

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

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 The DIO is concerned about the requirement for changes of use to incorporate new blue and green infrastructure. As the Council will be aware, the Redford Barracks site incorporates a number of listed buildings that may be retained and converted to residential accommodation as part of a wider scheme to redevelop the site. It would be challenging to retro-fit new blue/green infrastructure for these buildings and in terms of drainage it would be much less invasive to continue to rely upon existing systems. This policy would also be incompatible with the conversion of buildings with constrained curtilages which have little or no space to install features like swales or rain gardens. These issues will be further compounded for buildings that are listed or within conservation areas where the retro-fitting of blue/green infrastructure on the building itself, such as a green roof, would not be feasible or indeed desirable from a built heritage perspective. The DIO therefore suggests that changes of use should not be subject to this requirement, or any policy should be carefully caveated to ensure that requirements for green/blue infrastructure would take account of site constraints.

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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 The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO), which is part of the Ministry of Defence (MOD), is generally supportive of the aims of the new policy but is concerned that the requirement for new communities to have access to a 5-hectare park is excessive. This requirement may impact upon the deliverability of large development sites and undermine the other aims of City Plan 2030, as set out in Choice 2, regarding higher development densities and the efficient and effective use of land. It is also unclear how the ongoing maintenance of any large new communal spaces created under this policy would be funded. If the cost of maintenance was passed to residents/proprietors of the private sector housing in the development, bearing in mind separate proposals to increase on-site affordable housing requirements, this may create a prohibitive ongoing financial burden that will reduce the attractiveness of new developments to prospective residents. This burden could also be further increased by the cost of maintaining the allotments/food growing areas proposed as part of Choice 1. In this context, it is considered that the existing policy on open space in new development should be maintained. Should City of Edinburgh Council wish to take the 5-hectare requirement forward, the DIO suggests that the policy should only apply to large greenfield urban extensions where providing open space of this scale is more likely to be feasible. In contrast, if a 5-hectare open space was required to be accommodated within a constrained site within the existing urban envelope, such as at Redford Barracks, this could severely restrict development potential and undermine the future delivery of housing on the site.

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

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? - 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

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 Again, the DIO is supportive of the principles set out in choice 2. However, setting a minimum density requirement for all development in the city would limit the delivery of larger family housing which there is considerable demand for. Sites in suburban or edge of city locations are well placed to meet these demands and the requirement for high density developments in these locations may push demand outside the city, to potentially less sustainable locations, and undermine housing delivery. It may also result in development that is out of context with its surroundings and which compromises the character and setting of built heritage assets including conservation areas and listed buildings. Furthermore, site constraints, and the green space requirement set out in choice 1, may make the target of 65 units per hectare difficult to achieve in some locations. In that regard it is welcomed that the 'Housing Strategy' paper that accompanies 'Choices for City Plan 2030' has proposed a site-specific density for Redford that takes account of the special characteristics of the site. However, it is suggested that this site-specific approach to housing density should not be limited to Redford, but rather should continue to be applied across the city as is done presently.

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 Section 7 of the Building Standards Technical Handbook expressly excludes conversions and, given this, careful consideration should be given to the ramifications of requiring conversions to meet any of the standards, let alone the most stringent Platinum standard. The Platinum standard currently only covers carbon dioxide emissions and to meet it net emissions from new buildings requires to be zero. This would be extremely difficult to achieve for conversions, particularly for listed buildings where a conflict between requirements under this policy, and requirements under built heritage policies, is almost inevitable. These changes would also have a detrimental impact on the viability of conversion schemes which already tend to be more costly than new builds due to requirement for the use of traditional materials, specialist skills and the VAT that is applicable on building work and materials. As the Council are aware, the Ministry of Defence (MOD) building stock across Edinburgh includes numerous listed buildings and the DIO is concerned about the implications of this policy change on proposals for the conversion of some of these to mainstream residential accommodation. The DIO therefore recommends that conversions are expressly excluded from any new policy on carbon neutral buildings.

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 DIO is keen to continue to work with the Council on any future place brief for Redford Barracks. In that regard, while it is accepted that communities should play an important role in place briefs as suggested in Choice 4, it is also important that the requirements and aspirations of landowners are taken into account as part of this process.

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 The DIO also welcomes the intention of the Council to clearly set-out where contributions to improvements in community infrastructure are necessary. In that regard, the DIO would appreciate if the Council could, in due course, provide clarity regarding school infrastructure requirements in the catchments around Dreghorn Barracks, Redford Barracks and Craigiehall Barracks. With respect to Redford, the Choices paper currently suggests that a new primary school may be required to serve the redevelopment of the site but it is unclear if this would need to be accommodated on the site or elsewhere. The Choices paper is also particularly unclear about Firhill High School which is identified as having insufficient capacity to accommodate additional pupils from new development, but for which no specific solution has been identified. The DIO is concerned to ensure that the scale of school infrastructure that may be required to support the redevelopment of Redford is proportionate and reasonable and wishes to highlight that the associated costs could be prohibitive for future development. It is crucial that the next plan provides clarity on infrastructure requirements, and adopts an approach based on making best use of existing school infrastructure, to facilitate potential developments at these MOD sites.

