

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **1 A**

We want to connect our places, parks and green spaces together as part of a city-wide, regional, and national green network. We want new development to connect to, and deliver this network. Do you agree with this? - Select support / don't support

Short Response

Explanation Agree in principle. Not all proposals will be able to accommodate physical linkages. Should the Council seek to secure off-site improvement works, the LDP should set out in a clear manner how these are directly related to the proposed development.

Choice **1 B**

We want to change our policy to require all development (including change of use) to include green and blue infrastructure. Do you agree with this? - Support / Object

Short Response

Explanation It is difficult to comprehend how 'all development' can include green and blue infrastructure. Whilst the aspiration is laudable, a change of use, all in accordance with the Use Classes Order, for example changes of use from Classes 1 or 2 to Class 3 or from Class 5 to 6 (where development exceeds 235 sq m), will not necessitate the need for green or blue infrastructure, nor will the erection of a fence in a Conservation Area, where an Article 4 direction necessitates the need for an application for planning permission. In circumstances where building or engineering works are proposed, the nature and form of development will influence the extent to which green and blue infrastructure can be incorporated into the proposed development. A policy which supports the provision of blue and green infrastructure would be appropriate, with details of measures which can be taken to address the policy, set out in non statutory guidance. The policy should also acknowledge that in some circumstances, for example, a change of use, the need to provide green and blue infrastructure is not appropriate. The Council should not seek to secure contributions for off-site improvement works where the nature of development does not necessitate the provision of green or blue infrastructure.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **1 C**

We want to identify areas that can be used for future water management to enable adaptation to climate change. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Whilst the principle is supported, the Planning Authority must have due regard to the water environment within the Port of Leith and Forth Ports' as Statutory Harbour Authority. Forth Ports are happy to discuss any relevant matters further with the Council as it progresses with the preparation of the proposed Local Development Plan. Forth Ports Ltd own and operate the Port of Leith and a boundary of their operational estate will be issued to the Planning Authority to inform this submission. In addition, Forth Ports are the Statutory Harbour Authority and the Competent Harbour Authority for the Firth of Forth and perform a number of functions as prescribed by legislation (Forth Ports Authority Order Confirmation Act 1969) including overseeing of safety of navigation and licencing of all works below MHWS between the tidal limits inland and the mouth of the Firth. They operate the Forth and Tay Navigation Service which controls vessel movements on the Firths of Forth and Tay. In accordance with the Confirmation Act, Forth Ports also put in place bye-laws to protect the health, safety and security of both operators and members of the public within its operational estates. They also have a duty to ensure port facilities are securely protected in accordance with International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) code. With respect to the foregoing it is not appropriate for the Planning Authority to put in place policies and proposals which would impact on the water environment within the control of Forth Ports, could impact on their operations at the Port of Leith and their ability to fulfil their statutory obligations as Statutory Harbour Authority.

Choice **1 D**

We want to clearly set out under what circumstances the development of poor quality or underused open space will be considered acceptable. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice **1 E**

We want to introduce a new 'extra-large green space standard' which recognises that as we grow communities will need access to green spaces more than 5 hectares. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation This proposal is not supported. The requirement for access to greenspace of more than 5ha is prescriptive and does not take into account the location of new development which may constrain the ability to meet the requirement. This is particularly the case in relation to brownfield development sites, where it will not always be possible to provide a prescribed level of provision. A qualitative approach to green space provision is not recognised by the proposed policy approach. The existing Policy ENV20 provides the flexibility which enables greenspace provision to be tailor made to circumstances.

Choice **1 F**

We want to identify specific sites for new allotments and food growing, both as part of new development sites and within open space in the urban area. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation The proposal is not supported in its present form. Opportunities for community growing can be incorporated into new residential developments in a number of ways. A requirement for new allotments and food growing is prescriptive and the policy should allow for a flexible approach to provision.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice **1 F**

We want to identify specific sites for new allotments and food growing, both as part of new development sites and within open space in the urban area. Do you agree with this? - Upload (max size 3mb)

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **1 G**

We want to identify space for additional cemetery provision, including the potential for green and woodland burials. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **1 H**

We want to revise our existing policies and green space designations to ensure that new green spaces have long term maintenance and management arrangements in place. Do you agree with this? - Yes/No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **2 A**

We want all development (including change of use), through design and access statements, to demonstrate how their design will incorporate measures to tackle and adapt to climate change, their future adaptability and measures to address accessibility for people with varying needs, age and mobility issues as a key part of their layouts. - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation The proposal is not supported in its present form. Development must comply with current Building Standards and Regulations in relation to disabilities. With respect to Listed Buildings, it is not always possible to ensure compliance with standards which apply to new development. The proposal implies that all development must include a Design and Access Statement. Legislation identifies where Design Statements and Design and Access Statements must be provided and it is not appropriate to require all development to provide such Statements.

Choice **2 B**

We want to revise our policies on density to ensure that we make best use of the limited space in our city and that sites are not under-developed. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation The aspiration to ensure efficient use of land is supported. The requirement for higher density schemes must consider site specific characteristics, where appropriate, including: amenity and environmental considerations such as daylight, overshadowing, noise, air quality, wind canyons, ground conditions and topography; and infrastructure requirements including open space, drainage and access. Impact on natural and heritage designations as well as existing trees will also be a consideration. With regard to requiring a vertical mix of uses, this will be appropriate in some locations, although care needs to be taken on how this is implemented in detail given the possible tensions between business and residential uses in terms of amenity and building/fire regulations.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **2 C**

We want to revise our design and layout policies to achieve ensure their layouts deliver active travel and connectivity links. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **2 D**

We want all development, including student housing, to deliver quality open space and public realm, useable for a range of activities, including drying space, without losing densities. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **3 A**

We want all buildings and conversions to meet the zero carbon / platinum standards as set out in the current Scottish Building Regulations. Instead we could require new development to meet the bronze, silver or gold standard. Which standard should new development in Edinburgh meet? - Which standard?

Short Response

Explanation Compliance with Building Standards is supported. For a number of reasons the Council's preferred proposal should not be taken forward to the proposed Local Development Plan: The Scottish Government states that they, "create the building standards regulations and technical guidance, to ensure buildings are safe, efficient and sustainable" <https://www.gov.scot/policies/building-standards/>. It is not therefore for the Council through the LDP to dictate the standards which should apply to all new buildings and conversions. The Scottish Building Regulations are subject to revision and the Policy provides no baseline date upon which standards should be measured. The detail of the Platinum Standards is presently incomplete. The cost of implementing the zero carbon / platinum standards is likely to be significant and will have a negative impact on development viability. This will in turn, impact on the delivery of the strategy which the Local Development Plan puts in place. The remit of the Scottish Building Standards Agency addresses zero carbon/sustainability/renewable technologies at a national level and they are the appropriate authority through whom standards and requirements should be set. It is not for the Council through the LDP to set a target which is aspirational and is without justification.

Choice **4 A**

We want to work with local communities to prepare Place Briefs for areas and sites within City Plan 2030 highlighting the key elements of design, layout, and transport, education and healthcare infrastructure development should deliver. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation The principle is supported. Early engagement in the development process with local communities can enable new development to integrate into the established urban framework. In devising Place Briefs, a range of stakeholders including community groups, infrastructure providers and land owners/developers should be engaged. The aspirations which Place Briefs put in place should be realistic and achievable. They must recognise that delivery of any aspirations and proposals can be limited by: a land owner or developer's wish to take the form of development proposed in the Place Brief or LDP forward; and also constraints upon development which may not be known at the time of their preparation, e.g. ground conditions. The status of Place Briefs in determining applications must be made clear in Policy.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **4 B**

We want to support Local Place Plans being prepared by our communities. City Plan 2030 will set out how Local Place Plans can help us achieve great places and support community ambitions. - How should the Council work with local communities to prepare Local Place Plans?

Short Response

Explanation Support for Local Place Plans (LPP) is welcomed. LPPs were introduced by the T&CP(Sco) Act 2019 and will take time to develop and mature. Whilst there is now a planning purpose for the preparation of the National Planning Framework, Local Development Plans and Regional Spatial Strategies, which is “to manage the development and use of land in the long term public interest,” that planning purpose does not apply to LPPs. Any new Policy therefore needs to take great care in terms of the weight to be given to LPP.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 5 A

We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated and deliverable within the plan period. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Directing development to locations with existing infrastructure capacity is integral to the principles of sustainable development as set out in Scottish Planning Policy. Western HarbourForth Ports intimated to the Council in its letter of 18 March 2019 that it is committed to the residential led development of the land within their control at Western Harbour, as outlined in the Western Harbour Revised Design Framework (RDF) and approved by the Development Management Sub Committee in October 2018. The Council approved application ref: 19/00986/AMC for 938 new homes, 2,417 m2 of commercial floor space including provision of a health centre and associated infrastructure in September 2019 and development is expected to commence shortly. Capacity for a further 1,062 (rounded to 1,100) new homes has been identified on Forth Ports land holding at Western Harbour and which allows for land within 3rd party control to come forward at the scale identified in planning permission ref: 09/00165/OUT.A high level Transport Assessment has been prepared and demonstrates that the proposal can be accommodated.A copy of the letter and relevant attachments will be re-issued to the Council as part of this consultation response.Forth Ports intimated to the Council in its letter of 16 October 2019, that it Forth Ports will continue to utilise their land holdings at Britannia Quay and Land south of Edinburgh Dock for port operational use, including the handling of cargo related to the development of Western Harbour. Within the context of the ongoing port operational use, the land in the south of the port estate (Britannia Quay and land south of Edinburgh Dock) has potential to accommodate business and industrial and port related development, as well as facilities associated with the development of Western Harbour. Forth Ports however recognise that subject to market and operational requirements, potential could arise for alternative uses which may include residential led development, student housing, hotel and leisure use and some areas may become available for such uses. The preferred option (Choice 16) set out in the MIR continues to support the operational port estate for employment use and extends this designation to Britannia Quay, Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Seafield but recognising that there may be potential for mixed use development to take place in these locations. Forth Ports strongly welcome the preferred approach set out at Choice 16E and nothing in their response should be construed to indicate otherwise.Recognising that the Council wish to ensure all necessary infrastructure is planned for and supporting the 'infrastructure first' approach outlined in the Scottish Government's letter to the Council of 17 January 2020, which directed the Council not to adopt its supplementary guidance, Forth Ports consider it appropriate to advise the Council of what it considers to be the potential capacity for residential development as part of a mixed use development at Britannia Quay and Land South of Edinburgh Dock (including Prince of Wales Dock). Based on figures outlined in the proposed Local Development Plan (2015), Britannia Quay has the capacity to accommodate 1,340 new homes and based on Forth Ports' own site capacity assessment, Land South of Edinburgh Dock (including Prince of Wales Dock) has the capacity to accommodate just over 1,700 new homes and 5,440 sq m of commercial space. These figures are indicative only and are provided in good faith to assist the Council in planning for any potential infrastructure requirements. Unless advised otherwise the afore mentioned land will continue to be utilised for port and employment use in accordance with Policy Emp 8.Representation supported by the following which will be issued to the council via email to cityplan2030@edinburgh.gov.uk:Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from HolderPlanning 16 October 2019 regarding Port of Leith and Western

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Harbour which includes appendices of relevance to Questions 5A, 12A 16E Appendices to letter: • Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from Holder Planning 18 March 2019 regarding proposals for development at Western Harbour (Question 5A and 12A) • Briefing Note Forth Ports: Port Operations and Planning Policy Framework (Question 5A, 12A 16E) • Plan indicating areas of land which may become surplus to operational requirements (Question 5A and 16E) • Extracts from the Fife, Falkirk and Dundee Local Development Plans (Question 5A, 12A and 16E) • SWECO Western Harbour, Revised Design Framework – Transport Appraisal 2018 and supporting letter (Question 5A and 12A) • Western Harbour, Revised Design Framework (Question 5A and 12A) available at https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/Data/Development%20Management%20Sub-Committee/20181010/Agenda/item_72_-_western_harbour_revised_design_framework.pdf).

