Edinburgh or just certain parts of the city will become subject to overprovision measures. NTBCC will keep pushing for overprovision measures.

9.b Civic Licensing: Tables & Chairs (to note)

- Pavements in a certain location are wider, and a local pub has been abusing this, but has recently reduced the pavement width it takes to 1.5m.
- Cllr SJ: a report to TEC last year set and firmed up policy. If space for pedestrians passing the pavement tables and chairs cannot be maintained, this would be a ground for refusing the permit. It is necessary for the establishment to change its actions because the policy mandates a maximum of 1.5m.⁴
- M N Mitu: The cllr's statements are deficient – this is a very dangerous corner.
- D Renton: this is an instance where it is very difficult for mobility scooters to get past. Enforcement is needed.
- Cllr SJ: there is either lack of enforcement [by CEC] or lack of reporting of issues.

⁴ Minuter's note: Cllr SJ said this during the Beltane Fire Festival discussion but he may have been referring to tables and chairs.

9.c Beltane Fire Festival – Queue Management (to note/discuss)

Last year, the queue was on the pavement along Leith Street, leading to overspilling onto the street. A tables and chairs permit was in place for a bar at the top of Leith Street but hopefully they will remove these if the queue takes the same route as last year.

10 Transport and Environment matters

See [convenors's report on NTBCC website](#).

10.a Communal Bin Review Phase 6 Consultation – NTBCC response

See Q&A with Cllr Jenkinson.

10.b Trams to Newhaven Project Update

See convenor's report.

11 Culture and Communities matters

No discussion

12 Any other business

- P Williamson: I am happy to meet up with newer NTBCC members. [I WILL CIRCULATE AN INVITATION VIA NTBCC'S SECRETARY.](#)
- NTBCC will soon hold a business meeting.

13 Appendix: list of potential questions for Cllr Jenkinson**Communal Bin Review**

- How will operational efficiency, increased recycling, impact on World Heritage Site and views of residents be considered in any decisions about future waste collection arrangements in the New Town?
- Despite spending over £10.0M under the communal bin review there has been hardly any improvement in recycling rates across Edinburgh. What does the Council need to do to improve its performance?
- Why has no action been taken to address the misuse of communal bins by the short term let properties first identified in a Council improvement plan in November 2016?

Control of E-bikes

- What legislation exists to allow the Police or Council to take action to control the use of e-bikes and scooters both in terms of speed and use of pavements?
- Can the Council impose speed limits on e-bikes and scooters using cycleways?
- What action has the Council taken to improve its control of e-bikes?

Litter and Street Cleansing

- How many streets are surveyed in the calculating the LEAMS score for Edinburgh. Which of those streets are in the New Town and Broughton Community Council area?
- How do you reconcile the improving LEAMS scores with the experience of most residents of overflowing bins, graffiti, blocked drains, weeds in streets and pavements and fly tipping?

East London Street

- Why must East London Street remain as a setted street when the traffic along this street has increased resulting significant nuisance to residents since the original decision was taken in 2018 to include it?
- Why did you vote against the motion to increase the priority of the replacement of setts in this street which had cross party support among City Centre ward councillors?
- Will you attend a meeting of local Councillors, representatives of the NTBCC and local residents to hear first-hand the frustrations that they are all feeling about the lack of progress in addressing the health concerns that have prompted two petitions?

George Street and First New Town Project

- Is this project primarily a public realm project or a transport project and how will this determination affect the availability of finance for the project?
- What is the Plan B if the current scheme cannot be funded?

Public Realm Design and Maintenance

- Why has the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance not been subject to the same review and consultation processes as other Planning Guidance?
- Do you agree that the ESDG has more holes than a piece of Swiss cheese and therefore does not provide the necessary guidance to developers and Council staff?
- Picardy Place was developed under the St James GAM but is now a neglected space with weeds and dying trees. Who is responsible for the maintenance of public realm once it is installed?

Other Issues

- Has the Council abandoned its target to reduce car miles by 30% by 2030?
- Where is the promised additional atmospheric monitoring on the periphery of the LEZ?
- Why was there no consideration of the deputation in favour of further restrictions on the use of glyphosate at the March TEC?
- Do you agree that the consultation on the future of Princes Street lacked a proper vision?