

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 Dandara support increased connectivity and agree that new development can contribute to this. However, the delivery of green and blue infrastructure needs to fairly and reasonably relate to the development proposed. For example green and blue infrastructure may not be suitable on certain types of development and as such their delivery should be site specific. Likewise, depending on the location of development it may not be possible, depending on the neighboring land uses, for it to connect to green / blue networks. Where a specific site cannot deliver such connectivity it should not be prejudiced against.

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 Dandara do not agree that all development should include green and blue infrastructure. It will not be possible for all sites to include this. For instance, certain brownfield sites will struggle to deliver natural drainage based solutions. Accordingly, the delivery of green and blue infrastructure should be assessed on a site by site basis and a cart blanche approach should not be adopted. The delivery of green and blue infrastructure should be an aspiration and where it is not possible or feasible development should not be prejudiced against as the objective should be the delivery of much needed new homes.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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:

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? - 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: 01215 Response Ref: BHLF-KU2U-GPFB-6
Name: Natasha Douglas
Response Type: Developer / Landowner
On behalf of:

Supporting Info: Yes
Email: ndouglas@dandara.com

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: Not Answered

Explanation
Dandara support the efficient use of land and would agree that higher densities are appropriate in areas with good public transport. However, Dandara do not support the proposal to apply minimum densities at the proposed rates, namely 65 units per ha and 100 units per ha in high density areas, as identified on Map 2 -Edinburgh's urban density. Applying a broad brush approach to density requirements will severely restrict developers from delivering a range and variety of homes. Not only will this mean that Developers are forced to deliver a product that the market may not want but it will have further implications for designs. Sites will only be suitable for either slim dwellings or flatted properties. This would go against the grain of what SPP is seeking to achieve in paragraph 36 which states: 'Planning's purpose is to create better places. Placemaking is a creative, collaborative process that includes design, development, renewal or regeneration of our urban or rural built environments. The outcome should be sustainable, well-designed places and homes which meet people's needs'. Indeed, the adoption of such high minimum densities would also appear to lack compliance with SPP's requirement that 'Planning should support development that is designed to a high-quality, which demonstrates the six qualities of successful place'. Whilst it is imperative that land is efficiently used, and this is controlled through the planning process, it is contended that each site should be considered on its merits and distinct characteristics. Accordingly, densities will change from site to site with some sites supporting a lower density, with others supporting higher densities. Dandara would highlight that the delivery of a mix of dwelling as directed by the Edinburgh Design Guidance would be challenging should the proposed Plan adopt a minimum density. The two would be at odds with one another. Furthermore, the minimum densities proposed would be in conflict with the delivery of green and blue infrastructure. Dandara support proposals to encourage a variety of uses however, do not agree that a vertical mix of uses support the efficient use of land. The policy would not be deliverable nor realistic and fails to take into consideration area requirements such as impact on existing retail offerings. Dandara accept that a vertical mix of uses may be appropriate in some locations but the policy needs to be applied realistically with the appreciation that it will not be viable in all locations. Dandara would note that any policy concerning site density need to be sufficiently flexible that it can adapt to the differing characteristics of each site to ensure that a high quality place, where people want to live is delivered.

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 Dandara support development proposals that deliver the six qualities of successful place as cited in SPP. However, reserve the right to comment further once a revised policy is available for review.

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 Dandara are supportive that new development deliver quality open space however, would note that the densities proposed are too high to deliver both dwelling and external amenity space. Proposals need to be assessed on a site by site basis. For example lower densities with higher areas of open space may be suitable in areas where open space provision is poor. In comparison in areas where there is good access to open space higher densities and lower open space requirements may be more suitable. Each site needs to be assessed on its merit in order to deliver the six qualities of successful space as directed by SPP.

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 Dandara recognise the importance of addressing climate change, however believe that policy is more appropriately be addressed through Building Regulations rather than through the Local Development Plan. The requirements regarding reduction and the calculation of those reductions are complex and the Policy is in effect duplicating other controls.