Choice **5 B**

We want City Plan 2030 to set out where new community facilities are needed, and that these must be well connected to active travel routes and in locations with high accessibility to good sustainable public transport services. Do you agree with this? - Yes / NO

Short Response

Explanation Forth Ports support the identification of locations of new infrastructure in sustainable locations. Active travel requirements should be considered in preparing the LDP to enable new development to accommodate the necessary provision from the outset and avoid a requirement to retrofit any requirement, for example shared foot and cycle paths which require to be of a defined width. Where developer contributions are required for off-site works, the extent of any developer contributions sought must comply with the tests set out at paragraph 14 of Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements (Circular 3/2012). In addition to the provision of active travel routes as the Council seeks to maximise the potential for development on brownfield land and work towards its ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030, the Local Development Plan and Mobility Plan must ensure that transport infrastructure is fit for purpose in the long-term.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice 5 C

We want to reflect the desire to co-locate our community services close to the communities they serve, supporting a high walk-in population and reducing the need to travel. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 5 D1

We want to set out in the plan where development will be expected to contribute toward new or expanded community infrastructure. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 5 D2

We want to use cumulative contribution zones to determine infrastructure actions, costs and delivery mechanisms. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice **5 E**

We want to stop using supplementary guidance and set out guidance for developer contributions within the plan, Action Programme and in non-statutory guidance. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation In taking forward this approach, it will be necessary to clearly link the provision set out in the LDP, Action Programme and non-statutory guidance. A requirement for developer contributions will need to be clearly evidenced. Action Programmes must be kept up to date, clearly identify the scope and cost of proposals and how and when actions will be delivered. Engagement with relevant stakeholders, including landowners should take place as part of the Action Programme's preparation and subsequent revision.

Choice **6 A**

We want to create a new policy that assesses development against its ability to meet our targets for public transport usage and walking and cycling. These targets will vary according to the current or planned public transport services and high-quality active travel routes. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **6 B**

We want to use Place Briefs to set the targets for trips by walking, cycling and public transport based on current and planned transit interventions. This will determine appropriate parking levels to support high use of public transport. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Choice 2 sets out the Council's support for 'Place Briefs' which are to be prepared in consultation with local communities. In devising Place Briefs, it is appropriate to engage with land owners and developers who will be instrumental in bringing forward development. Place Briefs should not be used as a tool to masterplan areas, setting out parking and active travel proposals which may not be achievable due to landowners' intentions and/or constraints as well as other site specific constraints. There is a danger that Place Briefs become overly prescriptive whilst not informed by the necessary and costly detailed site works.

Choice **7 A**

We want to determine parking levels in development based on targets for trips by walking, cycling and public transport. These targets could be set by area, development type, or both and will be supported by other measures to control on-street parking. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **7 B**

We want to protect against the development of additional car parking in the city centre to support the delivery of the Council's city centre transformation programme. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **7 C**

We want to update our parking policies to control demand and to support parking for bikes, those with disabilities and electric vehicles via charging infrastructure. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **7 D**

We want to support the city's park and ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new park and ride and extensions, including any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan. Do you agree with this? - We want to support the city's park and ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new park and ride and extensions, including any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice **8 A**

We want to update our policy on the Cycle and Footpath Network to provide criteria for identifying new routes. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Yes, however proposals should be costed in the Council's action programme and an evidence base for developer contributions will be required. Developer contributions sought towards provision of new links should be in accordance with the provisions of Circular 3/2012, Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements, paragraph 14. New development should contribute proportionately towards the relevant actions. Comment on Question 8B (there is no text to provide an explanation to comment beyond yes/no): Yes - Forth Ports support recognition that the proposed development should avoid Port operational land. The form of the proposed connection will require to take into account physical and amenity constraints. A plan of the operational port estate will be issued to the Planning Authority in support of this representation. The plan is also relevant to Map 1 – 'A connected green area' of the Choices 2030 document.

Choice **8 B**

As part of the City Centre Transformation and other Council and partner projects to improve strategic walking and cycling links around the city, we want to add the following routes (along with our existing safeguards) to our network as active travel proposals to ensure that they are delivered. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **8 C**

We want City Plan 2030 to safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites. We also want the City Plan 2030 to include any new strategic active travel links which may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or which are identified through this consultation. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Yes, however safeguarding and adding other strategic active travel links without consultation is not appropriate. It may not be possible to deliver the proposed linkages as identified due to site specific matters (ownership or physical constraints) and it is therefore necessary that the Council engages with the appropriate parties prior to setting out its specific proposals. A flexible policy is required to ensure that where possible identified opportunities for active travel links are provided.

Choice **8 C**

We want City Plan 2030 to safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites. We also want the City Plan 2030 to include any new strategic active travel links which may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or which are identified through this consultation. Do you agree with this? - Upload new cycle routes

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **9 A**

We want to consult on designating Edinburgh, or parts of Edinburgh, as a 'Short Term Let Control Area' where planning permission will always be required for the change of use of whole properties for short-term lets. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **9 B**

We want to create a new policy on the loss of homes to alternative uses. This new policy will be used when planning permission is required for a change of use of residential flats and houses to short-stay commercial visitor accommodation or other uses. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **10 A**

We want to revise our policy on purpose-built student housing. We want to ensure that student housing is delivered at the right scale and in the right locations, helps create sustainable communities and looks after student's wellbeing. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **10 B**

We want to create a new policy framework which sets out a requirement for housing on all sites over a certain size coming forward for development. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Whilst it is recognised that the Council wishes to maximise opportunities for residential development, the proposed policy does not take into account the nature of the development which is primarily sought, for example an employment use and the requirements of that land use; the sites' physical ability to accommodate both the intended use which requires planning permission and residential development; amenity considerations which may restrict development or require the implementation of significant mitigation measures; the financial impact of developer contributions; or an applicant's ability to implement the residential element of any proposal. A policy of this nature has the potential to delay or prevent development due to the challenges of implementing proposals and could prevent proposals which contribute to the City's economic development taking place e.g. employment use. The existing approach should be retained. The existing policy approach supports housing as part of mixed-use development where appropriate represents a more flexible approach to the delivery of mixed-use development. It can take into account the nature and form of development, site characteristics including physical and environmental constraints and opportunities as well as the needs for other land uses which may not be compatible with residential use.

Choice **10 C**

We want to create a new policy promoting the better use of stand-alone out of centre retail units and commercial centres, where their redevelopment for mixed use including housing would be supported. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T
Name: Lesley McGrath
Response Type: Agent / Consultant
On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

Supporting Info: Yes
Email: lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

Choice 11 A

We want to amend our policy to increase the provision of affordable housing requirement from 25% to 35%. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation

Choice 11 B

We want City Plan 2030 to require a mix of housing types and tenures – we want the plan to be prescriptive on the required mix, including the percentage requirement for family housing and support for the Private Rented Sector. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T
Name: Lesley McGrath
Response Type: Agent / Consultant
On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

Supporting Info: Yes
Email: lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

Choice 12 A

Which option do you support? - Option 1/2/3

Short Response: Option 3 (Blended)

Explanation

Forth Ports would consider an alternative to the 'blended approach'. The Council recognises the short comings Option A (page 33) and these are not replicated here. Furthermore, the approach does not take into account Planning Policy which requires housing provision to reflect housing need and demand. Secondly, it is highly unlikely that the 142 identified sites will be developed in their entirety by 2032. Thirdly, the deliverability of these sites has not been considered in the Housing Study. Important basic information about the sites is apparently unknown including whether the owner is interested in selling / developing the site and who owns them. The approach promoted by Option 2 does not consider the release of brownfield sites. It is highly unlikely that it will be progressed. The number of new homes to be provided across the City requires to be further considered and this response does not seek to undertake such an assessment. This representation should not be construed as support for the assumed number of new homes required over the plan period. Western Harbour In accordance with SPP's presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development, it will be necessary to consider brownfield sites which can deliver new homes, including Forth Ports' land holding at Western Harbour which can support an additional 1,062 (rounded to 1,100) new homes. As intimated in their letter of 18 March 2019 to the Council, Forth Ports is committed to the residential led development of the land within their control at Western Harbour and this is outlined in the Western Harbour Revised Design Framework (RDF) which was approved by the Development Management Sub Committee on 10 October 2018 (The approved RDF is published on the Council's website and can be viewed at https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/Data/Development%20Management%20Sub-Committee/20181010/Agenda/item_72_-_western_harbour_revised_design_framework.pdf). It is no longer Forth Ports' intention to develop the extent of the retail and commercial space provided for within the Outline Permission 09/00165/OUT, although a small element of commercial development will take place to provide for local retail and commercial services. In accordance with the RDF, applications for phase one of the revised proposals for approval of matters specified in conditions for residential and commercial development providing for Classes 1, 2, 3 and 4 and associated infrastructure (19/00986/AMC); and a park (19/01040/AMC) were submitted and subsequently approved by Committee in September 2019. Together they will bring forward development of a new large park with an area of 4.4 ha, 938 new homes, 2,417 m2 of commercial floor space including provision of a health centre and associated infrastructure. The 938 new homes constitute the balance of homes which Forth Ports can develop under the terms of the outline permission. Proposals for phase two comprise the residential led development of the remaining development plots, including a waterfront promenade. Phase two development will require works to the harbour wall on the eastern boundary of Western Harbour. The phasing strategy outlined above is illustrated on page 63 of the RDF. It should be noted that phase two will also facilitate the completion of the new park. It is anticipated that a further 1,062 (rounded to 1,100) new homes can be accommodated on land within Forth Ports control, whilst providing for further development to take place at Western Harbour on land controlled by third parties. Planning Policy Context SES Plan (2013) provides the approved SDP context for development at Western Harbour. It identifies the site as being located within the Edinburgh Waterfront Strategic Development Area and Policy 1A – The Spatial Strategy Development Locations requires Local Development Plans to direct strategic development to the SDA's. The mix of uses and infrastructure requirements to accommodate development require to be set out by LDPs. Paragraph 34 of

