Agenda of New Town & Broughton Community Council's ordinary meeting, at Broughton St Mary's Church, on Monday 14 September 2026 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.

New actions

Item	Actor	Action
7.e	R Price	ascertain why the Albany St walkway is the way it is.
7.e	Cllr Mowat	delve into Albany St scaffolding permission-issues
10.b	M Birch	ask for a CEC official to give NTBCC a detailed update on St Mark's path
10.b	Cllr Caldwell	undertake liaisons with Powderhall residents and others, and to feed back the comms issues
10.d	M Birch	submit NTBCC's communal bins concerns

1 Welcome and apologies

The meeting was chaired by R Price (vicechair) in P Williamson (chair)'s absence.

1.a Present

Fiona Banatvala	NTBCC	Susan MacInnes	NTBCC	Cllr Jack Caldwell	Leith Walk ward
Mike Birch	NTBCC	Doug Neville	NTBCC	Cllr Margaret Graham	City Centre ward
Pierre Forissier	NTBCC	Richard Price	NTBCC	Cllr Max Mitchell	Inverleith ward
Stephen Hajducki	NTBCC	Gerry Wells	NTBCC	Cllr Jo Mowat	City Centre ward
Ken Lochrie	NTBCC	Alan McIntosh	*Broughton Spurtle*	~8 residents/visitors	

1.b Apologies

Laura Graham	NTBCC	Andrew Naughtie	NTBCC	Cllr Finlay McFarlane	City Centre ward
Annick Gaiilard	NTBCC	Peter Williamson	NTBCC	Cllr Hal Osler	Inverleith ward
Martin McDonnell	NTBCC	Bruce Ryan	Minutes secretary		

2 Declarations of interest

None

3 Approval of draft July minutes and draft August minutes

- July minutes approved as-is (proposed M Birch, seconded R Price, ND)
- August minutes approved as-is (ND)

4 Matters arising

4.a Actions from previous meetings

date added	Actor	Action	Status
Jul-26	S Hodge	Propose metric for small neighbourhoods for %ages residential, business etc	in progress
Jul-26	NTBCC members	Feed back to engagement convenors on current version of engagement action plan	complete
Jul-26	NTBCC members	NTBCC members to advise engagement convenors what should be 'out there' and supply/help with content	complete
Jul-26	F Banatvala	Engage with CEC community grants officials	in progress
Apr-26	Cllr Mowat	look into cumulative impact assessments for planning	in progress
Mar-26	NTBCC	consider its position on use of TVL revenues - find out how CCs views can be communicated (as well as via Cllrs)	in progress
Mar-26	S Hodge	Supply to cllrs details of a significant occurrence of fly-posting	in progress
Nov-25	S Hodge	Draft paper on concerns re e-bikes etc, then push for a public campaign	In progress

5 Visitor levy and participatory budgeting (M Edwards, CEC)

5.a Presentation

See also presentation slides.

- M Edwards is managing the community projects and community decision-making part of the visitor levy spend, branded 'your voice' ('TVL' in these notes.)
- The levy is 5% for stays on/after 24 July 2026, if booked after 1 October 2025. Edinburgh residents are not excepted from the TVL – it applies to the first 5 nights of any stay. Accommodation providers will make quarterly returns to CEC.
- Revenue will go to
  - CEC admin and accommodation providers' costs (2% of remitted funds)

DRAFT

  - Housing and tourism mitigation (£5m per year), participatory budgeting (£2m over 3 years)
  - Remaining revenue: 55% to city operations and infrastructure, 35% to culture, heritage and events, 10% to destination and visitor management.

- The PB aspects puts communities into decision-making – see slide 5 for full detail.
  - Advantages of participatory budgeting (PB) in general include tapping into hyperlocal knowledge of areas. Disadvantages include possible shiny campaigns and well-known organisations being rewarded rather than the best projects.
  - For this PB, each council ward will have a separate fund (on average £100,000 per ward) but the same process. Voting is by residents, and primarily online. Projects can focus on areas smaller than council wards. Grants can be up to £10k.
  - The overall project will learn from the first year's experience.