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 Dandara wish to note their concern regarding the preparation of Place Briefs for areas and sites within the proposed Plan. Instead Dandara consider that further engagement with communities is required at proposed Plan stage in order to fully engage communities in the planning of their localities. Dandara consider that landowner and developer involvement are imperative to ensure that Place Briefs are realistic and deliverable. Dandara also express concern regarding the requirement for development to fund healthcare facilities. This is entirely unacceptable. Many GP practices operate from privately owned facilities and it is entirely inappropriate to expect the development industry to fund the extension of existing privately-owned premises. In any event, healthcare is funded by Central Government through taxation and differs significantly from other locally funded infrastructure, such as roads and education.

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

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

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

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

Supporting Info
Email

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: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info
Email

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 Dandara express their reservation at this approach and would ask that further detail is provided so a meaningful response can be given. Dandara wish to would note their concern that any cumulative contribution zone would fail to take account of individual site and local circumstances. Reservation is expressed regarding the proposal to seek contributions to address the cumulative impact of development. Contributions from this are intended to support agreed improvements in the areas which are a consequence of new developments in that area. This results in the costs of mitigating the cumulative impacts being spread across a wide area with no single development being responsible for the entire cost of a specific infrastructure improvement. This is in effect, a 'roof tax', and there will inevitably be some winners and losers in this approach. A similar approach introduced by Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Planning Authority sought contributions to address the cumulative impact on the transport network of the significant scale of development planned for the Aberdeen City Region. The Strategic Transport Fund Supplementary Guidance was challenged on the basis that it failed to comply with Scottish Government Circular 3/2012. The developers argued that it lacked the direct relationship between the level of contribution sought and the impact of development. Both the Court of Session and The Supreme Court accepted this and quashed the Guidance, considering it to be unlawful.

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 Dandara are supportive of this however further detail is required at proposed plan stage so that contributions and the rationale for them can be fully understood.

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

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: Response Ref:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info
Email

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 Further detail is required on this in order to provide a meaningful response. Dandara would note that parking levels and car use habits may differ on a site by site basis. For example a proposal for student accommodation in the center of Edinburgh will require significantly less car parking than a proposal for family housing on the fringe of the city. It is important that any policy pertaining to car parking takes cognisance of that and the availability of public transport, walking and cycle routes. Dandara note that it is important that any targets for trips are realistic. Measures to control on street parking, such as traffic wardens, are not considered to be viable due to the cost implications associated with this; which would be borne by The City of Edinburgh Council.

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 Further detail clearly delineating the boundary of the city center is required in order to provide a meaningful response. Dandara reserve the right to provide a response once this information is available.

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

Supporting Info
Email

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

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 Dandara take issue with this. Whilst Dandara support development that protects the wellbeing of students it is considered that the proposals are unrealistic and do not take account of market forces. Student accommodation can be privately delivered yet the proposed policy makes no account for this. Dandara can see no reason why the policy cannot be amended to remove the requirement that student accommodation be managed by one of Edinburgh's Universities or Colleges. Privately managed student residences make a valuable contribution to housing Edinburghs many students and should be encouraged. Doing so creates choice of accommodation for students. Dandara take issue with the proposed policy dictating that proposals should have a maximum of 10% studio apartments. It is important that a mix of unit type be created and this should be market lead. Doing so offers a choice of accommodation for students and provides accommodation to suit various budgets.

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 Dandara take issue with this. SPP is clear that 'Planning should direct development to the right place'. Adopting a policy that dictates that housing must be provided on all sites over a certain size fails to do this. There will be uses on such sites that are bad neighbor development where residential uses are not appropriate. Furthermore the requirement for 50% of the site to be for Residential use may render proposals unviable. If The City of Edinburgh Council are seeking to increase the delivery of new homes Dandara would suggest that additional land is released for development.

Customer Ref: 01215 Response Ref: BHLF-KU2U-GPFB-6
Name: Natasha Douglas
Response Type: Developer / Landowner
On behalf of:

Supporting Info: Yes
Email: ndouglas@dandara.com

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: Not Answered

Explanation: Dandara support the flexibility that The City of Edinburgh Council appear to be promoting to increase the delivery of new homes however, in practice this policy would only be pertinent if such a site were to be redeveloped. Should such a situation arise it may not be viable to redevelop the site and include retail use. If The Edinburgh City Council are seeking to increase the delivery of new homes Dandara would suggest that additional land is released for development.