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T

Supporting Info Yes

Name Lesley McGrath

Email lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

SESPlan states, "The Edinburgh Waterfront SDA is one of the largest regeneration projects in Europe, with potential for new homes as well as commercial development....The aim is to develop sustainable mixed use development based on an urban village concept. In the longer term the Waterfront will be physically, socially and economically connected to exiting communities in the wider North Edinburgh area."Within this context the Local Development Plan (2016) identifies Western Harbour for residential led development, with Table 11 'Edinburgh Waterfront Development Principles' (page 50) setting out the development principles for of the area. The RDF (page 13) sets out how Forth Ports' proposals respond to the principles.Form of DevelopmentIt is anticipated that around 1,100 new homes could be developed on land within Forth Ports' control. As illustrated in the RDF, the expected form of development would be flatted and would most likely comprise a combination of 1, 2 and 3 bed homes, with 20% of homes providing family accommodation. An element of supporting commercial development for local community use would be provided. Development would follow the block layout within the RDF with heights likely to range from 4 to 8 storeys. Full details of the design framework and principles are set out in the RDF.Traffic and Transport Forth Ports' transport advisors (SWECO) have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the site capacity in respect of traffic and transport. They have concluded that:Western Harbour is ideally located to encourage travel by non-car modes of travel, minimising the impacts on the road network, thereby opening opportunities for higher density development;Development supported by junction improvements at Lindsay Road will enhancing pedestrian and cycle access to Western Harbour whilst reducing queuing and delays associated with further development. Improvements would be compatible with any future extension of the Edinburgh Tram;Taking into account the benefits of the proposed Edinburgh Tram extension, the development of around 1,100 new homes (1,062) can take place;Car parking can be provided at a lower level than the 100% assumed in the Council's parking standards (70% or lower). Phase one proposes car parking at a level of 60%;Early discussions with public transport operators to take place to discuss opportunities to enhance provision. In this regard, discussions with Lothian Buses are already ongoing in relation to the phase one development; and For any new planning application for the increase in housing on the site beyond that which has already got planning permission, discussions will be held with the Council to agree the need for any further assessments of the wider road network.Flood Risk AssessmentForth Ports' engineering advisors, ARUP, have undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment in respect of phase one (application ref: 19/00986/AMC). The Assessment confirms that the proposals would not be subject to risk of flooding. Further development proposals would apply the same principles as applied to phase one and therefore the site would not be at risk of flooding and would not result in any impact elsewhere.EcologyForth Ports' ecology advisors (SLR) have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the site in respect of ecological matters and no ecological constraints to development have been identified. AmenityWestern Harbour forms part of the City's established urban area and lies immediately to the west of the Port of Leith's operational estate. As part of their proposals for phase one, Forth Ports' acoustic advisors, New Acoustics, undertook acoustic surveys in respect of established port related, road traffic and commercial noise (ASDA) sources and the results of these surveys are set out in the Noise Impact Assessment which accompanies the residential led planning application. The survey demonstrates that residential development is acceptable within phase one of Western Harbour, noting that amenity of future residents will be ensured through a combination of compliance with open window assessment requirement and provision of alternative means of ventilation where closed window assessment is necessary.Representation supported by the following which will be issued to the council via email to cityplan2030@edinburgh.gov.uk:Plan of Land for residential led development at Western Harbour; and Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from HolderPlanning 16 October 2019 regarding Port of Leith and Western Harbour which includes appendices of relevance to Questions 5A, 12A 16EAppendices to letter:•Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from HolderPlanning 18 March 2019 regarding proposals for development at Western Harbour (Question 5A and 12A)•Briefing Note Forth Ports: Port Operations and Planning Policy Framework (Question 5A, 12A 16E)•Extracts from the Fife, Falkirk and Dundee Local Development Plans (Question 5A, 12A and 16E)•SWECO Western Harbour, Revised Design Framework – Transport Appraisal 2018 and supporting letter (Question 5A and 12A)•Western Harbour, Revised Design

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T

Supporting Info Yes

Name Lesley McGrath

Email lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

Framework (Question 5A and 12A) available at https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/Data/Development%20Management%20Sub-Committee/20181010/Agenda/item_72_-_western_harbour_revised_design_framework.pdf.

Choice 12 B1

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Support - Calderwood

Short Response Not Answered

Explanation

Choice 12 B2

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Support - Kirkliston

Short Response Not Answered

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **12 B3**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Support - West Edinburgh

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B4**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Support - East of Riccarton

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B5**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Support - South East Edinburgh

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice **12 B6**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Object - Calderwood

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B7**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Object - Kirkliston

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B8**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Object - West Edinburgh

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **12 B9**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Object - East of Riccarton

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B10**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Support Greenfield - Object - South East Edinburgh

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 BX**

Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply) - Explain why

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 12 C

Do you have a greenfield site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan? - Greenfield file upload

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 12 C

Do you have a greenfield site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan? - Greenfield file upload

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 12 C

Do you have a greenfield site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan? - Greenfield file upload

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice **12 D**

Do you have a brownfield site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan? - Brownfield sites upload

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **13 A**

We want to create a new policy that provides support for social enterprises, start-ups, culture and tourism, innovation and learning, and the low carbon sector, where there is a contribution to good growth for Edinburgh. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **14 A**

We want City Plan 2030 to support the best use of existing public transport infrastructure in West Edinburgh and accommodate the development of a mix of uses to support inclusive, sustainable growth. We will do this through 'an area of search' which allows a wide consideration of future uses within West Edinburgh without being tied to individual sites. Do you support this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **14 B**

We want to remove the safeguard in the existing plan for the Royal Highland Showground site to the south of the A8 at Norton Park and allocate the site for other uses. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **14 C**

We want City Plan 2030 to allocate the Airport's contingency runway, the "crosswinds runway" for the development of alternative uses next to the Edinburgh Gateway interchange. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **15 A**

We want to continue to use the national 'town centre first' approach. City Plan 2030 will protect and enhance the city centre as the regional core of south east Scotland providing shopping, commercial leisure, and entertainment and tourism activities. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 15 B

New shopping and leisure development will only be allowed within our town and local centres (including any new local centres) justified by the Commercial Needs study. Outwith local centres, small scale proposals will be permitted only in areas where there is evidence of a lack of food shopping within walking distance. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 C

We want to review our existing town and local centres including the potential for new identified centres and boundary changes where they support walking and cycling access to local services in outer areas, consistent with the outcomes of the City Mobility Plan. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 D

We want to continue to prepare and update supplementary guidance for our town centres to adapt to changing retail patterns and trends, and ensure an appropriate balance of uses within our centres to maintain their vitality, viability and deliver good placemaking. Instead we could stop using supplementary guidance for town centres and set out guidance within the plan. Which approach do you support? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice 15 E

We want to support new hotel provision in local, town, commercial centres and other locations with good public transport access throughout Edinburgh. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 G

We could also seek to reduce the quantity of retail floorspace within centres in favour of alternative uses such as increased leisure provision and permit commercial centres to accommodate any growing demand. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 A1

We want to continue to support office use at strategic office locations at Edinburgh Park/South Gyle, the International Business Gateway, Leith, the city centre, and in town and local centres. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice **16 A2**

We want to support office development at commercial centres as these also provide accessible locations. - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 A3**

We want to strengthen the requirement within the city centre to provide significant office floorspace within major mixed-use developments. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 A4**

We want to amend the boundary of the Leith strategic office location to remove areas with residential development consent. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T

Supporting Info Yes

Name Lesley McGrath

Email lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

Choice 16 A5

We want to continue to support office development in other accessible locations elsewhere in the urban area. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response Not Answered

Explanation Not Answered

Choice 16 A5

We want to continue to support office development in other accessible locations elsewhere in the urban area. Do you agree? - Do you have an office site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan?

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 B

We want to identify sites and locations within Edinburgh with potential for office development. Do you agree with this? - Yes/No

Short Response Not Answered

Explanation Not Answered

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 16 C

We want to introduce a loss of office policy to retain accessible office accommodation. This would not permit the redevelopment of office buildings other than for office use, unless existing office space is provided as part of denser development. This would apply across the city to recognise that office locations outwith the city centre and strategic office locations are important in meeting the needs of the mid-market. Or we could Introduce a 'loss of office' policy only in the city centre. - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E1

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Yes / No - Support - Leith Strategic Business Centre

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E2

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Yes / No - Support - Newbridge

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 16 E3

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Yes / No - Support - Newcraighall Industrial Estate.

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E4

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Yes / No - Support - The Crosswinds Runway

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E5

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Yes / No - Do not support - Leith Strategic Business Centre

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 16 E6

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Yes / No - Do not support - Newbridge

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E7

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Yes / No - Do not support - Newcraighall Industrial Estate.

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E8

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Yes / No - Do not support - The Crosswinds Runway

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T
Name: Lesley McGrath
Response Type: Agent / Consultant
On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

Supporting Info: Yes
Email: lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

Choice 16 EX

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Explain why

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation

Note - for avoidance of doubt we have ticked 'support' in respect 'Leith Strategic Business Centre.' We understand this is a typographical error and should read "Leith Docks: Seafield (Eastern Leith Docks), Britannia Quay and land to the south of Edinburgh Dock." Forth Ports supports the proposal.

1. Introduction
1.1 Forth Ports supports the proposal to retain the employment designation for the Port of Leith and to extend the designation to land at Britannia Quay, Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Seafield, noting that the land has the potential for development for alternative uses should the land become surplus to operational requirements.