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

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

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 DIO accepts that access to public transport and walking/cycling routes should be one of the considerations when determining applications for different development types, including residential development. However, there should also be an acceptance in the next plan that residential development, and other traffic generating uses, may be acceptable in less accessible locations where it will contribute towards the preservation and long-term retention of our built heritage. One such example is the barracks at Craigiehall which the MOD is seeking to dispose of following the 2015 Strategic Defence Review. The site contains a number of listed buildings, including several Category A Listed Buildings, and the surrounding area is a designated Designed Landscape. It is essential that a suitable long-term use for the site is found and the next plan should be supportive of its redevelopment whilst ensuring that any development preserves the special character of the site and surrounding green belt. This approach complies with Scottish Planning Policy which is supportive of positive change to listed buildings and accepts the principle of enabling development as a means of preventing the loss of these assets.

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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 It is unclear from the Choices paper whether the works to complete the River Almond walkway would impact upon any future development proposals at Craigiehall Barracks. MOD as landowner should be consulted on any proposed works in this area and any route safeguarded as part of the forthcoming City Plan 2030.

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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

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 The DIO appreciates that the affordability of housing across Edinburgh is of concern for both the Council and the local community. There appears to be a clear and significant demand for affordable housing across the city which has influenced the targets set by City of Edinburgh Council. However, the proposal to increase the affordable housing requirement from 25% to 35% on sites of 12 units or more is significant and may have a detrimental impact on the delivery of housing. This change may stifle the delivery of larger development sites, particularly in locations where profits for landowners and developers are marginal due to factors such as infrastructure and remediation costs, whilst encouraging the piecemeal development of small sites of 11 units or less. If larger sites do not come forward then this policy will have the opposite impact to that intended by actually reducing the rate of delivery of affordable housing. Section 3E of the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006 states that planning authorities must have regard to guidance issued by Scottish Ministers. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), which sets out national policies which reflect Scottish Ministers' priorities for the development and use of land, notes that "affordable housing required as a contribution within a market site should generally be no more than 25% of the total number of houses" (Paragraph 129). The blanket requirement for 35% affordable housing across the city is therefore significantly out-of-step with SPP. Whilst the Council has set out its reasons for this deviation with reference to its commitment to build 20,000 affordable homes by 2027, it is recommended that an alternative approach to help delivering these homes is considered, such as the allocation of additional land for market housing outside the urban envelope in locations such as Craigiehall Barracks, whilst retaining the 25% affordable housing requirement in line with SPP.

Customer Ref: 01234 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GFJG-5

Supporting Info

Name Nicolas Lopez

Email Nicolas.Lopez100@mod.gov.uk

Response Type Developer / Landowner

On behalf of: Defence Infrastructure Organisation

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: 01234 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GFJG-5
Name: Nicolas Lopez
Response Type: Developer / Landowner
On behalf of: Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Supporting Info:
Email: Nicolas.Lopez100@mod.gov.uk

Choice 12 A

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

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation

The DIO welcomes the support contained within Choices for City Plan 2030 for development at Redford Barracks. The estimated capacity of the site to accommodate 800 new homes, as noted in the supporting Housing Study, is considered to be appropriate as a minimum, though the DIO agrees that this should be refined through the place brief and masterplanning processes that will take place. Whichever growth strategy is pursued, DIO considers that the next plan should continue to recognise the contribution that Redford Barracks can make to the delivery of housing by making an appropriate allocation for this use. In relation to the Craigiehall Barracks site, the DIO is disappointed that it is not identified amongst the preferred sites within any of the three growth options assessed under Choice 12. To confirm, DIO have an interest as landowner in the smaller former barracks site, rather than the larger site identified in the Housing Study which appears to align with the boundary of application 18/10545/PPP by Hallam Land (see red line boundary of plan attached in response to 12D). The DIO does, however, welcome the fact that the supporting Housing Study identifies that there may be some scope, in landscape terms, for low density housing replacing existing military buildings, though notes that despite this the Housing Study does not come to any positive conclusions about the redevelopment of the former barracks in other respects. The DIO considers that a modest-scale development focussed on the sensitive re-development of the brownfield land and buildings at the barracks, which we would consider to be an established use within the green belt, would help to secure the long-term future of the numerous built heritage assets at the site, including a number of Category A Listed Buildings. The site could also make a small but significant contribution to meeting the Council's housing delivery targets. The DIO would be happy to help address any concerns about the sustainability of development taking place at the site by, for example, considering a commitment to the provision of electric vehicle infrastructure to support every home and to ensuring that new build elements meet the Platinum Standard set out in Section 7 of the Building Standards Technical Handbook as referred to in Choice 3. The development is also unlikely to produce more vehicle movements than the established military use and a small-scale residential presence at the site is already well-established. Furthermore, the DIO agrees with the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment undertaken in support of Choices for City Plan 2030 that much of Craigiehall Barracks is well contained in landscape terms and that a sensitive low density development could be accommodated without any further detriment to the character of the greenbelt or the designed landscape. Whilst any proposed development is unlikely to be of a scale that would necessitate major infrastructure works, MOD would be happy to provide a proportionate contribution to any infrastructure upgrades necessary to accommodate the development. Given the above, the DIO considers that the redevelopment of the site should be actively supported in City Plan 2030. Choices for City Plan 2030 does not currently acknowledge the importance of Service Family Accommodation to supporting the ongoing military role of Dregghorn Barracks, nor does it provide general support for military related development at Dregghorn or elsewhere. The MOD has a continued commitment to invest at Dregghorn Barracks and, to facilitate growth, the MOD seeks policy support in City Plan 2030 for any future military expansion within the base. On this basis, DIO request the inclusion of the following policy within the next local plan:

