

# **MINUTES**

# MONDAY 27 March 2017 LEITH COMMUNITY CENTRE (NEW KIRKGATE)

**Community Councillors present:** Angus Hardie, David Igoe, Andrew Mackenzie, Sally Millar (Secretary), Chrissie Reid, Jacqueline Rogers, Jim Scanlon (Chair), John Tibbitt (Vice-Chair).

Elected representatives: Councillor Chas Booth, Councillor Adam McVey.

In attendance: Adrian Graham, Walter Manclark, PC Paul McNiven, PC Kennedy.

Minute Taker: Kay Goodall.

**1. Welcome:** Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received from Ben Macpherson MSP, Deirdre Brock MP, Councillor Gordon Munro, Eileen Simpson, Michael Traill.

# 2. Police Report & Questions

# London Attack

PC McNiven read out a statement from Chief Constable Phil Gormley regarding the tragic events in London on 22 March. There is no intelligence regarding a threat in Scotland, but the UK threat level remains at Severe ("alert but not alarmed"). There are increased police patrols in Leith (as elsewhere) for reassurance and community engagement. If anyone witnesses or becomes a victim of a hate crime, they should contact Police Scotland on 999 in emergency, or 101, or Crimestoppers on 0800 555 111.

# Police Scotland 2026 Consultation

PC McNiven spoke briefly about the Police Scotland 2026 Consultation on planning policing for the next 10 years. He handed out leaflets and a weblink to the online consultation process. <a href="https://consult.scotland.police.uk/consultation/2026/">https://consult.scotland.police.uk/consultation/2026/</a> Sally reminded the meeting and the Police Officers that Michael has organised an event for all the Community Councils on Monday 3 April, which senior police will be attending (see topic 4 below). PC McNiven confirmed that there will also be other meetings about the Consultation.

#### Monthly statistics

Michael had asked if the local team could clarify whether not-protectively-marked statistics could be made available in a written form to LLCC. PC McNiven confirmed that they can, submitted a paper for February, and added that these will be made available from now onwards.

# Policing focus during February

Local officers have received training on speed detection equipment and are currently concentrating on 20mph zones around local schools - still very much in the educational stage, pulling motorists over and explaining the new changes and the risks to pedestrians, rather than fining everyone. However, if a driver is caught exceeding a speed that would attract at a ticket in a 30mph zone, they will receive a speeding ticket. Local officers recently used speed-guns in Claremont Park mid-morning and afternoon when schools come out: the highest speed recorded was 31mph.

#### Anti-social driving

Local officers have carried out over 40 hours of static patrols in both marked and unmarked vehicles. Hi-viz patrols do deter anti-social driving. This is a joint operation with Roads Policing, working with the Road Safety Team and Transport officials. There is no one single solution. Numerous vehicle defect notices have been issued. Patrols targeted at "boy racers" at Ocean Terminal have issued ASBOs.

## Parking around local primary schools

Local officers are working with their partner agencies such as Parking Enforcement at the City Council to tackle this ongoing problem.

# **Prostitution**

Local officers continue to patrol, both in uniform and plain clothes, particularly on the backshift (4pm-2am) and at weekends), often deploying two officers in an unmarked car, with a marked car as back-up, targeting customers.



# February statistics

PC McNiven gave a summary of statistics for February for the whole Leith Ward:

Housebreakings 11 (6 dwellings; 2 non-dwellings; 3 other premises)

Assaults 43 (36 common assaults; 1 emergency worker assault; 3 serious assaults, 3

robbery and assault)

Road Safety 16 (2 drink driving; 5 driving without a licence; 9 driving without insurance)

Theft (20 common theft; 28 shoplifting; 43 opening lockfast places; 10 thefts of

motor vehicles; 7 thefts from insecure motor vehicles; 3 attempted thefts from

motor vehicles)

Hate Crime 3 racially aggravated conduct

# Action update from previous meeting

The abandoned vehicle in the rear car park of Gordon St was investigated. No owner was traced and it has now been uplifted. Sally thanked Walter for reporting this. Police were thanked for their action. PC McNiven concluded that on the whole, local officers are keeping on top of tasks. Those wishing to contact the local community team should email Leith CPT <a href="mailto:edinburghleithcpt@scotland.pnn.police.uk">edinburghleithcpt@scotland.pnn.police.uk</a>: it is better not to email individual officers directly as they may be off duty or absent. Or phone 101.