1.2 In supporting the designation, the language of the Policy must clearly state that the allocation is for business and industrial development which may have potential to accommodate mixed use development. Forth Ports are concerned that the Policy could be interpreted as supporting business and industrial development only as part of mixed use development.

1.3 The Port of Leith is the City's port and has been so for centuries, adapting to the City's needs over time. It is the City's gateway to the sea, providing access to shipping, which is comparably less carbon intensive form of transport than other modes. Shipping replaces many vehicle miles supporting the City's ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030. It is a resource which the City must take care to nurture, as it provides port infrastructure which cannot be easily replicated and has the potential to support appropriate brownfield development over time. The provision of appropriate access to the Port is important to ensure that the Port of Leith estate can contribute to the long term success of the City.

2. Statutory framework, NPF 3 and Enterprise Area
2.1 Forth Ports are the Statutory Harbour Authority and the Competent Harbour Authority for the Firth of Forth and perform a number of functions as prescribed by legislation (Forth Ports Authority Order Confirmation Act 1969) including overseeing of safety of navigation and licencing of all works below MHSW between the tidal limits inland and the mouth of the Firth. They operate the Forth and Tay Navigation Service which controls vessel movements on the Firths of Forth and Tay. In accordance with the Confirmation Act, Forth Ports also put in place bye-laws to protect the health, safety and security of both operators and members of the public within its operational estates. They also have a duty to ensure port facilities are securely protected in accordance with International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) code.

2.2 National Planning Framework 3 identifies the provision of additional freight handling facilities at existing and disused ports on the Firth of Forth as a National Development . In addition the Port forms part of the Low Carbon / Renewables East Enterprise Area.

3. Forth Ports Ltd
3.1 Forth Ports Ltd is a port infrastructure company and will continue to operate as such, utilising its land holdings for port related uses. Notwithstanding the Company's core business, it recognises that Edinburgh's Waterfront, including the Port of Leith is going through a period of change and this situation presents potential options going forward.

4. The Port of Leith
4.1 The Port of Leith is integral to the fabric of Leith and the City. For centuries, its operations and land holdings have responded to changing economic requirements. Forth Ports are committed to retaining the Port of Leith as a genuine 'City Port' servicing the needs of the City and wider area.

4.2 Within this context Forth Ports continue to assess how the Port can support the economy and development of the City. In addition to port operational use, Forth Ports recognises that the Port of Leith is well positioned to:

- Support 'portcentric' logistics and particularly for the construction and creative industries;
- Accommodate distribution facilities for 'last mile distribution';
- Provide industrial development sites with good proximity to the City Centre, where limited sites exist with the same locational advantage; and
- Potentially accommodate alternative uses

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T

Supporting Info Yes

Name Lesley McGrath

Email lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

which may include residential led development, student housing, hotel and leisure use in the south of the port estate.4.3At the Port, the demolition of the Imperial Grain Warehouse and the consolidation of operations have freed up land available for operational port use, in the Port's northern operational core. Waterfront4.4There has been an increase in development of, and proposals for, residential development in the area, demonstrating that port-related uses, general industrial, storage and business operations can take place in proximity of one another. Proposals for the new tram line and Resolution Property's rebranding of the 'Porta' retail and leisure destination are catalysts for further change in the Waterfront area. Potential for Change4.5Forth Ports will continue to utilise their land holdings at Britannia Quay and land south of Edinburgh Dock for port operational use, including the handling of cargo related to the development of Western Harbour. Within the context of the ongoing port operational use, the land in the south of the port estate (Britannia Quay and land south of Edinburgh Dock) has potential to accommodate business and industrial and port related development, as well as facilities associated with the development of Western Harbour. Forth Ports however recognise that subject to market and operational requirements, potential could arise for alternative uses which may include residential led development, student housing, hotel and leisure use and some areas may become available for such uses.

4.6Land at Seafield has become available and is being actively marketed for business use. Forth Ports would support the development of non-port related Class 4, Class 5 and Class 6 uses. The land will remain part of the operational port estate to ensure that it can still be utilised for port use. The Seafield area (LDP ref: EW1d) is subject to a waste management/combined heat and power safeguard in the adopted LDP and Forth Ports support that such a use would be acceptable at Seafield. 4.7It is appropriate for the next LDP to put in place a flexible policy approach, which reflects future options for the area of land which lies in the south of the Port and Seafield. This allows the Port to maximise its economic contribution to the City whilst providing flexibility for alternative uses should the land no longer be required for port operational use. 4.8In addition to the potential changes identified above, the Port of Leith is well positioned to respond to the changing demands of transport logistics.4.9Trends in transport logistics include the growth of 'portcentric' logistics which provide for storage of goods at multimodal transport hubs. Goods are brought into and stored centrally at the port, rather than being transferred on to a distribution centre. Portcentric logistics provides benefits for business and the environment. For businesses, it reduces lead times, potential for damage, the number of handling stages and savings in transport costs and lower carbon emissions.4.10With significant levels of development ongoing across the City and the Lothians, Forth Ports recognise that the Port of Leith has the potential to function as a construction hub, providing a central location for materials including aggregate, timber and steel for example. This has the potential for further growth. In addition, Forth Ports has identified the potential to support a creative industries hub, allowing goods, including props and other equipment to be brought into and stored in the Port. The development of portcentric hubs clearly has the potential to support economic development, including creative industries within the area.4.11Another trend in transport logistics is the 'last mile' distribution concept which is the movement of goods from a transport hub to a final delivery destination, which is typically a residence. Land within the port estate can accommodate distribution facilities necessary to serve the high density area of Leith and beyond. Shipping, Port Operations and Operational Trends4.12Sea transport is less carbon intensive than other forms of transport, on a CO2 per tonne-km basis and sea transport replaces many vehicles miles and resultant vehicle emissions from road networks.4.13Ports have developed based on their locational/geographical advantage and perform a range of functions. The Port of Leith is the largest enclosed deepwater port in Scotland. It provides full modern docking and cargo handling services for a range of vessels and cargoes, and provides services for:•North Sea oil and gas including the handling of project materials;•Agriculture and drinks industry products which support significant secondary industries and jobs locally;•Cruise, including a dedicated cruise terminal;•Construction e.g. aggregate;•General bulk commodities e.g. road salt;•Engineering e.g. supporting off-shore activities;•Food processing e.g. Chancellor Mill;

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T
Name: Lesley McGrath
Response Type: Agent / Consultant
On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

Supporting Info: Yes

Email: lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

• Vehicle e.g. import of new cars; • Naval vessels. 4.14 Port operations can broadly be described as operations which relate to shipping and activities related to handling associated passengers and goods. These are largely industrial in nature. By their association with shipping, port operations can only take place in a port. The transitional nature of port activities requires port operators (including their agents and lessees) to handle, store and process different commodities in a flexible manner. The associated development requirements are permitted in accordance with Class 35 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992, as amended. 4.15 Forth Ports are seeing increases in demand for its infrastructure services. The demand and potential for portcentric transport logistics requires a positive planning framework, and support for Classes 4, 5 and 6 is required to fully address its potential. 4.16 The global trend towards increased processing of commodities within ports is a result of the shortening of manufacturing supply chains aligned with the competitive nature of economic activity and the need to reduce carbon emissions. Forth Ports are firmly of the view that many of these processes can be undertaken in accordance with their permitted development rights however these may not apply in all circumstances. To ensure that port operations keeps pace with global trends, it is appropriate for the LDP to support employment use within the Port. This will provide greater certainty for companies seeking to develop their operations and create employment within the Port. The designation of the Port's operational estate for employment use, which also acknowledges that potential for development for alternative uses on land at Britannia Quay, Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Seafield, should the land become surplus to operational requirement is welcomed. 5. New Street in Leith Docks Choices for CityPlan 2030 states, "many of the policies in our existing plan are working well. Local development plan policies and sites not mentioned in this document are not subject to consultation and most will be carried into CityPlan 2030." The MIR makes no reference to the Proposal T14 – New street in Leith Docks which is identified as, "a route for extension to Ocean Drive to support port development. ..." In absence of any detail it is not clear if the Proposal will be carried forward. The Council seeks to maximise the potential for support development on brownfield land, ensure that everyone can share in its economic success and work towards its ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030. The Local Development Plan and Mobility Plan must therefore ensure that transport infrastructure is fit for purpose in the long-term and the principle of a proposed road connection between Seafield Road and Ocean Drive remains appropriate. Its development will ensure the northern and eastern areas of the Port will remain accessible in the long-term for port related freight movement and will support brownfield development opportunities in the area. Ultimately, the nature of the road will be dependent on the function which it is intended to fulfil. The Council needs to provide this clarification and Forth Ports would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Council's proposals further as it progresses with preparation of the forthcoming Proposed LDP. The Council must consider the potential impact that the road's provision will have on the viability of development and support development and funding mechanisms which do not rely wholly on developer contributions. 6. Map 27 - Business and Industry Areas 6.1 The map Identifies the land to the east of the Port for business and industry. The plan shows the outline of the Port as employment land and also marks out a 'blob' which covers Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Seafield. The Plan should also cover land at Britannia Quay. 6.2 Forth Ports submission of 16 October 2019 to the Council will be re-issued, including a plan of the port estate. Technical Changes As there is no option to provide a response to Technical Changes. Commentary relevant to Seafield Waste Management is therefore provided here: Choices of CityPlan 2030 states (page 4) "many of the policies in our existing plan are working well. Local development plan policies and sites not mentioned in this document are not subject to consultation and most will be carried into CityPlan 2030." Whilst Technical Change B sets out general policy on waste management it does not address the Seafield (LDP ref: EW1d) waste management/combined heat and power safeguard in the adopted LDP. Forth Ports consider that support for a waste management facility incorporating thermal treatment with energy recovery can be accommodated within its land at Seafield which is identified for employment use. The CityPlan should continue to support the development of the combined heat and power facility at Seafield. Representation supported by the following which will be issued to the council via email to cityplan2030@edinburgh.gov.uk: • Boundary of Port of Leith (Questions 1C, 5A, 8C, 12A, 16E) • Letter to City of Edinburgh

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Council from HolderPlanning 16 October 2019 regarding Port of Leith and Western Harbour which includes appendices of relevance to Questions 5A, 12A 16E Appendices to letter: Briefing Note Forth Ports: Port Operations and Planning Policy Framework (Question 5A, 12A 16E) Plan indicating areas of land which may become surplus to operational requirements (Question 5A and 16E) Extracts from the Fife, Falkirk and Dundee Local Development Plans (Question 5A, 12A and 16E)

Choice **16 F**

We want to ensure new business space is provided as part of the redevelopment of urban sites and considered in Place Briefs for greenfield sites. We want to set out the amount expected to be re-provided, clearer criteria on what constitutes flexible business space, and how to deliver it, including the location on-site, and considering adjacent uses, servicing and visibility. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 G**

We want to continue to protect industrial estates that are designated under our current policy on Employment Sites and Premises (Emp 8). Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation With the exception of Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Britannia Quay (and as is addressed in response to point 16E) the Port of Leith is presently covered by employment policy designation (EMP8) which allows general industrial, storage or distribution and business use to take place. The policy designation remains appropriate.