- Delivery model (detail on slides 6 and 7) and timeline (slide 9)
  - Idea-generation (autumn to early winter 2026): CEC sets broad criteria, then communities highlight their priorities. Applicants do not have to reside or be located in the ward where the project takes place.
  - Project proposals (winter 2026-27): organisations submit proposals, CEC staff ensure they meet its criteria, including benefitting **both** residents/communities and visitors. Projects will be assessed against TVL legislation and CEC grant conditions by CEC officers and local priorities (led by communities). All projects meeting these criteria go into the vote.
  - Decision-making (voting, February-March 2027): ward residents vote for projects. Results will be announced in March 2027.
  - Evaluation of year 1 will take place in spring 2027, to enable planning years 2 and 3 in summer 2027.

- Spending model (slide 8)
  - Year 1 is the test year, allocating £425k; the bulk of the money (£1275k) will be allocated in years 2 and 3.

- There are other CEC funds – some details are on slide 10.

5.b Q&A/discussion

- F Banatvala: is it restricting that projects must benefit both communities and visitors? CCs already have insufficient resources. The scheme relies on strong community structures. NTBCC is relatively strong, but what about areas that do not have these? I reiterate NTBCC's lack of financial resources to undertake such project generation.
  - Projects could have different community-benefitting and visitor-benefitting aspects. For example, local young people could tell visitors about local history, benefitting both by creating and sharing knowledge. Friends of parks organisations could organise events benefitting both.

- R Price: what sorts of projects will not be eligible?
  - Those benefitting only residents, e.g. education and social programs not benefitting visitors as well.

- R Price: is there scope for additionality, i.e. funding things CEC would like to do but cannot afford.
  - We will look for projects that are in line with CEC policies, but this is a fund for external organisations.

- K Lochrie: what about projects around widening pavements?
  - I can see these benefitting both residents and visitors, but projects must be delivered by external organisations, and the £10k per project would not fix a great deal of pavement.

- M Birch: I can envisage projects in the city centre benefitting both residents and visitors, but some areas do not get many visitors so are likely to find it hard to propose eligible projects. This is also contrary to supporting more deprived areas.
  - Projects would need to bring additional benefit to visitors. For example performances and community history items benefitting both them and residents can take place in any part of Edinburgh.

- M Birch: what are the eligibility rules for organisations?
  - They need to be constituted, have their own bank accounts, and be independent organisations, not individuals or private businesses. Community Councils and residents' associations are eligible.

- G Wells: please explain the timing for years 2 and 3.
  - The timings for this spend are not fixed – it could be at any time in this period.

- S Hollege/F Banatvala: CC boundaries do not coincide with ward boundaries. For example NTBCC straddles 3 wards. Will. This complicate your admin? If NTBCC proposed a project for all 3 wards, would the project get 1/3 of its budget from each ward's allocation?
  - No – I only need to have regard to ward boundaries for admin. The putative NTBCC project would need to apply to all three wards.

- Cllr Mowat: I do not understand how the community priorities identification will be done, despite my long experience of being on 'risk and best value' and other relevant CEC committees. For example, NTBCC is very well informed but there has been no community consultation with it since 2013. So how will you identify community priorities?
  - It's what comes forward in the idea generation phase of this project. However, should this way not work, we will change methods.