#### Reporting problems

Chair observed that he had received a couple of emails from local residents to say that they have been phoning 101 to report prostitution incidents but not have not been offered incident numbers, nor been asked for descriptions of perpetrators. Residents feel that their calls are not being recorded/followed up.

# ACTION: PC McNiven will feed this back to the sergeant, to notify the call centres. PC McNiven will also make PC Margo Darling aware, as she is the officer tasked with tackling this.

Andrew commented that the Croft is festooned with condom packets and used condoms: the frequency and quantity suggest the area is used for prostitution. PC McNiven encouraged people to report this via the Leith CPT mailbox.

Chair noted that the Salvation Army van is now circling the Links again, PC McNiven confirmed that PC Darling is aware of this.

Andrew noted an increase in vans and camper vans parked alongside the Links and the suspicion of locals that people are living in them. PC McNiven said it is not unlawful to do this unless it is in a designated area, or is a safety or anti-social behaviour matter, or if the vehicle is not taxed or MOT'd. Chair asked whether emptying a bucket of waste out on the Links (which has been seen) could amount to an unlawful activity and PC McNiven confirmed that it could.

# 3. Adoption of Minutes of previous meeting (27/02/17) and Matters Arising

Adoption of the Minutes of the previous meeting was proposed John Tibbitt and seconded by Andrew Mackenzie. These are available at <a href="http://www.leithlinkscc.org.uk/">http://www.leithlinkscc.org.uk/</a>

# Outstanding actions

Automatic alerts on LLCC social media for times of the police open surgeries: It was not known whether this has been set up yet.

Anti-social behaviour around Leith Links: PC Spence has been focusing on this.

**Removal** / replacement of litter bins around the Links: Sally and Councillors Booth & Munro have all raised this with the Council. Sally reported that the latest news is that the Taskforce Manager is on the case and both bins will be replaced 'as soon as possible'. Contact details for this type of problem are <a href="mailto:waste@edinburgh.gov.uk">waste@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>

This stimulated discussion of other 'bin-related issues'. Walter noted that communal bins are often not being emptied in his block because it is not possible to get a refuse truck down the vennel if a car is parked there. If residents instead move the bins out for collection, people then dump rubbish in the bin rooms. A rat has been seen in one of the bin rooms. People also take drugs in there as the rooms are often left unlocked (not least by council staff). Some of the small bins have not been emptied in several years, so residents have to do this, because those bins are inaccessible to the refuse truck.

# ACTION: Councillors Booth & McVey will take this up with the Waste Officer.

Councillor McVey warned that there is a risk that the small bins may just be removed if there is no adequate access. Adrian noted that there is a similar problem at the back of Elbe Street where there are two vennels where bins have to be dragged out. Adrian added that he had reported this and that the work had been done that same day. He feels these problems have got worse since the Waste Transport Station was shut. Councillor McVey said that the problem is partly access, partly lack of imagination about how to keep access open on bin day, and partly Council reluctance to get tow



trucks out to move parked vehicles blocking access. If a truck cannot get access, the team will go back that day and the next day - 3 times in all. But if a parked vehicle is there for 48 hours (and it may not be parked illegally), that will be reported as a missed collection.

**Speeding on Claremont Park and possible need for zebra crossing:** Councillor Booth has raised this. He was told that the City Council is waiting to see what happens after the implementation of the 20mph. Hence, there will be no road safety assessment at the moment, but it may take place in the future if there is an ongoing problem.

**Pedestrian guardrail on Gladstone Place:** Councillor Booth has raised this but has received no response, despite having chased it up. He will do so again.

#### • Other Matters Arising

**Crops and Pots:** Adrian offered clarification on an issue reported in the previous Minutes. The Croft users actually have 5 hosepipes which can link and stretch to the far end, so people are actually not forced to fill containers and carry water across the site.

*Hustings for Leith Ward:* Chair announced that the Conservative Party has now come forward with a candidate, who will attend. Councillor Booth observed that the deadline for nominations is Wed 29 March.

**Seafield smell:** Sally observed that the Seafield sewage smell was noticeable that evening; it is more severe when there is good weather and no wind. She reminded people to phone and report this whenever it happens. Councillor Booth added that he had received an email about this that day.

Planning & Licencing Sub-Committee: Sally, Angus and Andrew had a meeting on 15 March, see below.

**Trees along Water of Leith:** Adrian noted that the Water of Leith is starting to get shorn of trees by certain developers and wished to raise this as a point for future consideration.