Customer Ref: 01752 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T

Name: Lesley McGrath

Response Type: Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Forth Ports Ltd

Supporting Info: Yes

Email: lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

Choice 16 H

We want to introduce a policy that provides criteria for locations that we would support city-wide and neighbourhood goods distribution hubs. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response: Yes

Explanation: Further details are required however, this is positive and responds to a demand for local deliveries. Such proposals can take place within areas identified for employment use.

Response ID ANON-KU2U-GWRC-T

Submitted to **Choices for City Plan 2030**

Submitted on **2020-04-30 09:32:20**

Your information and data

1 What is your name?

Name:

Lesley McGrath

2 What is your email address?

Email:

lesley.mcgrath@holderplanning.co.uk

3. If you do not have an email address What is your address?

Full address including postcode:

5 South Charlotte Street, Edinburgh, EH2 4AN

4 I am responding as

Agent / Consultant

5 IF you are responding on behalf of an organisation or an other individual, what is their name?

Agent on behalf of:

Forth Ports Ltd

6 I agree to my response being published to this consultation.

Yes

Choice 1 - Making Edinburgh a sustainable, active and connected city

1A We want to connect our places, parks and green spaces together as part of a city-wide, regional, and national green network. We want new development to connect to, and deliver this network. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

Agree in principle.

Not all proposals will be able to accommodate physical linkages.

Should the Council seek to secure off-site improvement works, the LDP should set out in a clear manner how these are directly related to the proposed development.

1B We want to change our policy to require all development (including change of use) to include green and blue infrastructure. Do you agree with this?

No

Explain why:

It is difficult to comprehend how 'all development' can include green and blue infrastructure. Whilst the aspiration is laudable, a change of use, all in accordance with the Use Classes Order, for example changes of use from Classes 1 or 2 to Class 3 or from Class 5 to 6 (where development exceeds 235 sq m), will not necessitate the need for green or blue infrastructure, nor will the erection of a fence in a Conservation Area, where an Article 4 direction necessitates the need for an application for planning permission.

In circumstances where building or engineering works are proposed, the nature and form of development will influence the extent to which green and blue infrastructure can be incorporated into the proposed development.

A policy which supports the provision of blue and green infrastructure would be appropriate, with details of measures which can be taken to address the policy, set out in non statutory guidance. The policy should also acknowledge that in some circumstances, for example, a change of use, the need to provide green and blue infrastructure is not appropriate.

The Council should not seek to secure contributions for off-site improvement works where the nature of development does not necessitate the provision of green or blue infrastructure.

1C We want to identify areas that can be used for future water management to enable adaptation to climate change. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

Whilst the principle is supported, the Planning Authority must have due regard to the water environment within the Port of Leith and Forth Ports' as Statutory Harbour Authority. Forth Ports are happy to discuss any relevant matters further with the Council as it progresses with the preparation of the proposed Local Development Plan.

Forth Ports Ltd own and operate the Port of Leith and a boundary of their operational estate will be issued to the Planning Authority to inform this submission.

In addition, Forth Ports are the Statutory Harbour Authority and the Competent Harbour Authority for the Firth of Forth and perform a number of functions as prescribed by legislation (Forth Ports Authority Order Confirmation Act 1969) including overseeing of safety of navigation and licencing of all works below MHWS between the tidal limits inland and the mouth of the Firth. They operate the Forth and Tay Navigation Service which controls vessel movements on the Firths of Forth and Tay.

In accordance with the Confirmation Act, Forth Ports also put in place bye-laws to protect the health, safety and security of both operators and members of the public within its operational estates. They also have a duty to ensure port facilities are securely protected in accordance with International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) code.

With respect to the foregoing it is not appropriate for the Planning Authority to put in place policies and proposals which would impact on the water environment within the control of Forth Ports, could impact on their operations at the Port of Leith and their ability to fulfil their statutory obligations as Statutory Harbour Authority.

1D We want to clearly set out under what circumstances the development of poor quality or underused open space will be considered acceptable. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

1E We want to introduce a new 'extra-large green space standard' which recognises that as we grow communities will need access to green spaces more than 5 hectares. Do you agree with this?

No

Explain why:

This proposal is not supported.

The requirement for access to greenspace of more than 5ha is prescriptive and does not take into account the location of new development which may constrain the ability to meet the requirement. This is particularly the case in relation to brownfield development sites, where it will not always be possible to provide a prescribed level of provision. A qualitative approach to green space provision is not recognised by the proposed policy approach.

The existing Policy ENV20 provides the flexibility which enables greenspace provision to be tailor made to circumstances.

1F We want to identify specific sites for new allotments and food growing, both as part of new development sites and within open space in the urban area. Do you agree with this?

No

Explain why:

The proposal is not supported in its present form.

Opportunities for community growing can be incorporated into new residential developments in a number of ways. A requirement for new allotments and food growing is prescriptive and the policy should allow for a flexible approach to provision.

Upload (max size 3mb):

No file was uploaded

1G We want to identify space for additional cemetery provision, including the potential for green and woodland burials. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

1H We want to revise our existing policies and green space designations to ensure that new green spaces have long term maintenance and management arrangements in place. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

Choice 2 - Improving the quality and density of development

2A We want all development (including change of use), through design and access statements, to demonstrate how their design will incorporate measures to tackle and adapt to climate change, their future adaptability and measures to address accessibility for people with varying needs, age and mobility issues as a key part of their layouts.

No

Explain why:

The proposal is not supported in its present form. Development must comply with current Building Standards and Regulations in relation to disabilities. With respect to Listed Buildings, it is not always possible to ensure compliance with standards which apply to new development.

The proposal implies that all development must include a Design and Access Statement. Legislation identifies where Design Statements and Design and Access Statements must be provided and it is not appropriate to require all development to provide such Statements.

2B We want to revise our policies on density to ensure that we make best use of the limited space in our city and that sites are not under-developed. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

The aspiration to ensure efficient use of land is supported.

The requirement for higher density schemes must consider site specific characteristics, where appropriate, including: amenity and environmental considerations such as daylight, overshadowing, noise, air quality, wind canyons, ground conditions and topography; and infrastructure requirements including open space, drainage and access. Impact on natural and heritage designations as well as existing trees will also be a consideration.

With regard to requiring a vertical mix of uses, this will be appropriate in some locations, although care needs to be taken on how this is implemented in detail given the possible tensions between business and residential uses in terms of amenity and building/fire regulations.

2C We want to revise our design and layout policies to achieve ensure their layouts deliver active travel and connectivity links. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

2D We want all development, including student housing, to deliver quality open space and public realm, useable for a range of activities, including drying space, without losing densities. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

Choice 3 - Delivering carbon neutral buildings

2A We want all buildings and conversions to meet the zero carbon / platinum standards as set out in the current Scottish Building Regulations. Instead we could require new development to meet the bronze, silver or gold standard. Which standard should new development in Edinburgh meet?

Current Building Standards (currently bronze)

Explain why:

Compliance with Building Standards is supported.

For a number of reasons the Council's preferred proposal should not be taken forward to the proposed Local Development Plan:

The Scottish Governments states that they, "create the building standards regulations and technical guidance, to ensure buildings are safe, efficient and sustainable" <https://www.gov.scot/policies/building-standards/>. It is not therefore for the Council through the LDP to dictate the standards which should apply to all new buildings and conversions.

The Scottish Building Regulations are subject to revision and the Policy provides no baseline date upon which standards should be measured.

The detail of the Platinum Standards is presently incomplete.

The cost of implementing the zero carbon /platinum standards is likely to be significant and will have a negative impact on development viability. This will in turn, impact on the delivery of the strategy which the Local Development Plan puts in place.

The remit of the Scottish Building Standards Agency addresses zero carbon/sustainability/renewable technologies at a national level and they are the appropriate authority through whom standards and requirements should be set. It is not for the Council through the LDP to set a target which is aspirational and is without justification.

Choice 4 - Creating Place Briefs and supporting the use of Local Place Plans in our communities

4A We want to work with local communities to prepare Place Briefs for areas and sites within City Plan 2030 highlighting the key elements of design, layout, and transport, education and healthcare infrastructure development should deliver. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

The principle is supported.

Early engagement in the development process with local communities can enable new development to integrate into the established urban framework. In devising Place Briefs, a range of stakeholders including community groups, infrastructure providers and land owners/developers should be engaged.

The aspirations which Place Briefs put in place should be realistic and achievable.

They must recognise that delivery of any aspirations and proposals can be limited by: a land owner or developer's wish to take the form of development proposed in the Place Brief or LDP forward; and also constraints upon development which may not be known at the time of their preparation, e.g. ground conditions.

The status of Place Briefs in determining applications must be made clear in Policy.

4B We want to support Local Place Plans being prepared by our communities. City Plan 2030 will set out how Local Place Plans can help us achieve great places and support community ambitions.

How should the Council work with local communities to prepare Local Place Plans?:

Support for Local Place Plans (LPP) is welcomed. LPPs were introduced by the T&CP(Sco) Act 2019 and will take time to develop and mature.

Whilst there is now a planning purpose for the preparation of the National Planning Framework, Local Development Plans and Regional Spatial Strategies, which is "to manage the development and use of land in the long term public interest," that planning purpose does not apply to LPPs.

Any new Policy therefore needs to take great care in terms of the weight to be given to LPP.

Choice 5 - Delivering community infrastructure

5A We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated and deliverable within the plan period. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

Directing development to locations with existing infrastructure capacity is integral to the principles of sustainable development as set out in Scottish Planning Policy.

Western Harbour

Forth Ports intimated to the Council in its letter of 18 March 2019 that it is committed to the residential led development of the land within their control at Western Harbour, as outlined in the Western Harbour Revised Design Framework (RDF) and approved by the Development Management Sub Committee in October 2018. The Council approved application ref: 19/00986/AMC for 938 new homes, 2,417 m² of commercial floor space including provision of a health centre and associated infrastructure in September 2019 and development is expected to commence shortly. Capacity for a further 1,062 (rounded to 1,100) new homes has been identified on Forth Ports land holding at Western Harbour and which allows for land within 3rd party control to come forward at the scale identified in planning permission ref: 09/00165/OUT.