1. Proposals associated with defence and military operations will be supported at existing sites where they would enhance or sustain operational capabilities.
2. Non-military or non-defence related development within or in the areas around a defence or military site will not be supported where it would adversely affect military operations or capability,

Customer Ref:

01234

Response Ref:

ANON-KU2U-GFJG-5

Supporting Info

Name

Nicolas Lopez

Email

Nicolas.Lopez100@mod.gov.uk

Response Type

Developer / Landowner

On behalf of:

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a defence or military need for the site.

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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:

01234

Response Ref:

ANON-KU2U-GFJG-5

Supporting Info

Name

Nicolas Lopez

Email

Nicolas.Lopez100@mod.gov.uk

Response Type

Developer / Landowner

On behalf of:

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

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

Not Answered

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

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

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

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:

01234

Response Ref:

ANON-KU2U-GFJG-5

Supporting Info

Name

Nicolas Lopez

Email

Nicolas.Lopez100@mod.gov.uk

Response Type

Developer / Landowner

On behalf of:

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

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

Choice 12 D

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

Short Response

Yes

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

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

Supporting Info
Email

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 The DIO notes and welcomes the Council's continued support for the delivery of new hotels in appropriate and accessible locations under Choice 15. A potential location where a new hotel could be accommodated is Redford Barracks which contains several listed buildings that could lend themselves to sensitive conversion to a hotel. Redford is also accessibly located adjacent to several bus routes and the delivery of a new hotel would align with strong visitor demand in the city, and a lack of available city centre sites, as set out in the supporting Commercial Needs Study on Visitor Accommodation. Some of the listed buildings at Craigiehall Barracks could also be suitable for conversion to a hotel and, although it is less accessible than Redford, the development would help secure the preservation of one or more of the historic buildings at the site. Moreover, and as highlighted in our response to Choice 12, the DIO would consider providing extensive electric car infrastructure to mitigate the environmental impact of its redevelopment. The environmental impact of traffic movements associated with this use should also be considered in the context of the impact of traffic associated with the site's established and lawful use as a barracks. It is therefore recommended that any allocations for Redford, or Craigiehall, barracks' made in City Plan 2030 make reference to the suitability of these sites for accommodating hotels

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:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info
Email

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:

01234

Response Ref:

ANON-KU2U-GFJG-5

Supporting Info

Name

Nicolas Lopez

Email

Nicolas.Lopez100@mod.gov.uk

Response Type

Developer / Landowner

On behalf of:

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

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

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

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:
Name
Response Type
On behalf of:

Supporting Info
Email

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: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

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 The DIO considers that, in addition to the policy changes proposed in Choice 16, City Plan 2030 should highlight the important role the MOD has as a significant employer in the city and should be supportive of any future growth at Dreghorn Barracks. On this basis, the DIO requests the inclusion of the following policy within the next local plan:1. Proposals associated with defence and military operations will be supported at existing sites where they would enhance or sustain operational capabilities.2. Non-military or non-defence related development within or in the areas around a defence or military site will not be supported where it would adversely affect military operations or capability, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a defence or military need for the site.



Defence
Infrastructure
Organisation

ARMY HQ CRAIGIEHALL
EDINBURGH
GARRISON & SFA
PARCELS PLAN

- MOD owned boundary
- Operational area - 31.50ha
- SFA area - 7.18ha

Scale 1:5,000

IMPORTANT NOTE ABOUT SCALE
The scale ratio stated is accurate when reproduced at A3 size by Geospatial Services. Any other reproduction by conventional or electronic means, e.g. printing from a PDF, may alter the scale of the map. Please check the dimensions of the grid to confirm any change in scale before taking measurements.

PRODUCTION REFERENCE
PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE MAP REFERENCE AND VERSION NUMBER ARE QUOTED IN **ALL WRITTEN & VERBAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Map reference:
Transactional/2017/20171127-6808
Craigiehall Garrison & SFA areas
Version Number:
1
Production Date:
29.11.2017
Drawn By:
JL (DIO Data-1a1h Geo Ops Analyst)
Checked By:

GEOSPATIAL SERVICES
DATA ANALYTICS & INSIGHT
Defence Infrastructure Organisation
St George's House
Kingston Road
SUTTON COLDFIELD B75 7RL
E-MAIL: DIO Data-Geo Svcs@mod.uk