#### 4. Upcoming Events

# - Police Scotland 2026 Consultation

Michael has organised an event for all the Community Councils in Edinburgh, on Monday 3 April 2017 at the City Chambers. Senior officers are attending. David commented on the need for this briefing: from a layperson's point of view, he thought, the Police 2026 Strategy document is bulky and responding to the Consultation will be demanding - for a group, and even more so for an individual.

# - Leith Hustings

These are taking place on Wednesday 19 April at 6.30pm in Leith Community Centre. Sally sought views on how to encourage as many people as possible people along. LLCC is advertising on social media. Chair has put up posters on noticeboards on the Links. David suggested that details could be sent to all the local churches for their newsletters, which have quite a high readership and do advertise such events.

# ACTION: David will get the email addresses for all the churches, with a view to asking them all to include the item in their newsletters.

Angus asked if, as it is a multi-member ward, it is possible for there to be more than one candidate from each party. Councillor McVey answered that this has occurred in the past, but is not happening this time.

# - Leith Market Community Day

This is happening on Saturday 29 April. LLCC has a stall at this and needs volunteers to man the stall throughout the day. There will be various community events besides the market.

# - Leith Festival Gala Day

This will take place on Saturday 10 June and LLCC has a stall booked, shared with the other two Leith Community Councils. LLCC volunteers are needed to man the stall for 'shifts' throughout the day. Ideas for the stall are needed: last year there was a gazebo and table, but not much else, although Sally and Michael had produced leaflets and balloons. John suggested it was a chance for a consultation exercise on what local people think is most important. David observed that at a recent stall he was involved in, a wee bit of cake was offered to anyone who filled in the form. Chair suggested sticky notes on which people could write what they would like to see done on the Links. He added that Michael's online consultation about outdoor exercise equipment got the biggest response ever. Sally noted that LLCC now has big display boards which could be used as a wall for sticky notes for peoples views — Post-Its can sometimes be more attractive than filling in a form. Angus commented that it need not just cover parks & greenspace issues: it could be anything you love/that irritates you about the area. Chair added that safety at night was still a concern of this kind.



#### 5. Planning Sub-Committee Update

# Scottish Government Consultation on proposed changes to planning system

Sally is preparing the LLCC response to this, based on helpful information from Planning Democracy and the views of LLCC's own sub-committee (which met on 15 March) and work that Angus has been carrying out in this area through his own work. The plan is to keep the LLCC response fairly simple, making a couple of key points of our own and answering a few of the main consultation questions but not all of the technical questions. (The format of the consultation is very user-unfriendly.) Firstly, LLCC's priority is for local communities to have the right to a stronger voice in planning and development, at all stages, i.e. including local Place Plan building, pre-application consultation, application, and appeal stages. Community Councils have an important role to play in this, and should be statutory consultee for all major development proposals. LLCC supports Equal Right of Appeal (ERA). As Angus explained at the previous meeting, currently developers have the right to appeal but communities do not. Scottish Government seems have ruled Equal Right of Appeal out *before* the consultation, which is extraordinary. Angus had raised a Freedom of Information request to ask to see Scottish Government's evidence against ERA, but the response was that because of special circumstances it will not be sent until 12 April, too late for putting into a consultation response.

Secondly, LLCC does not necessarily accept that the first / main/ only purpose of planning is to facilitate development (often it seems, at any cost to the local community and regardless of (lack of) infrastructure issues) in the name of 'economic growth'. While we, of course, recognize the need for new development, houses, and economic growth, we think that planning should be about improving quality of life for the average person / the majority of ordinary people in the local community and do not accept that 'the market' alone should shape regulation.

Chair expressed dissatisfaction with the Section 75 provision (whereby the developer must make a financial contribution to infrastructure). He noted that in practice developers can go back and negotiate not paying this if development profitability is threatened e.g. if the work is taking longer than projected. Yet the City Council cannot afford to provide the necessary extra infrastructure without this financial support. However the current consultation is about the Scottish Planning system, not just about the City of Edinburgh process. LLCC view is that the planning system (often described as 'broken') needs to be more radically overhauled than the current review & consultation propose. Council planning services need to be better led and better resourced, as they have been cut back stringently and currently only seem to provide a reactive and ineffective service.

