

Customer Ref: 01746      Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W

Name: Ross Manson

Response Type: Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

Supporting Info:

Email: ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

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:

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:

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

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

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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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 Watkin Jones Group is supportive of this policy principle, as higher density development improves the viability and vitality of an area. The principles of new urbanism should be promoted through the Local Development Plan to create diverse and vibrant communities with a mixture of uses. Where local amenities, employment and/ or studying opportunities are accessible to a site by non-car modes, higher density development should be encouraged. Not only will higher densities help City of Edinburgh Council deliver private housing, more affordable homes will be built as a result. Increasing densities in the urban area will also mitigate against urban sprawl into the greenbelt and other greenfield sites. The densities stated in the revised policy are not particularly dense and do not make efficient use of limited space. 100 dwellings per hectare is similar in density to a Victorian 4-storey perimeter block in Marchmont. This is not a particularly dense minimum for high-density urban areas. Densities should be maximised but also informed by the surrounding context to utilise scarce urban development sites and, where appropriate, should look to increase building heights and densities.

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**

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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** The Watkin Jones Group agrees that an appropriate provision of private external open space and appropriate and proportionate improvements to the public realm should be included in or provided by purpose-built student accommodation. PBSA has a high level of internal amenity and is less reliant on large areas of useable greenspace. As the students are provided with high quality internal amenity, the external amenity requirement should be lower than mainstream housing. Generally, a qualitative approach to assessing open space and public realm in proposals should be adopted instead of a quantitative assessment as quality multi-purpose spaces can increase development density and promote greater social interaction. The appropriateness of drying areas in all development is not always practicable nor required and should not be a mandatory policy requirement. This should be assessed on a case by case basis.

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**

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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

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

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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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



Customer Ref: 01746 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W

Name Ross Manson

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

Supporting Info

Email ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

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 Not Answered

Explanation Not Answered

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 Not Answered

Explanation Not Answered

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

Supporting Info   
Email

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** The Watkin Jones Group agree that development should contribute to an increase in sustainable transport usage. It would be appropriate to measure the public transport usage of an area and target a percentage increase over the lifetime of the plan. The Local Development Plan should define the transport usage targets using a tiered approach (city-wide, district and local) for specific types of development, much like the parking standards in the Edinburgh Design Guidance. This will ensure that applications in different locations for varying uses throughout Edinburgh will not be held to a single standard of assessment. Proposals adjacent to sustainable transport corridors should be considered more favourably if they are designed to take advantage of public transport, cycling and walking routes. Along these transport corridors there is an opportunity to increase the density of development and greater potential to reduce the reliance on private cars.

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**

Customer Ref: 01746      Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W  
Name: Ross Manson  
Response Type: Agent / Consultant  
On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

Supporting Info:   
Email: ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

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: No

**Explanation** The targets must be informed. The current cycle parking standards for housing and student accommodation are onerous and have the potential to result in large areas of inactive frontages and dead space on the ground floor of buildings, where more family friendly flats, DDA flats, or alternative ground floor uses could be located. If the cycle parking is not within the building it will be located externally which can reduce the area of useable amenity space. 100% cycle parking provision for student accommodation is not guaranteed to translate into 100% cycle usage as many students will also travel by alternative means such as walking or public transport. The LDP standards for cycle parking provision should align with BREEAM, which is the world's leading sustainability assessment and certification scheme. BREEAM requires a 50% cycle parking provision on new student accommodation developments, and this is recognised throughout the world as a sustainable standard. In our Client's experience, cycle parking usage in student accommodation is typically used by up to 25% of the residents. Where sites proposed for PBSA are located on direct public transport routes to the intended university or college the cycle parking provision should be reconsidered, allowing a reduction in on-site provision to 1 space per 3 students. To offset the on-site provision the applicant may also propose a bike-hire facility that will benefit the future residents and the existing community through new sustainable transport infrastructure. An independent study should be undertaken to inform the level of cycle parking associated with student accommodation and general housing as the uptake also depends on the existing or planned cycle infrastructure in the area and not just the availability of storage. The Watkin Jones Group encourages a proportionate approach to defining cycle parking levels informed by the location of the proposal in relation to direct public transport routes to the university or college (e.g shopping) required by students on a daily basis. In terms of private car parking, student accommodation development does not require parking spaces and students are expected to sign-up to lease agreements strongly encouraging them from not using cars within the city, which alongside a number of other initiatives (e.g. travel plans, cycle parking, locating development close to the facilities required by students) ensures that students do not require a car. The Watkin Jones Group has taken this approach on numerous projects and find it an effective way of controlling private car usage. Although private car ownership is likely to be higher in build to rent and private residential development, car ownership is generally in decline and it is now common across the UK for residential developments in highly accessible locations to be car free. These dwelling types should be assessed against target occupiers, location, accessibility of the site by non-car modes to local amenities/ facilities and places of work, measures proposed by the development to minimise car usage, as well as the surrounding context.