DRAFT

- An attendee: how will community voting work?
  - Residents will log onto the voting website, entering email address, postcode and date of birth. This will deliver them to the part for the appropriate ward, then vote for the projects they favour. We want as much participation as possible, even though this may involve organisations canvassing the people they know to vote for their projects. If year one results in large organisations getting most of the money, changes will be made for later years.
- N Reid: is an even pattern across the 17 wards of applications and spending anticipated? It is possible that a few wards would have many applications (totalling lots of money) but others few or zero.
  - My quality role is to ensure that proposed projects meet a minimum standard to be funded. Otherwise, it's about what communities wish to see funded. I do have some concerns about the distribution of applications. We know that some areas are more community-active than others, because historically they have not made many applications to the community grants fund. My role includes encouraging organisations in those areas to apply, and providing the support they need to do so. Organisations are not restricted to working in just one ward.
- A McIntosh: are the TVL PB funds additional to existing PB funding for Leith?
  - Yes – there is no connection between the two. For example, LeithChooses is funded from CEC's community grants fund (CGF); the TVL PB is funded from TVL revenues, and is not LeithChooses.
  - Cllr Mowat: Leith does get more funding: PB costs more than other CGF funding.
- F Banatvala: so what is the difference between TVL PB and LeithChooses PB?
  - A primary difference is that TVL PB projects must benefit both visitors and residents/communities. We do not aim to duplicate the CGF: amounts are different (CGF maximum award is £5k, TVL PB maximum in the first year is £10k. Thereafter there can be multi-year funding for bigger projects.)
- K Lochrie: how will Edinburgh people find out about this?
  - Online advertising, posters, word of mouth, other publicity
- M Birch: what is the participation rate in LeithChooses, which has existed for years? We are concerned that the TVL PB will have a very low participation rate unless there is very good publicity. Could the TVL PB be advertised in council tax letters? Other councils send out weekly email newsletters to anyone who contacts them about anything – CEC may be missing out on this use of IT, and using hyperlocal media.
  - Around 5% at the voting day, plus online voting. I don't think CEC can advertise anything else in council tax letters. We can create bookmarks advertising the TVL PB for sharing via local libraries. CEC doesn't currently publish local news-mailings.
- S Holledge: if I was part of a TVL PB-funded project, I would be concerned that I would need to reach 20,000 people in this ward. How would this be done? (I do know how to reach people in my hyperlocal area.)
  - F Banatvala: it may not be necessary to reach all of this ward. You would just need to be the most popular project in the ward. However, many potential voters do not know which ward they are in.
  - M Edwards: because of this, people have to enter their postcode when they wish to vote. [This leads them to the vote for their ward.]
- F Banatvala: if a project or CC straddles two wards, how does voting work?
  - Each person's vote is based on which ward they live in. If a ward boundary goes down the middle of a street, people living on other side of the boundary will all be able to vote but for different sets of projects. We aim to spread the benefits across the city, but there need to be some boundaries to enable this spread, and CEC wards exist and work.
- R Price: the idea of an experimental first year seems sensible, and we appreciate there will be teething problems. What would you like NTBCC to do? We can publicise via our website etc. When can we expect relevant material?
  - For applicants – sometime next month; for voters – later on. I will be grateful if you circulate via this network, including sharing these slides.

6 Chair's report

6.a Engagement talks with Edinburgh World Heritage

See chair's note on current status of these talks. The meeting with EWH is on 23 September.

7 Planning

All points made by R Price unless otherwise noted.

7.a Princes Street & Waverley Valley strategy – CEC Planning Committee 10 September

NTBCC and other organisations have concerns whether what has been published is really a strategy, and whether it is ambitious enough. A workshop in June was well organised, with a wide range of stakeholders attending. It considered, among other things, Richard Murphy's proposals. The report which went to CEC planning a week ago had two options: 'ambitious pragmatism' and 'radical rethink'. (The details provided for both options were indicative rather than specific.) CEC officers recommended the former option. A key factor is that this option can be started now, but the other would need a lot of procurement work. A report with specific detail is due in 2027. Issues to be sorted include pavement widths (including possible extension into the carriageway), possible repaving in sandstone and granite curbs, access to the

gardens (especially for wheelchairs and prams), garden opening hours and lighting. This has been generally accepted as a good start.