One proposal in the consultation, that could strengthen Planning resources, is charging developers more for applications, but that could be dangerous, as developers might then demand better service (i.e. to get their own way) whereas planning services should be for all i.e. for the community as well as for developers. Councillor McVey commented that the cap in Scotland on planning application costs is embarrassingly low (compared to England for example): there should be a more tiered system. Angus asked why this needs to be decided at national level. Councillor McVey in response gave the example of the Canonmills project, where every member of the City Council planning committee rejected the application, yet this was overturned by the Reporter (in other word, local decisions are already dealt with nationally) The Reporter's job is a "reasonableness" one: was the decision founded in policy? (Not on 'Is this a good or bad development?') and the Reporter can also award costs for or against the developer or Council. Some of this is administered by national guidelines and so the City Council cannot set new tiers, even though Edinburgh is very different from the rest of country. Sally commented that a number of the proposals in the consultation seem to be to 'streamline' by taking decisions up to national or regional level, rather than down to local government or community level although Scottish Government claims that it wants to empower and involve communities more.

# Local planning issues; Licensing issues; HMO issues

Chair receives the licensing and planning applications information, and Michael passes these on via the weekly Bulletin. Chair said that he had not seen anything proposed for the ward in the last month that looks concerning. Sally mentioned a recent revival of rumblings (e.g. by Leith Links Residents Association) about HMOs, and the concern that Leith Links is once more being used as a 'dumping ground', with a disproportionately large number of homeless accommodation properties in use here. Chair observed that Abbots House was run as a hotel before (with shockingly bad reviews on Trip Advisor) but is now categorized as an HMO and used as homeless accommodation.

David noted that some premises are known as cannabis suppliers. Chair added that he personally has seen anti-social behaviour taking place outside local addresses. Chair noted that homeless



accommodation is needed, but a key question is whether the residents are getting adequate support, if such accommodation is badly managed. Adrian commented on the very poor quality of much of such accommodation, on poor management, and on the number of recent deaths at the Abbots House, which does not indicate good support.

Sally commented that as these particular premises already have their HMO licences, it is too late to object, but if problems are reported to the police, that can affect whether or not their HMO licence gets renewed (and, Councillor McVey pointed out, whether they are kept on the Council's approved framework for homeless referrals). If nobody reports incidents to the police, chances are that complaints will be ineffective.

At our request, Councillor Munro had contacted City Council officials to ask how many HMOs used as homeless accommodation there were in the ward. Council had previously agreed to use no more than 8 B&B properties in any single ward. There are 28 altogether on 'the framework' (Council register of approved properties), but the City Council currently makes referrals to only 7 in this Ward (plus one more awaiting its HMO licence), amounting to 90 beds available within the ward. However there was a qualification that Council sometimes uses 'non-contracted' B&Bs for emergency placements. Chair and Adrian said they could think of many more than 7, used locally, off the top of their heads. Adrian asked whether Links Apartments, Poplar Lane and Abbot's House are all classed as one unit. Sally commented that the number of properties doesn't tell much about the size of the problem. For example, Abbots House is only '1 property' but has a licence for 45 residents, which makes it a huge facility. Andrew emphasised that the real concern is not just the number of properties but the number of beds, as well as the quality of management.

Chair observed that several other places locally also had the potential to be used in future. It was unclear what was planned for some premises, e.g. new development in Constitution Street, all properties owned by the same person/company. Councillor Munro's research had not showed any activity there for the moment, re homeless accommodation, but it is one to watch.

Andrew enquired about the work done by Turning Point. Chair explained that Turning Point is a support organisation for people in recovery. NHS staff are also present there for people with serious addiction needing additional support, or rehab. Referral is by GP and the waiting list is quite short. Adrian added that they can help with housing and other problems, and the service is excellent.

Councillor McVey said that the City Council has determined that use of B&Bs and hostels is not acceptable for homelessness. Chair asked about the cost of purpose-built new buildings: would it be affordable? Councillor McVey responded that the proposal has been approved and the City Council has identified a suitable site; Phase 1 of changes coming in (for families who are homeless) will in the long-term lead to better outcomes and be more efficient. However, meanwhile people are perceiving an increase not a reduction, in places for single men, locally. Councillor McVey confirmed that the owners of these premises are paid around £50/pp/per night. Angus asked whether the City Council reacts to each individual application, or whether it has limits on density across an area? Councillor McVey explained that a premises has to be approved by the Council in order to go 'on the framework'. One hotel lost the contract and had to re-tender. If it is not on the framework it can't offer homeless accommodation. Angus asked whether this could operate as a method of control and Councillor McVey agreed that it could.

Councillor McVey commented further that the Framework's minimum standard is a very high bar to get over. Complaints should be made to the City Council as service provider: the service will be taken into account in the next tendering exercise. The team is quite proactive at investigating if complaints are made. Adrian commented that not all homeless premises are bad: some are excellent.