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

Supporting Info
Email

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 Dandara do not dispute the need for affordable housing in Edinburgh however they take issue with the approach taken by the Plan to increase the requirement to provide 35% affordable housing. SPP directs that the Local Development Plan should clearly set out the scale and distribution of the affordable housing requirements for their area. It makes a clear statement that "...the level of affordable housing required as a contribution within a market site should generally be no more than 25% of the total number of houses". The inference to be drawn from this is that the affordable housing needs should be identified up to the benchmark figure of 25%. At paragraph 129 SPP advises that Planning Authorities should consider the level of affordable housing contribution which is likely to be deliverable in the current economic climate, as part of a viable housing development. In formulating policy The City of Edinburgh Council appear to have had little regard to the wider economic climate confronting the housebuilding industry; and indeed the country. Only now is the industry beginning to emerge from the 2008-2009 recession with build rates gradually increasing, but still falling well short of pre-recession levels. The recovery in the housing market has also been compounded as a result of the change in stamp duty to the land & buildings transaction tax, which has further slowed the market at the higher end as potential purchasers have to finance significantly more than previously. This is notwithstanding the uncertainty created by Brexit and effect of this on the market. Given that affordable housing provision is dependent upon the delivery of mainstream housing, it is imperative that consideration be given to the economic climate when formulating policy and negotiating the level of onsite provision. It benefits neither the development industry nor the Planning Authority, in terms of its requirement to deliver affordable housing, if development is stifled by the policy requirements of the Local Development Plan. The policy as proposed places the burden of delivering affordable housing firmly on housebuilders and landowners. It is contended that the policy should take a more proactive approach in terms of identifying and allocating specific sites for affordable housing. Planning Advice Note 2/2010 promotes four additional or alternative means of delivering affordable housing which could be considered. These include: 1. Allocating new sites in the Local Development Plan specifically for affordable housing; 2. Identifying plots for self-build dwellings; 3. Using compulsory purchase powers to support the delivery of a new supply and regeneration; 4. Making appropriate surplus Local Authority land or buildings available for affordable housing. Given the encouragement and mechanisms available to The City of Edinburgh Council to take a more proactive approach to the delivery of affordable housing, this should be reflected through the proposed Local Development Plan. In those areas where demand is high for affordable housing the proposed Plan should identify specific sites for such provision and the method by which they will be delivered. Increasing the percentage of affordable housing across the board does guarantee a greater delivery of affordable housing as more marginal developments will not come forward. Furthermore, the greater percentage of affordable on site the less contributions

Customer Ref: 01215 Response Ref: BHLF-KU2U-GPFB-6
Name: Natasha Douglas
Response Type: Developer / Landowner
On behalf of:

Supporting Info: Yes
Email: ndouglas@dandara.com

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 Dandara support that development should deliver a mix of housing types and tenures however do not feel that the plan need be so specific that it is prescriptive on required mix and the percentage required for family housing. The policy should direct its focus on achieving a quality place delivering a choice of home which will ultimately be dictated by market forces. The best way of securing a mix of housing types is to allocate a variety of sites in different locations. Dandara would also highlight the conflict between this proposal and earlier proposals to increase the minimum densities to 65 / 100 units per hectare; which if taken forward would not deliver a mix of house types.

Choice 12 A

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

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation To secure the delivery of much needed homes within Edinburgh, including affordable homes, as well as an appropriate level of amenity space Dandara support a land release that is predominantly greenfield but with brownfield sites included within the urban areas as windfall allocations. Residential development is more compatible on greenfield sites than commercial development. This is due to their location and nature. Whilst residential development should be considered on brownfield sites consideration should also be given to their redevelopment for commercial uses.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

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

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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 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 D**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

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

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

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

Supporting Info
Email

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

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

Supporting Info
Email

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

Choice 16 A2

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

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

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

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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

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

Customer Ref: 01215 Response Ref: BHLF-KU2U-GPFB-6

Name: Natasha Douglas

Response Type: Developer / Landowner

On behalf of:

Supporting Info: Yes

Email: ndouglas@dandara.com