- S Holledge: the George St officer is happy to arrange a meeting to consider details. The devil is always in details.
- R Price: I suggest waiting for the detailed plans in 2027.
- Cllr Mitchell: the 2027 plan would be specific, so it enables CEC transport to start delivering. Costs are likely to be £13m to £14m. Detailed design work will start soon, using TVL revenue.
- S Holledge: George St had a long design process, but this seems to be progressing too quickly.
- Cllr Mowat: George St took about 10 years. It has taken 2 years to decide the direction of travel for Princes St.
- A McIntosh: I recall that NTBCC decided in June to state that Princes St could only be designed in conjunction with George St work. Has NTBCC changed its position?
- R Price: this is a first step to overcome obvious issues, so we do not think this is the final decision. Other, more ambitious plans are still possible in the future. There have been many ambitious ideas for Princes St. The current plans do not answer fundamental questions about what Prince St should be.
- Cllr Mowat: the context of this decision includes 7 weeks' closure of Princes St. Also, CEC decided in February not to use TVL revenue to fund George St plans that had become massively top-heavy and costly. Contingency planning and lesson-learning is needed in tandem against similar closures. Some aspects of the Richard Murphy plans are unviable.
- M Birch: until we see designs, we cannot know whether they are OK. We have also highlighted paving outside Balmoral and Waverley steps. CEC has said that work here will be deferred until after the tram project. The Waverley station masterplan seems to have stalled. There is no will to reduce the number of buses using Princes St from CEC or bus companies. Traffic commissioners have control here, not CEC.
- R Price: in summary, there is benefit in pursuing 'ambitious pragmatism' but other questions need to be revisited. NTBCC should get a presentation from CEC officers in 2027, and make a position statement.

7.b Forth Street aparthotel proposal (24/00660/FUL) hearing

An amended application reducing the number of rooms went to DMSC in August. A hearing (20 September) was granted. NTBCC and others will attend. There may also be a site visit. The developer's PR company invited NTBCC and others to talk with them. There are some conservation advantages in the latest plans but there would still be extensive development to the rear, and servicing issues, so NTBCC isn't happy with these plans.

7.c 57 Henderson Row (26/01640/FUL)

The latest version of this application has been refused. Most people are happy with the idea of conversion from offices to residential, so long as it stays in the existing mass.

7.d 109 Princes Street advertising consent (26/01365/ADV): DPEA appeal

Prior to the fire, a proposal to erect advertising shrouding with downlighters was refused. Despite the building burning down, this decision has been appealed.

7.e 58 Albany Street (25/02873/FUL) hoardings

R Price/K Lochrie: this site has planning permission for a Travelodge. Work has encroached onto the carriageway, and now has a 30m advertising hoarding outside it. The pedestrian walkway past it is difficult to navigate: it is hard to see the way out, it has no lighting, is not wide enough for prams and pedestrians to pass each other, and may facilitate mugging. There are also issues with the traffic at the end of Albany St.

- S Hajducki: this is incompetent, lazy scaffolding – it does not need to be this way. CEC should not have permitted this.
- *ACTION: R PRICE TO ASCERTAIN WHY THE WALKWAY IS THE WAY IT IS*.
- *ACTION: CLLR MOWAT TO DELVE INTO SCAFFOLDING PERMISSION-ISSUES*.

7.f 108-114 & 116 Dundas Street hotel (26/01504/FUL) – awaiting decision

It's not clear yet whether this will go to DMSC. Demolition has started.

7.g CityPlan 2040

Between now and 30 September, NTBCC will work on its position.

8 Culture & Communities

See also convenor's report. All points made by D Neville unless otherwise noted.

- Highlighted NTBCC-specific points include
  - the agreed funding for lighting, including Calton Hill
  - the piloting of the Edinburgh nature network in Leith
  - management rules for streets and civic spaces.
- Highlighted city-wide points include
  - Adoption of the parliament cairn via the Calton Hill management plan
  - Agreement of firework control zones
  - Third Party Cultural Grant Funding 2027-28 report being referred to full council

9 Licensing

See convenor's report

- R Price: there has been discussion of the links between planning and licensing, e.g. short-term lets needing both planning permission and licensing, and deliberately unlicensed STLs, which do not attract sufficient potentials. The legislation may not be good enough, and enforcement may need to be strengthened. Breaches can be reported.
  - Cllr Mowat: the way into reporting needs to be better advertised so people know how to do it. CEC has asked SG to improve legislation and increase fine. CEC would like to investigate unlicensed properties. Relevant cases are at court now: officers have hard evidence. There are both planning and licensing enforcement routes.
  - G Wells: when I reported an issue to both planning and licensing, planning picked this up. It was a simple process but took some time.