A high level Transport Assessment has been prepared and demonstrates that the proposal can be accommodated.

A copy of the letter and relevant attachments will be re-issued to the Council as part of this consultation response.

Forth Ports intimated to the Council in its letter of 16 October 2019, that it Forth Ports will continue to utilise their land holdings at Britannia Quay and Land south of Edinburgh Dock for port operational use, including the handling of cargo related to the development of Western Harbour. Within the context of the ongoing port operational use, the land in the south of the port estate (Britannia Quay and land south of Edinburgh Dock) has potential to accommodate business and industrial and port related development, as well as facilities associated with the development of Western Harbour. Forth Ports however recognise that subject to market and operational requirements, potential could arise for alternative uses which may include residential led development, student housing, hotel and leisure use and some areas may become available for such uses.

The preferred option (Choice 16) set out in the MIR continues to support the operational port estate for employment use and extends this designation to Britannia Quay, Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Seafield but recognising that there may be potential for mixed use development to take place in these locations. Forth Ports strongly welcome the preferred approach set out at Choice 16E and nothing in their response should be construed to indicate otherwise.

Recognising that the Council wish to ensure all necessary infrastructure is planned for and supporting the 'infrastructure first' approach outlined in the Scottish Government's letter to the Council of 17 January 2020, which directed the Council not to adopt its supplementary guidance, Forth Ports consider it appropriate to advise the Council of what it considers to be the potential capacity for residential development as part of a mixed use development at Britannia Quay and Land South of Edinburgh Dock (including Prince of Wales Dock).

Based on figures outlined in the proposed Local Development Plan (2015), Britannia Quay has the capacity to accommodate 1,340 new homes and based on Forth Ports' own site capacity assessment, Land South of Edinburgh Dock (including Prince of Wales Dock) has the capacity to accommodate just over 1,700 new homes and 5,440 sq m of commercial space. These figures are indicative only and are provided in good faith to assist the Council in planning for any

potential infrastructure requirements. Unless advised otherwise the afore mentioned land will continue to be utilised for port and employment use in accordance with Policy Emp 8.

Representation supported by the following which will be issued to the council via email to cityplan2030@edinburgh.gov.uk:

Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from HolderPlanning 16 October 2019 regarding Port of Leith and Western Harbour which includes appendices of relevance to Questions 5A, 12A 16E

Appendices to letter:

- Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from HolderPlanning 18 March 2019 regarding proposals for development at Western Harbour (Question 5A and 12A)
- Briefing Note Forth Ports: Port Operations and Planning Policy Framework (Question 5A, 12A 16E)
- Plan indicating areas of land which may become surplus to operational requirements (Question 5A and 16E)
- Extracts from the Fife, Falkirk and Dundee Local Development Plans (Question 5A, 12A and 16E)
- SWECO Western Harbour, Revised Design Framework – Transport Appraisal 2018 and supporting letter (Question 5A and 12A)
- Western Harbour, Revised Design Framework (Question 5A and 12A) available at

https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/Data/Development%20Management%20Sub-Committee/20181010/Agenda/item_72_-_western_harbour_revised_design_framework.p

5B We want City Plan 2030 to set out where new community facilities are needed, and that these must be well connected to active travel routes and in locations with high accessibility to good sustainable public transport services. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

Forth Ports support the identification of locations of new infrastructure in sustainable locations. Active travel requirements should be considered in preparing the LDP to enable new development to accommodate the necessary provision from the outset and avoid a requirement to retrofit any requirement, for example shared foot and cycle paths which require to be of a defined width.

Where developer contributions are required for off-site works, the extent of any developer contributions sought must comply with the tests set out at paragraph 14 of Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements (Circular 3/2012).

In addition to the provision of active travel routes as the Council seeks to maximise the potential for development on brownfield land and work towards its ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030, the Local Development Plan and Mobility Plan must ensure that transport infrastructure is fit for purpose in the long-term.

5C We want to reflect the desire to co-locate our community services close to the communities they serve, supporting a high walk-in population and reducing the need to travel. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

Forth Ports support the identification of locations of new infrastructure in sustainable locations.

5D.1 We want to set out in the plan where development will be expected to contribute toward new or expanded community infrastructure. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

The identification of development which should contribute towards new or expanded community infrastructure is supported as this provides certainty however the use of contribution zones is problematic.

The use of cumulative contributions zones is not supported particularly in relation to transport and education contributions for the reasons outlined in the Ministers direction to City of Edinburgh Council, dated 17 January 2020.

5D.2 We want to use cumulative contribution zones to determine infrastructure actions, costs and delivery mechanisms. Do you agree with this?

No

Explain why:

See response to 5D.1

5E We want to stop using supplementary guidance and set out guidance for developer contributions within the plan, Action Programme and in non-statutory guidance. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

In taking forward this approach, it will be necessary to clearly link the provision set out in the LDP, Action Programme and non-statutory guidance. A requirement for developer contributions will need to be clearly evidenced. Action Programmes must be kept up to date, clearly identify the scope and cost of proposals and how and when actions will be delivered. Engagement with relevant stakeholders, including landowners should take place as part of the Action Programme's preparation and subsequent revision.

Choice 6 - Creating places for people, not cars

6A We want to create a new policy that assesses development against its ability to meet our targets for public transport usage and walking and cycling. These targets will vary according to the current or planned public transport services and high-quality active travel routes. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

6B We want to use Place Briefs to set the targets for trips by walking, cycling and public transport based on current and planned transit interventions. This will determine appropriate parking levels to support high use of public transport. Do you agree with this?

No

Explain why:

Choice 2 sets out the Council's support for 'Place Briefs' which are to be prepared in consultation with local communities. In devising Place Briefs, it is appropriate to engage with land owners and developers who will be instrumental in bringing forward development.

Place Briefs should not be used as a tool to masterplan areas, setting out parking and active travel proposals which may not be achievable due to landowners' intentions and/or constraints as well as other site specific constraints.

There is a danger that Place Briefs become overly prescriptive whilst not informed by the necessary and costly detailed site works.

Choice 7 - Supporting the reduction in car use in Edinburgh

7A We want to determine parking levels in development based on targets for trips by walking, cycling and public transport. These targets could be set by area, development type, or both and will be supported by other measures to control on-street parking. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

7B We want to protect against the development of additional car parking in the city centre to support the delivery of the Council's city centre transformation programme. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

7C We want to update our parking policies to control demand and to support parking for bikes, those with disabilities and electric vehicles via charging infrastructure. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

The proposal is supported.

Policies for cycle provision and electric vehicles should be proportionate and reasonable. The appropriate infrastructure, including sufficient capacity within the electricity grid and sub-stations capable of accommodating demand needs to be available for electric vehicle charging. Where the necessary infrastructure is not available, developments can be made ready to accommodate future demand.

7D We want to support the city's park and ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new park and ride and extensions, including any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

Choice 8 - Delivering new walking and cycle routes

8A We want to update our policy on the Cycle and Footpath Network to provide criteria for identifying new routes. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

Yes, however proposals should be costed in the Council's action programme and an evidence base for developer contributions will be required. Developer contributions sought towards provision of new links should be in accordance with the provisions of Circular 3/2012, Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements, paragraph 14. New development should contribute proportionately towards the relevant actions.

Comment on Question 8B (there is no text to provide an explanation to comment beyond yes/no):

Yes - Forth Ports support recognition that the proposed development should avoid Port operational land. The form of the proposed connection will require to take into account physical and amenity constraints.

A plan of the operational port estate will be issued to the Planning Authority in support of this representation. The plan is also relevant to Map 1 – 'A connected green area' of the Choices 2030 document.

8B As part of the City Centre Transformation and other Council and partner projects to improve strategic walking and cycling links around the city, we want to add the following routes (along with our existing safeguards) to our network as active travel proposals to ensure that they are delivered. Do you agree with this?

Yes

8C We want City Plan 2030 to safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites. We also want the City Plan 2030 to include any new strategic active travel links which may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or which are identified through this consultation. Do you agree with this?

Yes

Explain why:

Yes, however safeguarding and adding other strategic active travel links without consultation is not appropriate. It may not be possible to deliver the proposed linkages as identified due to site specific matters (ownership or physical constraints) and it is therefore necessary that the Council engages with the appropriate parties prior to setting out its specific proposals.

A flexible policy is required to ensure that where possible identified opportunities for active travel links are provided.

Upload new cycle routes:

No file was uploaded

Choice 10 - Ensuring the better use of land

10A. We want to revise our policy on purpose-built student housing. We want to ensure that student housing is delivered at the right scale and in the right locations, helps create sustainable communities and looks after student's wellbeing. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

10B We want to create a new policy framework which sets out a requirement for housing on all sites over a certain size coming forward for development. Do you agree with this?

No

Explain why:

Whilst it is recognised that the Council wishes to maximise opportunities for residential development, the proposed policy does not take into account the nature of the development which is primarily sought, for example an employment use and the requirements of that land use; the sites' physical ability to accommodate both the intended use which requires planning permission and residential development; amenity considerations which may restrict development or require the implementation of significant mitigation measures; the financial impact of developer contributions; or an applicant's ability to implement the residential element of any proposal.

A policy of this nature has the potential to delay or prevent development due to the challenges of implementing proposals and could prevent proposals which contribute to the City's economic development taking place e.g. employment use.

The existing approach should be retained. The existing policy approach supports housing as part of mixed-use development where appropriate represents a more flexible approach to the delivery of mixed-use development. It can take into account the nature and form of development, site characteristics including physical and environmental constraints and opportunities as well as the needs for other land uses which may not be compatible with residential use.

10C We want to create a new policy promoting the better use of stand-alone out of centre retail units and commercial centres, where their redevelopment for mixed use including housing would be supported. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

Choice 11 - Delivering more affordable homes

11A We want to amend our policy to increase the provision of affordable housing requirement from 25% to 35%. Do you agree with this approach?

Not Answered

Explain why:

11B We want City Plan 2030 to require a mix of housing types and tenures – we want the plan to be prescriptive on the required mix, including the percentage requirement for family housing and support for the Private Rented Sector. Do you agree with this?

Not Answered

Explain why:

Choice 12 - Building our new homes and infrastructure

12A Which option do you support?

Option 3 (Blended approach)

Explain why you support that option, or why haven't chosen an option:

Forth Ports would consider an alternative to the 'blended approach'.

