

**MINUTES – Meeting of the North Berwick Coastal Area Partnership,  
27<sup>th</sup> January, 2015 7-9pm at Hope Rooms North Berwick**

**Meeting Chaired by :**

Paolo Vestri, Service Manager Corporate Policy and Improvement (PV)

**Members (and substitute members) present**

Hilary Smith, North Berwick Community Council (HS)  
Rosanne Ainslie, Gullane Area Community Council (RA)  
Niall Bradley, Aberlady Primary School Parent Council (NB)  
Elma Danks, North Berwick Community Council (ED)  
Ian Donald, Association of East Lothian Day Centres (ID)  
JF, Gullane Primary School Parent Council (JF)  
Jeremy Findlay, Gullane Area Community Council (JFin)  
Linda Hall, North Berwick Community Council (LH)  
Lesley Kay, North Berwick Area Children and Youth Network (LK)  
Sheila Sinclair, North Berwick Community Council (SS)  
Ian Watson, North Berwick Area Children and Youth Network (IW)  
Cllr. Jim Goodfellow (JG)- part-attendance  
Liz Sandison, Lime Grove TRA (LS)

**Others in attendance**

Kaela Scott, Local Community Planning Officer, East Lothian Council (KS)  
Andy Stewart, Principal Planner Policy and Projects (AS)  
Jean Squires, Planner Policy and Projects (JS)  
Stephanie Carr, Assistant Local Community Planning Officer, East Lothian Council (SC)  
Sandra King, Community Learning and Development, East Lothian Council (SK)

Martin Hoyts- member of the public

Sheena Anthoney- member of the public

**Apologies received**

David Small, Chair, Director of Health and Social Care, East Lothian Council (DS)  
Cllr. Tim Day (TD)

Agenda Item	Key discussion points	Action
1. Welcome	PV welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were noted, including those from Chair DS.	
2. Approval of the minutes	Minutes were approved without amendment.	
3. Matters Arising	<p><b>a) Broadband Consultation</b></p> <p>KS highlighted the survey is now underway to help demonstrate that there is a need and demand for Superfast Broadband services from rural and remote communities across East Lothian.</p> <p>KS encouraged the AP, particularly in the relevant communities, to disseminate the information, distribute the posters and encourage people to complete the survey.</p> <p>The survey can be found on the East Lothian Consultation Hub- <a href="https://eastlothianconsultations.co.uk/policy-partnerships/community-broadband">https://eastlothianconsultations.co.uk/policy-partnerships/community-broadband</a> , closing 20<sup>th</sup> February 2015.</p> <p>There was a question raised over the meaning of ‘rural’ and how people would determine whether they are living in a ‘rural’ area or not. KS advised that people should follow the list of areas highlighted in the introduction to the survey and that, the survey requests the respondent to type in their postcode at the start of the survey. This information can be used to sort and filter responses.</p> <p><b>b) Any other matters arising</b></p> <p>No other matters arising.</p>	
4. MIR Consultation- Developing a ward-wide perspective	<p>AS explained the MIR as the first stage for ELC in developing a new Local Development Plan. He noted it as a research and consultation document, one that is essentially a precursor to the final plan. AS further noted the MIR consultation will be closing on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2015.</p> <p>Following Scottish Government approval of the South East Scotland Strategic Plan, East Lothian Council must meet the requirements that have been set-out in this higher-level document, including the delivery of land for 10 050 houses before the year 2024.</p> <p>AS emphasised the importance of obtaining AP views across a spectrum of issues covered by the MIR and opened up the meeting for a structured discussion around a number of key themes</p> <p>The following views from members of the AP are recorded below.</p>	

➤ **The preferred strategy and sustainable planning in relation to housing- compact versus dispersed**

There were mixed feelings weighing up the pros and cons of compact versus strategy-

- One perspective of AP members was that although they were happy to see most development in the west through adoption of the compact strategy, there was a level of concern about how people in these areas felt about that this concentration.
- Another view questioned the value of allocating houses in areas where there is not sufficient infrastructure for example, employment, transport etc- questioning whether dispersed is really a viable and realistic option.
- The ease and timing of travelling to Edinburgh on the current trains network was also questioned- and it was voiced that even adopting a compact strategy would not alleviate this problem.

AS acknowledged current challenges with rail-based transport but also emphasised bus-based networks need to be analysed and the concept of active travel is becoming a more realistic option.

AS also explained that following a high-level rail utilisation assessment, there could be scope and potential capacity for another local service on the East Coast Mainline.