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:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

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

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? - Upload new cycle routes**

Short Response

Explanation

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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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**

The Watkin Jones Group agree with what the policy is trying to achieve, however, the specific requirements of the policy are onerous and cause particular concern for a provider of high-quality purpose built managed student accommodation like the Watkin Jones Group. The requirements will exclude privately built and managed student accommodation from the marketplace and goes against PBSA trends throughout the UK, where universities/HEIs have decreased investment in building new student accommodation or refurbishing existing stock, which has meant a reduction in student accommodation provided directly by universities/ HEIs. This has allowed private specialist developers and operators like the Watkin Jones Group to fill this gap, enabling universities to focus funds on improving their academic offer. Alongside this, there has been a UK wide trend whereby an increasing number of students (particularly later years students) now choose PBSA over other forms of student accommodation (e.g. uncontrolled HMOs) for a variety of reasons including quality of accommodation, location, and rents are inclusive of bills providing more cost certainty. Removing privately provided PBSA from the market could therefore have disastrous effects on Edinburgh staying at the forefront of places to study in the UK, with the quality and range of student accommodation being key factors in whether a student chooses to stay in a city/ town or not. The Watkin Jones Group has invested significantly in Edinburgh and have built and manage some of the best accommodation in the city, offering choice to the high number of domiciled and non-domiciled students in Edinburgh. Students are attracted to Edinburgh because of the excellent tuition and courses on offer at the Higher Education Institutes (“HEIs”) and the high standard of accommodation throughout the city. To maintain the level of students studying at the universities and colleges, Edinburgh must maintain its attractiveness as a place to live and study. The policy requirements would see the demise of privately built and managed student accommodation in Edinburgh, resulting in a less competitive PBSA market with an anticipated increase in HMO properties occupied by students. The policy creates an unreasonably controlled market for PBSA that is restricting private developer and operator opportunities in Edinburgh, effectively allowing the universities and HEIs to control the market. We consider each of the policy proposals in turn below: 1) New purpose-built student accommodation to be located on a direct walking, cycling, or public transport route to its intended university or college. The Watkin Jones Group agrees with this requirement because it promotes the use of sustainable transport and directs student housing to areas with good access to walking, cycling and public transport routes. It may be construed that student accommodation must be located immediately adjacent to a bus or cycle route, which is not always achievable. Other ways to consider the accessibility of student accommodation should also be considered (e.g. whether it is within walking or cycling distance of the intended university or college and, if this is not achievable, whether it is within a reasonable walking distance of public transport facilities which provide access to the intended university or college). 2) To deliver market and affordable housing as part of the mix. The Watkin Jones Group support the delivery of housing throughout Edinburgh, however, the requirement for 50% of the gross floor area to be mainstream residential should be considered on a case by case basis and should be informed by a number of factors, including the market requirement for accommodation in that location, proximity and accessibility by non-car modes to universities/ HEIs. In some locations, it may be better for most or all of developments to be for student accommodation. 3) To be built for, and managed by, one of Edinburgh’s

Customer Ref: 01746      Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W  
Name: Ross Manson  
Response Type: Agent / Consultant  
On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