The Council recognises the short comings Option A (page 33) and these are not replicated here. Furthermore, the approach does not take into account Planning Policy which requires housing provision to reflect housing need and demand. Secondly, it is highly unlikely that the 142 identified sites will be developed in their entirety by 2032. Thirdly, the deliverability of these sites has not been considered in the Housing Study. Important basic information about the sites is apparently unknown including whether the owner is interested in selling / developing the site and who owns them.

The approach promoted by Option 2 does not consider the release of brownfield sites. It is highly unlikely that it will be progressed.

The number of new homes to be provided across the City requires to be further considered and this response does not seek to undertake such an assessment. This representation should not be construed as support for the assumed number of new homes required over the plan period.

Western Harbour

In accordance with SPP's presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development, it will be necessary to consider brownfield sites which can deliver new homes, including Forth Ports' land holding at Western Harbour which can support an additional 1,062 (rounded to 1,100) new homes.

As intimated in their letter of 18 March 2019 to the Council, Forth Ports is committed to the residential led development of the land within their control at Western Harbour and this is outlined in the Western Harbour Revised Design Framework (RDF) which was approved by the Development Management Sub Committee on 10 October 2018 (The approved RDF is published on the Council's website and can be viewed at https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/Data/Development%20Management%20Sub-Committee/20181010/Agenda/item_72_-_western_harbour_revised_design_framework.ppt). It is no longer Forth Ports' intention to develop the extent of the retail and commercial space provided for within the Outline Permission 09/00165/OUT, although a small element of commercial development will take place to provide for local retail and commercial services.

In accordance with the RDF, applications for phase one of the revised proposals for approval of matters specified in conditions for residential and commercial development providing for Classes 1, 2, 3 and 4 and associated infrastructure (19/00986/AMC); and a park (19/01040/AMC) were submitted and subsequently approved by Committee in September 2019. Together they will bring forward development of a new large park with an area of 4.4 ha, 938 new homes, 2,417 m² of commercial floor space including provision of a health centre and associated infrastructure. The 938 new homes constitute the balance of homes which Forth Ports can develop under the terms of the outline permission.

Proposals for phase two comprise the residential led development of the remaining development plots, including a waterfront promenade. Phase two development will require works to the harbour wall on the eastern boundary of Western Harbour. The phasing strategy outlined above is illustrated on page 63 of the RDF. It should be noted that phase two will also facilitate the completion of the new park.

It is anticipated that a further 1,062 (rounded to 1,100) new homes can be accommodated on land within Forth Ports control, whilst providing for further development to take place at Western Harbour on land controlled by third parties.

Planning Policy Context

SESPlan (2013) provides the approved SDP context for development at Western Harbour. It identifies the site as being located within the Edinburgh Waterfront Strategic Development Area and Policy 1A – The Spatial Strategy Development Locations requires Local Development Plans to direct strategic development to the SDA's. The mix of uses and infrastructure requirements to accommodate development require to be set out by LDPs.

Paragraph 34 of SESPlan states, "The Edinburgh Waterfront SDA is one of the largest regeneration projects in Europe, with potential for new homes as well as commercial development....The aim is to develop sustainable mixed use development based on an urban village concept. In the longer term the Waterfront will be physically, socially and economically connected to existing communities in the wider North Edinburgh area."

Within this context the Local Development Plan (2016) identifies Western Harbour for residential led development, with Table 11 'Edinburgh Waterfront Development Principles' (page 50) setting out the development principles for of the area. The RDF (page 13) sets out how Forth Ports' proposals respond to the principles.

Form of Development

It is anticipated that around 1,100 new homes could be developed on land within Forth Ports' control. As illustrated in the RDF, the expected form of development would be flatted and would most likely comprise a combination of 1, 2 and 3 bed homes, with 20% of homes providing family accommodation. An element of supporting commercial development for local community use would be provided. Development would follow the block layout within the RDF with heights likely to range from 4 to 8 storeys. Full details of the design framework and principles are set out in the RDF.

Traffic and Transport

Forth Ports' transport advisors (SWECO) have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the site capacity in respect of traffic and transport. They have concluded that:

Western Harbour is ideally located to encourage travel by non-car modes of travel, minimising the impacts on the road network, thereby opening opportunities for higher density development;

Development supported by junction improvements at Lindsay Road will enhance pedestrian and cycle access to Western Harbour whilst reducing queuing and delays associated with further development. Improvements would be compatible with any future extension of the Edinburgh Tram;

Taking into account the benefits of the proposed Edinburgh Tram extension, the development of around 1,100 new homes (1,062) can take place;

Car parking can be provided at a lower level than the 100% assumed in the Council's parking standards (70% or lower). Phase one proposes car parking at a level of 60%;

Early discussions with public transport operators to take place to discuss opportunities to enhance provision. In this regard, discussions with Lothian Buses are already ongoing in relation to the phase one development; and

For any new planning application for the increase in housing on the site beyond that which has already got planning permission, discussions will be held with the Council to agree the need for any further assessments of the wider road network.

Flood Risk Assessment

Forth Ports' engineering advisors, ARUP, have undertaken a Flood Risk Assessment in respect of phase one (application ref: 19/00986/AMC). The Assessment confirms that the proposals would not be subject to risk of flooding. Further development proposals would apply the same principles as applied to phase one and therefore the site would not be at risk of flooding and would not result in any impact elsewhere.

Ecology

Forth Ports' ecology advisors (SLR) have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the site in respect of ecological matters and no ecological constraints to development have been identified.

Amenity

Western Harbour forms part of the City's established urban area and lies immediately to the west of the Port of Leith's operational estate. As part of their proposals for phase one, Forth Ports' acoustic advisors, New Acoustics, undertook acoustic surveys in respect of established port related, road traffic and commercial noise (ASDA) sources and the results of these surveys are set out in the Noise Impact Assessment which accompanies the residential led planning application.

The survey demonstrates that residential development is acceptable within phase one of Western Harbour, noting that amenity of future residents will be ensured through a combination of compliance with open window assessment requirement and provision of alternative means of ventilation where closed window assessment is necessary.

Representation supported by the following which will be issued to the council via email to cityplan2030@edinburgh.gov.uk:

Plan of Land for residential led development at Western Harbour; and

Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from HolderPlanning 16 October 2019 regarding Port of Leith and Western Harbour which includes appendices of relevance to Questions 5A, 12A 16E

Appendices to letter:

- Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from HolderPlanning 18 March 2019 regarding proposals for development at Western Harbour (Question 5A and 12A)
- Briefing Note Forth Ports: Port Operations and Planning Policy Framework (Question 5A, 12A 16E)
- Extracts from the Fife, Falkirk and Dundee Local Development Plans (Question 5A, 12A and 16E)
- SWECO Western Harbour, Revised Design Framework – Transport Appraisal 2018 and supporting letter (Question 5A and 12A)
- Western Harbour, Revised Design Framework (Question 5A and 12A) available at

https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/Data/Development%20Management%20Sub-Committee/20181010/Agenda/item_72_-_western_harbour_revised_design_framework.p

12B Do you support or object to any of the proposed greenfield areas? (Please tick all that apply)

Support Greenfield - Support:

Support Greenfield - Object:

Explain why:

12C Do you have a greenfield site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan?

Greenfield file upload:

No file was uploaded

Greenfield file upload:

No file was uploaded

Greenfield file upload:

No file was uploaded

12D Do you have a brownfield site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan?**Brownfield sites upload:**

124-7N-WH-XX-DR-A-05004-Land for Residential Led Development at Western ..._.pdf was uploaded

Choice 16 (part 2) - Delivering Business and Industrial Space**16E We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree?****Yes / No - Support:**

Leith Strategic Business Centre

Yes / No - Do not support:**Explain why:**

Note - for avoidance of doubt we have ticked 'support' in respect 'Leith Strategic Business Centre.' We understand this is a typographical error and should read "Leith Docks: Seafield (Eastern Leith Docks), Britannia Quay and land to the south of Edinburgh Dock." Forth Ports supports the proposal.

1. Introduction

1.1 Forth Ports supports the proposal to retain the employment designation for the Port of Leith and to extend the designation to land at Britannia Quay, Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Seafield, noting that the land has the potential for development for alternative uses should the land become surplus to operational requirements.

1.2 In supporting the designation, the language of the Policy must clearly state that the allocation is for business and industrial development which may have potential to accommodate mixed use development. Forth Ports are concerned that the Policy could be interpreted as supporting business and industrial development only as part of mixed use development.

1.3 The Port of Leith is the City's port and has been so for centuries, adapting to the City's needs over time. It is the City's gateway to the sea, providing access to shipping, which is comparably less carbon intensive form of transport than other modes. Shipping replaces many vehicle miles supporting the City's ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030. It is a resource which the City must take care to nurture, as it provides port infrastructure which cannot be easily replicated and has the potential to support appropriate brownfield development over time. The provision of appropriate access to the Port is important to ensure that the Port of Leith estate can contribute to the long term success of the City.

2. Statutory framework, NPF 3 and Enterprise Area

2.1 Forth Ports are the Statutory Harbour Authority and the Competent Harbour Authority for the Firth of Forth and perform a number of functions as prescribed by legislation (Forth Ports Authority Order Confirmation Act 1969) including overseeing of safety of navigation and licencing of all works below MHWS between the tidal limits inland and the mouth of the Firth. They operate the Forth and Tay Navigation Service which controls vessel movements on the Firths of Forth and Tay. In accordance with the Confirmation Act, Forth Ports also put in place bye-laws to protect the health, safety and security of both operators and members of the public within its operational estates. They also have a duty to ensure port facilities are securely protected in accordance with International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) code.

2.2 National Planning Framework 3 identifies the provision of additional freight handling facilities at existing and disused ports on the Firth of Forth as a National Development . In addition the Port forms part of the Low Carbon / Renewables East Enterprise Area.

3. Forth Ports Ltd

3.1 Forth Ports Ltd is a port infrastructure company and will continue to operate as such, utilising its land holdings for port related uses. Notwithstanding the Company's core business, it recognises that Edinburgh's Waterfront, including the Port of Leith is going through a period of change and this situation presents potential options going forward.

4. The Port of Leith

4.1 The Port of Leith is integral to the fabric of Leith and the City. For centuries, its operations and land holdings have responded to changing economic requirements. Forth Ports are committed to retaining the Port of Leith as a genuine 'City Port' servicing the needs of the City and wider area.

