

Craightinny & Duddingston Neighbourhood Partnership

Tuesday 19 January 2016

PRESENT

Partnership Members

Cllr Alex Lunn	City of Edinburgh Council (Convener)
Cllr Stefan Tymkewycz	City of Edinburgh Council
Brenda Devlin	Voluntary Sector Representative

Supporting Officers

James Hunter	CEC - East Neighbourhood Manager
Mary Dunbar	CEC - Partnership & Information Manager
Ross Woodside	Edinburgh & Lothians Greenspace Trust (ELGT)

Apologies

Liz Ferguson	Voluntary Sector representative
Joan Griffiths	City Edinburgh Council
Neil Clyde	Police Scotland

1. Order of Business

- 1.1 Welcome – Cllr Alex Lunn, Convenor opened and welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Neighbourhood Partnership considered one additional tabled **Supplementary Community Grants Report**, which was ruled urgent by the Convener. It was agreed to consider this item as **5.1.1**. No other notices of motion or other items of business were submitted as urgent for consideration at the meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest

Brenda Devlin: NP Voluntary Sector Representative - Northfield Community Centre's 'Community Grant' application.

3. Deputations

None

4. Minute of Meeting held on 17 November 2015

- 4.1 Agreed as a correct record.

5. NP Business

5.1 Community Grants Report (circulated) – Agreed

5.1.1 Supplementary Community Grants Report - (tabled) - agreed

- Link-up Women's Support Centre - awarded £1418.

5.2 New Park for EH15 – The 'Three Draft Park Plans'

- Presentation by Ross Woodside, Project Programme Manager, Edinburgh & Lothians Greenspace Trust (ELGT). He outlined the 'three draft plans' which have been developed based on the consultation findings. He confirmed that the main theme for the three designs is a 'natural park'. Ross answered the questions raised (details outlined as appendix 1 at the end of the Minute), which will be included as part of ELGT's planned feedback to the NP, before it makes a final decision.

The next steps – The NP agreed that the three draft 'Park Design Plans' will be displayed in the local libraries, Northfield Community Centre and Restalrig Hub, as well as some other community centres during February 2016. In addition, there is an option to vote on-line at ELGT's website. All options allow local people to view the three draft plans, complete a voting form to identify their preferred design and to choose one of the two park name choices: 'St John's Park' (retain school history), or 'Trevelen Park' (the

original name for Duddingston, which means the settlement by the lake of reeds).

The NP will consider the final local preferences and make its final decision on the 'preferred design' for submission to Children and Families, at its meeting on 17 March 2016.

6. Date and themes for future Meetings

6.1 Date and time for the next Neighbourhood Partnership Board meetings:

- **Thursday 17 March 2016, at 6pm, in Parsons Green Primary School.**

QUESTIONS RE: PARK DESIGN PROPOSALS**Concept A**

- Is the lighting to the school only? - (Yes)
- Height of Scots Pine trees? - Up to 20m at maturity, 2.5m standard.
- Final school boundary line (waved line indicated in the plans)? – No impact on area of the park space. Full planning will be required for the park.
- Is a school garden proposed within the inside line of the school boundary? - (TBC)
- Who would maintain park grounds including the bin emptying? – City of Edinburgh Council.

Concept B

- Concept A has mainly evergreen trees, but does Plan B mainly include deciduous trees? – Yes.
- It's thought that there is a large amount of debris below the ground in the north-west corner. – It was identified that meadow areas can survive best in impoverished soil
- Is getting the site ready impacting on the budget for the park concept? - (Yes)
- Will the slope be problem for Hamilton Terrace/Gardens re: drainage water? - Some design elements can help shape where water could collect and proposed grassland and trees will help absorb water.
- Drainage: should this be included to protect the houses? - As above
- Growing space just looks too fancy, was it done for design purposes – Designed to be a growing space.

Concept C

- Why are there gaps in the boundary hedge? - Designed to help add perspective.
- Interactive play equipment: will this be for adults too? - Open to comments via the final stage of the consultation – indicative is for young people, but not just toddlers.
- Can the two proposed play areas at the perimeter be moved further into the park to reduce noise for neighbouring homes? – Possible yes, open for consultation views.
- Concrete/Skate, wheels area: Is this too close to houses and should/could it be placed further into the park? - Open to consultation for views.
- This is a duller design, why? - Budget limitations were considered and this design proposes more expensive features within it e.g. the larger concrete element.
- Has the 'light' impact on the park been considered e.g. open frontage versus trees and the potential to dominate and block light to houses and gardens? – Ross identified aspects and current light impact from current school buildings.

General

- Was the Police Liaison Officer consulted? – Yes.
- Will people be allowed skate through the park and will the path surfaces attract this? - Less likely with the bitmac/secondary surfacing types.
- If pupils walk to school through lane access at Hamilton Gardens it means the school streets would need to continue?
- View expressed that the new park and Figgate Park should be linked to minimise traffic from the Gardens.
- Is Aspen a native tree? - Yes
- Comment – sculpture play might be boring after a while.
- What is the planting distance between trees? - Approximately 5m for Pines.
- How will the community growing allotment be resourced/managed? - Potential for service such as Carr Gomm, or a Friends of Park group to get involved.