

# Minutes

## Cammo Estate Advisory Committee

Edinburgh 6 April 2016

### Present:-

**Representing the National Trust for Scotland** – David Chamberlain (Convener) and Kingsley Bruce.

**Representing the City of Edinburgh Council** – Councillor Norman Work.

**In Attendance:-** Peter Scott (Cramond and Barnton Community Council), Nick Bengé and Simon Gillam (Friends of Cammo), Lesley Price (Estates Manager), Susan Dickson (Senior Natural Heritage Officer) and David Kyles (Natural Heritage Officer), (Services from Communities) and Blair Ritchie (Committee Services).

**Apologies:-** Councillor Keil, Christopher Cassells, Margery Naylor, Lesley Price and Jenny Hargreaves.

## 1. Minute

---

1.1 Cammo Estate Advisory Committee of 16 December 2015

### Decision

To approve the minute as a correct record.

## 2. Matters Arising

---

### Item 4 - A Vision for Cammo

The Friends of Cammo had indicated to the Heritage Service that the Friends should be taken into account in the future Vision for the estate.

### Item 5 – Cammo Estate Management Plan

Progress was being made with the Local Reserve Designation (LNR). The consultation with the public was still to take place, notice of which would be circulated. It would now be possible to focus on the LNR declaration. The Council had to formally consult prior to declaring a site a Local Nature Reserve. It was hoped to achieve Local Nature Reserve status for Cammo Estate in the near future. The public consultation had to be held for a minimum of 3 weeks.

### **Item 9 – Walls Condition Survey**

The pineapple structures had been repaired. The walls condition survey had taken place and no further action was required at present.

#### **Decision**

The Walled Garden had been surveyed but no further work had been scheduled apart from the initial Heras fence erection across an 8m section on the south side.

### **3. Review of Service**

---

The Senior Natural Heritage Officer provided an update on the review of the Natural Heritage Service. She gave an outline of the process and timescales for the review, the new structure and how it would affect the Heritage Service.

Discussion took place on the review and any possible implications.

#### **Decision**

To note that the Advisory Committee valued the work provided by the Natural Heritage Service.

### **4. Cammo Home Farm**

---

The Advisory Committee had previously considered, amongst other matters, the sale of the Home Farm and consideration of this by the Finance and Resources Committee.

Details were provided of progress in the sale of the Home Farm and the need to consult the National Trust. It was also necessary for planning permission to be granted for the proposals.

Discussion took place about the impact of any building work on the surrounding area, the need for proper fencing around the building site, the conservation agreement and the need to maintain the character of the area, and the role of the Advisory Committee.

#### **Decision**

The National Trust to check the height and type of fence that would be erected in the event of building works taking place.

(Reference – Cammo Estate Advisory Committee 16 December 2015 (item 3)).

### **5. Cammo Estate Management Plan**

---

The Senior Natural Heritage Officer gave an update on the Cammo Estate Management Plan.

She indicated that this was related to the proposed sale of the Home Farm as some of the funds from the sale would be used to assist in the implementation of the Management Plan. Additionally, some of the money would be “seed funding” and a

portion of it would be spent on upgrading the facilities within the Cammo Estate. Seed funding was an amount of funding that was available to begin the process of applying for more. Certain grant applications required an amount of funding to be contributed rather than the whole amount being provided by the funder. HLF required seed money for the application to be successful.

Discussion took place and it was suggested that the allocation of the funding on upgrading facilities was dependent upon various factors. It had to be determined if the HLF bid was going to proceed and what would be the impact of the review of the Heritage Service

The Natural Heritage Officer circulated copies of the Work Plan and referred to aspects of the Plan such as the treatment of the flowered leek invasion at the North Gate, the replacement of the failed Plum Yew and work on paths throughout the estate, which accounted for a large portion of the funding.