4.2 Within this context Forth Ports continue to assess how the Port can support the economy and development of the City. In addition to port operational use, Forth Ports recognises that the Port of Leith is well positioned to:

- Support 'portcentric' logistics and particularly for the construction and creative industries;
- Accommodate distribution facilities for 'last mile distribution';
- Provide industrial development sites with good proximity to the City Centre, where limited sites exist with the same locational advantage; and
- Potentially accommodate alternative uses which may include residential led development, student housing, hotel and leisure use in the south of the port estate.

4.3 At the Port, the demolition of the Imperial Grain Warehouse and the consolidation of operations have freed up land available for operational port use, in the Port's northern operational core.

Waterfront

4.4 There has been an increase in development of, and proposals for, residential development in the area, demonstrating that port-related uses, general industrial, storage and business operations can take place in proximity of one another. Proposals for the new tram line and Resolution Property's rebranding of the 'Porta' retail and leisure destination are catalysts for further change in the Waterfront area.

Potential for Change

4.5 Forth Ports will continue to utilise their land holdings at Britannia Quay and land south of Edinburgh Dock for port operational use, including the handling of cargo related to the development of Western Harbour. Within the context of the ongoing port operational use, the land in the south of the port estate (Britannia Quay and land south of Edinburgh Dock) has potential to accommodate business and industrial and port related development, as well as facilities associated with the development of Western Harbour. Forth Ports however recognise that subject to market and operational requirements, potential could arise for alternative uses which may include residential led development, student housing, hotel and leisure use and some areas may become available for such uses.

4.6 Land at Seafield has become available and is being actively marketed for business use. Forth Ports would support the development of non-port related Class 4, Class 5 and Class 6 uses. The land will remain part of the operational port estate to ensure that it can still be utilised for port use. The Seafield area (LDP ref: EW1d) is subject to a waste management/combined heat and power safeguard in the adopted LDP and Forth Ports support that such a use would be acceptable at Seafield.

4.7 It is appropriate for the next LDP to put in place a flexible policy approach, which reflects future options for the area of land which lies in the south of the Port and Seafield. This allows the Port to maximise its economic contribution to the City whilst providing flexibility for alternative uses should the land no longer be required for port operational use.

4.8 In addition to the potential changes identified above, the Port of Leith is well positioned to respond to the changing demands of transport logistics.

4.9 Trends in transport logistics include the growth of 'portcentric' logistics which provide for storage of goods at multimodal transport hubs. Goods are brought into and stored centrally at the port, rather than being transferred on to a distribution centre. Portcentric logistics provides benefits for business and the environment. For businesses, it reduces lead times, potential for damage, the number of handling stages and savings in transport costs and lower carbon emissions.

4.10 With significant levels of development ongoing across the City and the Lothians, Forth Ports recognise that the Port of Leith has the potential to function as a construction hub, providing a central location for materials including aggregate, timber and steel for example. This has the potential for further growth. In addition, Forth Ports has identified the potential to support a creative industries hub, allowing goods, including props and other equipment to be brought into and stored in the Port. The development of portcentric hubs clearly has the potential to support economic development, including creative industries within the area.

4.11 Another trend in transport logistics is the 'last mile' distribution concept which is the movement of goods from a transport hub to a final delivery destination, which is typically a residence. Land within the port estate can accommodate distribution facilities necessary to serve the high density area of Leith and beyond.

Shipping, Port Operations and Operational Trends

4.12 Sea transport is less carbon intensive than other forms of transport, on a CO2 per tonne-km basis and sea transport replaces many vehicle miles and resultant vehicle emissions from road networks.

4.13 Ports have developed based on their locational/geographical advantage and perform a range of functions. The Port of Leith is the largest enclosed deepwater port in Scotland. It provides full modern docking and cargo handling services for a range of vessels and cargoes, and provides services for:

- North Sea oil and gas including the handling of project materials;
- Agriculture and drinks industry products which support significant secondary industries and jobs locally;
- Cruise, including a dedicated cruise terminal;
- Construction e.g. aggregate;
- General bulk commodities e.g. road salt;
- Engineering e.g. supporting off-shore activities;
- Food processing e.g. Chancellot Mill;
- Vehicle e.g. import of new cars;
- Naval vessels.

4.14 Port operations can broadly be described as operations which relate to shipping and activities related to handling associated passengers and goods. These are largely industrial in nature. By their association with shipping, port operations can only take place in a port. The transitional nature of port activities requires port operators (including their agents and lessees) to handle, store and process different commodities in a flexible manner. The associated development requirements are permitted in accordance with Class 35 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992, as amended.

4.15 Forth Ports are seeing increases in demand for its infrastructure services. The demand and potential for portcentric transport logistics requires a positive planning framework, and support for Classes 4, 5 and 6 is required to fully address its potential.

4.16 The global trend towards increased processing of commodities within ports is a result of the shortening of manufacturing supply chains aligned with the competitive nature of economic activity and the need to reduce carbon emissions. Forth Ports are firmly of the view that many of these processes can be undertaken in accordance with their permitted development rights however these may not apply in all circumstances. To ensure that port operations keeps pace with global trends, it is appropriate for the LDP to support employment use within the Port. This will provide greater certainty for companies seeking to develop

their operations and create employment within the Port. The designation of the Port's operational estate for employment use, which also acknowledges that potential for development for alternative uses on land at Britannia Quay, Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Seafield, should the land become surplus to operational requirement is welcomed.

5. New Street in Leith Docks

Choices for CityPlan 2030 states, "many of the policies in our existing plan are working well. Local development plan policies and sites not mentioned in this document are not subject to consultation and most will be carried into CityPlan 2030." The MIR makes no reference to the Proposal T14 – New street in Leith Docks which is identified as, "a route for extension to Ocean Drive to support port development. ..." In absence of any detail it is not clear if the Proposal will be carried forward.

The Council seeks to maximise the potential for support development on brownfield land, ensure that everyone can share in its economic success and work towards its ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030. The Local Development Plan and Mobility Plan must therefore ensure that transport infrastructure is fit for purpose in the long-term and the principle of a proposed road connection between Seafield Road and Ocean Drive remains appropriate. Its development will ensure the northern and eastern areas of the Port will remain accessible in the long-term for port related freight movement and will support brownfield development opportunities in the area.

Ultimately, the nature of the road will be dependent on the function which it is intended to fulfil. The Council needs to provide this clarification and Forth Ports would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Council's proposals further as it progresses with preparation of the forthcoming Proposed LDP. The Council must consider the potential impact that the road's provision will have on the viability of development and support development and funding mechanisms which do not rely wholly on developer contributions.

6. Map 27 ■ Business and Industry Areas

6.1 The map identifies the land to the east of the Port for business and industry. The plan shows the outline of the Port as employment land and also marks out a 'blob' which covers Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Seafield. The Plan should also cover land at Britannia Quay.

6.2 Forth Ports submission of 16 October 2019 to the Council will be re-issued, including a plan of the port estate.

Technical Changes

As there is no option to provide a response to Technical Changes. Commentary relevant to Seafield Waste Management is therefore provided here:

Choices of CityPlan 2030 states (page 4) "many of the policies in our existing plan are working well. Local development plan policies and sites not mentioned in this document are not subject to consultation and most will be carried into CityPlan 2030."

Whilst Technical Change B sets out general policy on waste management it does not address the Seafield (LDP ref: EW1d) waste management/combined heat and power safeguard in the adopted LDP. Forth Ports consider that support for a waste management facility incorporating thermal treatment with energy recovery can be accommodated within its land at Seafield which is identified for employment use. The CityPlan should continue to support the development of the combined heat and power facility at Seafield.

Representation supported by the following which will be issued to the council via email to cityplan2030@edinburgh.gov.uk:

- Boundary of Port of Leith (Questions 1C, 5A, 8C, 12A, 16E)
- Letter to City of Edinburgh Council from HolderPlanning 16 October 2019 regarding Port of Leith and Western Harbour which includes appendices of relevance to Questions 5A, 12A 16E

Appendices to letter:

Briefing Note Forth Ports: Port Operations and Planning Policy Framework (Question 5A, 12A 16E)

Plan indicating areas of land which may become surplus to operational requirements (Question 5A and 16E)

Extracts from the Fife, Falkirk and Dundee Local Development Plans (Question 5A, 12A and 16E)

16F We want to ensure new business space is provided as part of the redevelopment of urban sites and considered in Place Briefs for greenfield sites. We want to set out the amount expected to be re-provided, clearer criteria on what constitutes flexible business space, and how to deliver it, including the location on-site, and considering adjacent uses, servicing and visibility. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Explain why:

16G We want to continue to protect industrial estates that are designated under our current policy on Employment Sites and Premises (Emp 8). Do you agree?

Yes

Explain why:

With the exception of Land South of Edinburgh Dock and Britannia Quay (and as is addressed in response to point 16E) the Port of Leith is presently covered by employment policy designation (EMP8) which allows general industrial, storage or distribution and business use to take place. The policy designation remains appropriate.

16H We want to introduce a policy that provides criteria for locations that we would support city-wide and neighbourhood goods distribution hubs. Do you agree?

Yes

Explain why:

Further details are required however, this is positive and responds to a demand for local deliveries. Such proposals can take place within areas identified for employment use.

Equalities and Rights

17 Do you think there will be any equalities or rights impacts (positive or negative) arising from the Choices?

Not Answered

Explain why:

Environmental Report

18 Do you have any comments on the environmental impacts set out in the Environmental Report arising from the Choices?

Not Answered

Please use the space below for comments.:

General Notes

1. Dimensions are in millimetres unless stated otherwise.
2. Levels are in metres AOD unless stated otherwise.
3. Dimensions govern. Do not scale off drawing.
4. All dimensions to be verified on site before proceeding.
5. All discrepancies to be notified in writing to 7N Architects LLP.

© 7N Architects LLP 2019

Land within Forth Ports control to accommodate at least 1,062 new homes and associated development.

New Park
4.4 hectares (ref: 19/01040/AMC)

Plots G, I, K, N, O, P:
938 new homes and 2,417 m² of commercial floor space including provision of a health centre (ref: 19/00986/AMC)

New Primary School

Plots D, E, F, H, J, K, L, M
Land within Forth Ports' control to accommodate at least 1,062 new homes and associated development



-	25.03.20	For Information	BW
Rev	Date	Reason For Issue	Chk

7N Architects

7 Randolph Place, Edinburgh EH3 7TE +44 (0) 131 220 5541 www.7narchitects.com

Client
Edinburgh Forthside Developments Limited

Project
Western Harbour

Drawing Title
Land for residential led development at Western Harbour

Status		
For Information		
Scale	Paper Size	Date
1 : 2000	@A1	25.03.20
Project No.	Draw No.	Rev No.
124	7N-WH-XX-DR-A-05004	-