Councillor McVey suggested inviting someone from the City Council, probably a member of the Homeless Team, to come and talk about how the whole process operates, at the next meeting. i.e. an overview of policy and procedures generally, and for Leith Ward / Leith Links specifically: how they allocate places, service standards, responses to complaints etc.. (Councillor Munro had also suggested this, as it would also serve to show Council that the community is keeping an eye on number of placements in its area.)

# ACTION: Councillor McVey will get back to Chair about arranging this.

It will be a normal LLCC meeting but residents who have expressed a particular interest could be alerted and might attend (e.g. Leith Links Residents Association).



# 6. Community Links Fund Update Voting event 11.3.17

Chair offered thanks and congratulations to all round the table for a very successful day, especially to Michael and Sally as the main organisers and to all those who had volunteered on the day. There had been a very good turnout and all went well.

#### **Results & Awards**

Online voting went smoothly, the votes have now all been counted, winners notified and award cheques have been handed over to all successful projects. Next steps are evaluation and reporting to Scottish Government.

# **Discussion on Learning Points (and planning for next time?)**

The time scale of the process had been very tight which meant that decisions on the structure and rules of the project had had to be taken very quickly. Maybe things had been missed, but it was a learning experience. Scottish Government had intended the whole initiative as a kind of pilot, and LLCC's experience (including mistakes) will be instructive for LLCC in the future and potentially to others. Learning/Discussion Points included the following: It is important to cover all eventualities in 'the 'Rules' from the start. For instance, what should happen if an applicant does not turn up? This time, three applicants did not take up their table at the Social Voting (and one of them still won an award). Chair suggested that, given that most of the applications are made by teams, LLCC might require at least one individual to turn up on the day to represent the bid, and if they don't, then the application could be removed from the process. Sally suggested that maybe it was not ideal to allow people to apply to both the small and the big fund. There could have been an equal-sized fund for small unconstituted groups so that they are not directly competing against big constituted groups. David also suggested that the rules be amended so that organisations that already receive majority of funding from central or local government are excluded. Adrian commented that on the day, everything worked really well. He suggested weighting the votes of those who attend so that they count for more than those online.

Angus commented that there was great value in people meeting each other face to face, in many cases for the first time. Electronic voting has its own value, but the social capital generated by the event was the most valuable. Sally pointed out that in future there could be choices made and a decision to change things- online voting need not necessarily be repeated, in future.

192 people voted on the day and there were 728 online votes (920 in all). Chrissie asked if there was any double voting (in-person and online). Sally explained that Michael had taken any doubles out. The votes had to be scrutinized 'manually'. Numerous online votes had had to be dis-allowed: in spite of a map at the start of the process, clearly defining the area, people had voted whose address was outside Leith Links area. It's impossible to say whether these were attempts at 'cheating' or merely people mistakenly thinking they did live in the area. Leith Links is perhaps too small for this kind of operation; people identify with 'Leith' as a whole, but seemingly don't have a sense of whether or not they are within Leith Links.

Chair thanked Sally and Michael for the immense amount of work they had put in under huge pressure of time - the process would never have happened without them. It had been a magnificent endeavour from the moment of being awarded the grant, to delivery. If LLCC had had a full year to organise, it would have even better. David added that next time, the whole team will be able to help. Sally said she did not know if it will happen again. Scottish Government have indicated an intention for money to be available, but it remains to be seen if that happens, also what the terms are, for a future round. If it does recur, LLCC will have to act quickly to decide whether or not to apply, and what kind of project to propose. Rather than just 'tweaking' the existing model, LLCC could apply in future to run one of various completely different models of PB. For example a Youth Bank, i.e. funding and supporting Leith Academy (and other schools?) Pupil Council to run their own 'internal' participative budgetary exercise for projects to benefit school children (instead of schools competing with outside groups). Or, Michael had suggested, LLCC could get the community to vote for priority 'themes', and then just focus on one particular theme for projects e.g. health and wellbeing or whatever theme received the most votes. LLCC can also get new ideas and learn from other projects around Scotland. Scottish Government might choose to award funds to applicants with a successful 'track record' (which might include LLCC) or might choose to award the money to new and different applicants second time round.

Sally added that whatever happened about 'next time', LLCC should work to maintain and develop the social capital generated by this project. John observed that people were making contact and sparking



ideas: it would be good to put a mechanism in place to sustain that sort of exchange, whether or not there is another cycle. One project applicant had suggested a social event for project applicants to get together and speak to each other (as their whole time on the Voting Day had been taken up with speaking to the public). Angus added that there was so much energy at the Social Voting Event Day that LLCC could have captured it for another purpose unrelated to participatory budgeting. Sally responded that LLCC has collected a lot of email addresses as a result of the voting process, therefore a means of keeping in contact with people.

# Mopping up, Evaluation, Reporting

Walter felt that the day had gone very well overall but noted some feedback from local residents on voting: elderly tenants were slightly penalised as many do not have computers and had struggled to access the online voting because they didn't have email addresses. Sally agreed that this was an issue. Adrian commented that when Leith £ecides tried to deal with this, their aim had been to generate an automatic email address for those without - but this had failed.

John asked if there had been a comparison between in-person and online voting patterns: were there biases? Was it significantly different? Sally was not able to report an accurate evidence-based analysis at this point. But anecdotally, there was no significant difference. In the online voting, people could have voted for just one or two projects, but in fact almost everybody did vote for both categories, and for four projects in each category. This can be taken as community 'buy-in' to the model of fund allocation, as opposed to just 'crowd-sourcing' votes for one or other 'pet' project. The Final Report to Scottish Government, currently in preparation, will contain as much evaluation evidence as we can amass.

David asked how much the project had cost LLCC. It cost nothing as it was entirely covered by the Scottish Government grant, even coming in slightly under budget as LLCC had been very frugal with admin. Equipment bought for this project, such as pull-up banners and display boards, will be useful for future events. LLCC had paid the various venues used, either as cash payment or as a donation (e.g. flipcharts to the Community Centre). The last remaining funds will cover putting out one more leaflet, to report the results of the voting to all local residents, and an 'ad' in the Forth Advertiser. Adrian suggested using any remaining funds for posters for Leith Gala Day about who won.

#### 7. Open Forum

**Social media:** David asked who was Admin on the LLCC social media accounts and wished to have it noted that although the Twitter feed is usually very dynamic and appropriate, he felt that one particular tweet recently was out of character. It was a negative remark about a specific politician, probably sent in good faith to 'chivvy along' our elected representatives, but he felt that such tweets should be avoided by the Community Council.

Chair explained the over all position currently, i.e. who the Admins and Editors are on the website and social media accounts. New people would be welcome to get involved and to be added as Editors and/or Admins. Michael has stated that he would like someone else to take over the weekly bulletin (emailed), from May. Sally suggested the possible creation of a Communications Sub-Committee, to enable sharing the workload but, importantly, making sure we have a coherent and consistent approach. Adrian commented that Leith Central has one, which meets virtually. Chair commented that Michael has set up a set of tags for website articles, with specific tags for particular topics, so there would be a learning curve for anyone taking on more involvement with the website, to keep this system straight. John, David and Andrew expressed a possible interest in getting involved but didn't think they currently had access to the information that makes up the Bulletin, for example – where does the information come from?

ACTION: John, David, Andrew and Michael will aim to get together with Michael to explore what would be involved in handing over / taking on the Weekly Bulletin (and maybe more aspects of communications / social media). Decision on Communication Sub-Committee deferred for the moment.

**Outdoor gym:** Sally, on behalf of Michael, asked whether the Parks & Greenspace Sub-Committee will be taking the outdoor gym plan forward. Michael has been looking into this for some time and is keen to develop the idea as soon as possible. Jacqueline noted the positive response on the Facebook poll but felt that was not enough to establish this as the first priority (other polls on other suggested ideas might also poll very highly). People may have other desires e.g. a bigger playpark, basketball, skateboard facilities and so on. Adrian pointed out that Transgression has come back to Ocean Terminal and that there is a new skateboard park near the Chancelot Mill. Meanwhile LLCC also needs information on how existing outdoor gyms are being set up and used.



ACTION: this will be discussed at the next Parks and Green Spaces Committee meeting – date to be set asap.

**Future Events:** Adrian mentioned the showing of "I Love Daniel Blake" at Leith Community Cinema, and the forthcoming fundraiser for the Citadel at the Voodoo Rooms on Thursday 20 April from 7.30, with Boots For Dancing, among other bands. Sally mentioned the annual Leith Links Residents Association Quiz which will take place on Friday 26 May.

Chair thanked all attendees. Meeting ended at 9pm.

\*\*\*

Date of Next Public Meeting: 24 April 2017, 7pm. Shore Room, Leith Community Centre, New Kirkgate