- The AP demonstrated concern on road capacity with particular reference made to Old Craighall. There was a general view, that whether the dispersed or compact strategy is adopted, the amount of traffic currently is, and will continue to highly congested. Improvements, and/or new design considerations will be required here.
- It was noted that Gullane Area and North Berwick Community Councils are supportive of the compact strategy.
- A further point related to county cohesiveness, and there was concern of magnifying the 'East-West split' that already exists to some extent at present. The importance of achieving a 'balance' in development was noted, with concern over high concentration of development in the West, and too much resource focus therefore in the west to the detriment of the east.
- The proposed Blindwells site seemed to gain general support and it was acknowledged this could be a valuable commercial opportunity in particular with potential to attract people

from Edinburgh.

- The AP agreed there must be sufficient infrastructure to aligned with the level of development- but there was a challenge acknowledged of what is needed first, likening it to the 'chicken and egg' reference.
- There was general support from the AP for a compact strategy, however this was not unanimous

➤ **Proposed local sites**

Gullane

- There was a level of acceptance for the need for development at Gullane – particularly in relation to the old Fires Service Training site - but emphasised that this must be mixed-use- private and affordable housing as well as employment land.
- There was also importance placed on the type of housing with an acknowledgement of a lack of 3 to 4 bedroom housing.
- In relation to the other preferred site, another concern was that development would encroach upon agricultural land and impact on protected species.
- Concerns were voiced over the impact of increased school capacities for Gullane Primary, and the ramifications this may have for general safety with a potential increase in the number of vehicles.

Aberlady

- There was a level of acknowledgement the proposed site situated at Aberlady would be unlikely to cause significant congestion problems, particularly as the school is within walking distance.

Dirleton

- There was a mixed response to this proposed site, with emphasis placed on the importance of avoiding traffic congestion and ensuring housing allocation did not occur too close to the castle.

Drem

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no support for development at Drem by AP and a suggested alternative site was made of East Fortune.</li> <li>• Community Councils also stated their position as against this proposed site.</li> </ul> <p>AS explained ways in which the AP concerns perhaps could be mitigated in regards to environmental constraints and implications for tourism and agriculture. AS also highlighted potential challenges to regenerating the site of East Fortune due to its listing as cultural heritage land and current existence of historically-listed buildings. AS explained however, that Historic Scotland could be potentially approached with this.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">➤ <b>Countryside Around Towns designations</b></p> <p>AS explained details of this new policy area and encouraged the AP to comments on its strengths and weaknesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AP agreed this was a good concept in principle and there needs to be this protection.</li> <li>• There were comments however that the current designation in NB was not in the right place- and suggested more protection needs to be further South towards Dirleton, then spreading East.</li> <li>• Emphasis was placed on preventing the merging of Blindwells into Prestonpans, Cockenzie and Port-Seton.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Developing our Area Plan</b></p>	<p><b>a) Confirmation of AP budgets</b></p> <p>KS confirmed that the December Council Meeting approved a devolved Area Partnership budget and £200,000 has been allocated to the NBC Area Partnership for the next financial year. Portions of this are ring-fenced around specific service areas – eg Transport . Landscape and Countryside while £ 50,000 is a more general allocation able to be used to deliver on priorities identified in the Area Plan.</p> <p>This link will take you to the Council Paper  <a href="http://www.eastlothian.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/16033/10_ar_ea_partnerships-devolved_budgets">http://www.eastlothian.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/16033/10_ar_ea_partnerships-devolved_budgets</a></p>	

	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>b) Appointment of Area Managers</b></p> <p>KS confirmed four Area Manager posts have been established by East Lothian Council and advertised internally, with applications closing on Friday 30<sup>th</sup> January. The Area Manager will work directly with the AP as well as carry out a liaison role between the AP and council service providers to promote the better co-ordination of service and deliver on priorities identified in the Area Plans. It is hoped that these posts will be in place before the Partnership meets again.</p> <p>The appointment of the Area Manager will further assist the AP in the transition to a community Chair and will be able to support the development of this role.</p>	
<p><b>6. AOCB</b></p>	<p>No other matters arising.</p>	
<p><b>7. Dates of next meetings</b></p>	<p><i>Core Dates (venues tbc).</i></p> <p><b>Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> March, 7-9pm- rescheduled as per earlier email to members</b></p> <p><i>Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> June, 7-9pm</i></p> <p><i>Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> September, 7-9pm</i></p> <p><i>Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> November, 7-9pm</i></p> <p>Members are urged to book these into their diaries to ensure their organisation is represented at these key business meetings.</p> <p>It was also noted that there may be a need for further meetings / sub-group meetings to address specific issues or further consultations and that these would be negotiated with members as and when required.</p>	<p>Please send any apologies to: <a href="mailto:nbc-ap@eastlothian.gov.uk">nbc-ap@eastlothian.gov.uk</a></p>

**Contact:** Kaela Scott, Local Community Planning Officer  
 Email: [nbc-ap@eastlothian.gov.uk](mailto:nbc-ap@eastlothian.gov.uk)  
 Phone: 01620 82782