10 Transport and environment

See convenor's report. All points made by M Birch unless otherwise noted.

10.a TEC Update (to note)

10.a.i North-south tram extension

See convenor's report and NTBCC's **deputation to the CEC T&E committee**, reiterating NTBCC's concerns. There are also concerns that funding for actually building tram extensions is not available, so other spend (e.g. publicity) is a waste.

- Cllr Mowat: CEC is waiting on the SEStransit report (due in 2027) which would make clear what transport options SG would fund.
- An attendee: why was the Bridges route chose over the Lothian Rd route?
  - Cllr Mowat: it's because it's the busier bus corridor. I will continue to vote against spending on tram extensions until there is funding to build them. The feasibility study of the south-suburban tram-train has not yet been done, so it is not yet known whether this is feasible.
  - This attendee: South Bridge has not been surveyed, so it's not clear whether it could support trams.

10.a.ii Tables and chairs permits

See convenor's report. There has been no response about busy streets only being left 1·7m due to tables and chairs.

10.a.iii TRO process review

See convenor's report and NTBCC's deputation to the CEC T&E committee, welcoming the review but noting transparency and other issues. It is likely that the scheme of delegation will be reconsidered by CEC in October

10.a.iv Coach plan

See convenor's report. In NTBCC's area, the only official coach park is at Regent Rd. Other unofficial coach-parks happen.

- R Price: Regent Rd is never full, in my observation, so why are other coach-parks being considered?
- Cllr Mowat: more coach parking is needed on the west of Edinburgh.

10.b St Marks path - CEC update (to discuss)

- See also convenor's report.
- Cllr Caldwell: CEC full council had mandated a full report on the bridge's status by December 2026. The Greens added and amendment that total replacement must be considered in the city mobility plan. There is only anecdotal evidence, not hard data, on the bridge's use. I will keep on investigating funding options.
- M Birch/Cllr Caldwell: interim options have been suggested to reopen the bridge, but it may need full replacement. There has not yet been a response to LCCC's request for a CEC official to give a detailed update.
- An attendee: the bridge was last inspected in 2014, and had cracks then, but CEC took no action and has not collected evidence on the bridge's importance. Nor has CEC set up a diversion, or to engage with Powderhall residents.
- R Price: it seems that CEC is kicking this problem into the long grass.
  - *Action: M Birch to ask for a CEC official to give NTBCC a detailed update*. (The compromise would be for NTBCC to attend LCCC's detail report, if that happens.)
- Another attendee: Powderhall owners would appreciate sight of relevant correspondence, and is unhappy with CEC's lack of communication with affected residents.
- *Action: Cllr Caldwell to undertake liaisons with Powderhall residents and others, and to feed back the communications issues*.

10.c Impact of the Princes Street fire and public transport disruption (to discuss)

- This has been taken into the Princes St/Waverley Valley discussions – see planning items above

10.d Communal bin review (to discuss)

See also convenor's report and summary of key issues raised during communal bin review walkabout.

- Stage 1 TROs have now been issued, which is surprising. CCs ae statutory consultees for this stage of the TRO process, but it's possible that the plans will not be changed now that the TRO process has been started. CEC officials seemed to accept that some of NTBCC's points will lead to definite improvements but may push back on others.
  - Cllr Mowat: NTBCC should submit its concerns anyway.
  - *Action: M Birch to do this, and share with its ward councillors*.
- Today's meeting about gull-proof bags showed that engagement on this is much better. CEC is due to receive the green GPBs in late September, so comms should start in early October, then issue the GPBs to relevant streets in November. (This does not apply to streets which have hybrid arrangements.)

10.e St Andrews Square and Picardy Place

See convenor's report and NTBCC feedback on St Andrews Square.

DRAFT

- Future maintenance of Picardy Place may depend on Essential Edinburgh expanding its membership, despite CEC parks being supposed to undertake this. Grass is hard to maintain, so more diverse approaches are needed.

11 Engagement and communications matters

No discussion

12 Councillors' reports

No discussion

13 Open forum (for residents to raise any concerns)

No discussion

14 AOCB

No discussion

DRAFT