Discussion took place and the following points were raised:

- Work had been carried out along the golf course.
- There had been greater expenditure than in the previous financial year.
- The Work Plan would be updated.
- Some of the proposed work in the first five years had not been carried out as the Home Farm had not been sold.
- The Heritage Service had performed well, considering the resources available.
- The previous indicative costings on spending were realistic as they had been based on the proposed sale of the Home Farm.
- The Water Tower might be part of the HLF bid.
- It had to be ensured that any funding received was used carefully.
- If the HLF bid did not proceed, then the funding might be used for the Management Plan.
- It should be established if the Estate would continue to be funded in the same way from the Council, or would some of the receipt from the sale of the Home Farm be used.
- The funding allocated to the Estate should not be used for maintenance.
- The figure given for the total spend for 2015/16 for the Work Plan was a reasonable amount.
- The funding from Off-Road Cycling might have to be allocated differently in the future.
- Part of the role of the Heritage Service was to access funding.
- There might be constraints on the capital sum, when it was allocated.
- There were concerns that some of the capital sum might be spent on the consultation for HLF status.
- It was necessary to carry over items from the last five years, which had not been achieved, but it was hoped that their prescriptions were quite valid.

## **Decision**

The Senior Natural Heritage Officer to send the Management Plan to Committee Services to be forwarded to the Advisory Committee for their comments.

## **6. Interpretation of the Estate**

---

At the previous meeting, it had been agreed to set up a working group to develop Interpretation on the estate, to be chaired by the representative of the Barnton and Cramond Community Council.

The representative of the Barnton and Cramond Community Council indicated that he had held a useful meeting with the Heritage Service and the Friends of Cammo to discuss interpretation. It was thought that in the longer term, there might be HLF funding for more substantial interpretation. In the short term, there would be an interpretation board providing a history of Cammo House, along with its immediate grounds consisting of the curling pond (or canal), tended lawns, vistas (or views) and possibly the Pinetum (a collection of specimen coniferous trees).

Discussion took place regarding the attendance of the National Trust at the next meeting of the Working Group, the possible placing of interpretation on the new walkway, the cost of the interpretation boards and the provision of fencing and signage around the perimeter.

## **Decision**

- 1) To note that the Advisory Committee endorsed the new signage.
- 2) The representative of the Barnton and Cramond Community Council to contact the National Trust to provide details of the next meeting of the Working Group and a member of the Trust to attend the meeting.

(Reference – Cammo Estate Advisory Committee 16 December 2015 (item 6).

## **7. Work of Friends of Cammo**

---

The representative of the Friends of Cammo informed the Advisory Committee of the work which was being carried out on the estate. This included moving plumb trees and plants, work on the hedgerow and wildflowers, mulching of trees and litter picking. They had also made a bid for post code lottery funding, to clean the canal.

It was also reported that one of their members had spent an entire day cleaning the lodge and had improved the lighting.

Discussion took place and the following points were made:

- Permission should be sought to clean the canal and to find a nearby location to dispose of the silage, to avoid excessive cost.

- If the HLF bid was successful, it would be possible to deliver the Friends' vision for Cammo. The timing for the bid by the Friends of Cammo was important.
- The National Trust had its own vision for Cammo and it would be necessary for the Trust to be clear in its role.
- The Vision for Cammo was presented at the previous meeting by the former Parks Development Manager, which might provided a good basis for the future of Cammo.
- The work of the voluntary bodies was crucial to the maintenance of the Estate, but they should be monitored to ensure that they worked effectively.

Regarding the volunteers on the canal project, there might be scope to clear the canal near the house to make into an amenity area. However, this would probably not take place until next winter.

### **Decision**

To note the ongoing work of the Friends of Cammo and to thank them for the work they carried out on the estate.

## **8. Nature Conservation**

---

The Natural Heritage Officer reported on nature conservation. He indicated that there had been monitoring of badger activity on other sites and there had been a considerable amount of this activity on the Estate.

Discussion took place on survey work on the field meadow grass, the possible benefits of a baseline invertebrate survey and lists of species. There was further discussion on the possible benefits of a "bio blitz" on the estate, which would involve up to sixty people and would take place over a 36 hour period.

### **Decision**

To note the ongoing work on nature conservation.

## **9. Date of Next Meeting**

---

Wednesday 3 August 2016 at 2.00 pm in the Cammo Lodge.