Supporting Info:   
Email: ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

universities or colleges and,The Watkin Jones Group strongly disagree with this requirement as it will discourage investment in the city and would burden the universities/ HEIs with the management and maintenance of a significant number of student bedspaces. As detailed earlier, this is opposed to national trends whereby universities are decreasing the amount of student accommodation that they own and operate leaving this to the private sector, so that they can use their land and funds to continually improve their academic offer. It also opposes trends where more students, from all years of study, are choosing PBSA over other forms of student accommodation (e.g uncontrolled HMOs) for the reasons stated earlier. Students are entitled to a choice of accommodation and should not be restricted to a building managed by the same institution they attend.City of Edinburgh Council’s Student Housing Schedule 2017 states there were 18,988 purpose-built bedspaces in Edinburgh at the end of 2017 and circa 58,000 full-time students attending the four universities. It is acknowledged that some students may live at home, however the figures clearly show the supply of PBSA is significantly exceeded by the number of students attending university in Edinburgh. In comparison with other cities where there is well in excess of 50% students residing in PBSA or halls, it also demonstrates a significant undersupply of managed student accommodation in the city. To meet the demand and provide students with a variety of types and costs of accommodation, private operators must not be excluded from the marketplace.A suitable alternative to this subsection of the policy is the requirement for applicants to demonstrate a need and demand for student accommodation in a defined area.4) Deliver a maximum of 10% studio flats.The Watkin Jones Group disagree with the restriction on a student’s choice of accommodation. Studio accommodation is suited to the needs of mature, 2nd-Year, 3rd–Year and post graduate students and provides a secure, independent and well-managed environment. The needs of students must be met by providing a range of accommodation choices.It is inappropriate to single out one form of student accommodation without any evidence to support the approach. Studios have and will hopefully continue to be part of a mix of accommodation in terms of format, specification and pricing models, and as such it is inappropriate to specify limitations on any particular form of student accommodation. The policy approach should focus on the principle of the use being demonstrated as acceptable, rather than the form of accommodation within it.The approach also fails to acknowledge the wider role of studio style accommodation in terms of futureproofing, and suitability for conversion to BTR, co-living etc, all of which are likely to play an increasing role in the housing mix in the future. The consideration of alternative uses from the outset is a sustainable approach and can safeguard against future unforeseen fluctuations in demand for student accommodation, and for specific products.

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



Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

**Explanation** 35% on-site affordable housing may have an adverse effect on development viability in the city. Due to already high land values in the city the affordable housing requirements should remain at 25% or lower and the higher percentage requirements should be on greenfield sites only. This approach makes it more attractive for developers to build on brownfield sites in the city before considering cheaper and less risky greenfield sites. If the 35% requirement is progressed, applicants should be afforded flexibility in terms of the tenures and definitions of affordable housing, as well as being able to detail the viability of the development for the Council's review and consideration if they are unable to provide the policy requirement. This is particularly pertinent to Build to Rent projects where investors may wish to retain ownership and management of the buildings and offer residents with consistent services and ensure the affordable housing is tenure blind. Indeed, it is now commonly acknowledged that affordable housing within BTR products is provided as a discount market rent product (typically 20% provision at 20% less than market rent) and national policy in England is reflective of this.

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

Explanation

Choice **12 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01746 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W

Supporting Info

Name Ross Manson

Email ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

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

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 Not Answered

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 Not Answered

Explanation

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

Customer Ref: 01746 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W

Supporting Info

Name Ross Manson

Email ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

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 Not Answered

Explanation

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 Not Answered

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 Not Answered

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01746

Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W

Supporting Info

Name Ross Manson

Email ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

Choice 12 BX

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

Short Response Not Answered

Explanation Not Answered

Choice 12 C

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

Short Response No

Explanation

Choice 12 C

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

Short Response No

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 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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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



Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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

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

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

Supporting Info   
Email

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

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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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

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

Customer Ref: 01746

Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W

Supporting Info

Name Ross Manson

Email ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

Response Type Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

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 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? - 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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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

Explanation

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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

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

Supporting Info   
Email

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

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

Customer Ref:  Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

Explanation

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



Customer Ref: 01746      Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWG1-W  
Name: Ross Manson  
Response Type: Agent / Consultant  
On behalf of: Watkin Jones Group

Supporting Info:   
Email: ross.manson@mansonplanning.co.uk

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:

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:

Explanation: