

Customer Ref:

01643

Response Ref:

ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N

Supporting Info

Name

Virginia Sharp

Email

virginia.sharp@hes.scot

Response Type

Key Agency

On behalf of:

Historic Environment Scotland

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

Not Answered

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

Not Answered

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

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

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 We recognise that bold measures are required to help deliver Scotland's climate change targets. We support your aspirations for high standards in new buildings and conversions, and are broadly supportive of the proposal that such development should meet the Platinum (zero carbon) standard, where feasible. In the case of conversions of traditional and historic buildings, it will be important for your plan recognise that different, flexible, informed approaches which understand the nature of the building may be required to achieve a zero carbon conversion which is successful and sustainable in the long term. In a limited number of cases, it may not be technically feasible to achieve the required standard without causing significant detrimental impacts on the fabric and / or the cultural significance of a historic building. Your plan should therefore recognise that in some cases, exemptions or lower standards will be the appropriate approach.

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 We are very supportive of your proposal to work with local communities to prepare Place Briefs for areas and sites within City Plan 2030. This will offer the opportunity to put placemaking at the heart of every development, improving outcomes. The findings of the environmental assessment of both the Choices and Proposed Plan phases of the development planning process should be the basis of the development of any Place Brief. We have provided detailed comments on the adequacy of the environmental assessment for this purpose in our Environmental Report response via the SEA gateway. We would welcome early engagement on the development of all Place Briefs where historic environment assets within our statutory planning remit will be affected.

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N
Name: Virginia Sharp
Response Type: Key Agency
On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

Supporting Info:
Email: virginia.sharp@hes.scot

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: We welcome your aspiration to support communities to develop Local Place Plans which can influence the development of Place Briefs. Local Place Plans offer communities a key opportunity to identify elements of the local historic environment which are important and valued by the community, and for them to set out their aspirations for those historic environment assets as their places evolve and develop. You can support communities by signposting and supporting use of tools and advice such as the Place Standard and forthcoming Historic Environment Scotland advice on how to recognise local heritage. The development of Place Briefs should be informed by Local Place Plans, or have the flexibility to respond to them, in cases where the Place Brief is in place before the Local Place Plan has been developed. You should also help communities to understand how Place Briefs might affect and inform their place planning.

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: 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

Choice 6 A

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **6 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **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

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

Choice 10 A

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice **10 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N

Name: Virginia Sharp

Response Type: Key Agency

On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

Supporting Info:

Email: virginia.sharp@hes.scot

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: Not Answered

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N
Name: Virginia Sharp
Response Type: Key Agency
On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

Supporting Info:
Email: virginia.sharp@hes.scot

Choice 12 A

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

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation

We consider that Option A has the potential for positive effects on the historic environment, as many proposed brownfield sites provide opportunities for the sustainable reuse, or continued use, of historic buildings and places. However, many of the sites also have potential for negative effects on the historic environment without the implementation of robust mitigation. It is not currently clear from the environmental assessment to what extent positive effects might be achieved, and how far negative effects might be mitigated. We have provided detailed comments on this issue in our separate Environmental Report response via the SEA gateway. We have also provided detailed comments on some specific brownfield sites below. You should use these comments to inform the plan as it moves towards Proposed Plan stage. Option B has the potential for negative effects on several historic environment assets, although we consider that it would be possible to mitigate these to an acceptable level. As it is not yet known which of the sites from Option A and Option B might be blended for the Option C approach, we are not able to take a view on the potential impacts of this option at this point. In summary, we consider that Option A offers the most scope for positive effects for the historic environment, and also for the historic environment to play a key part in successful placemaking for these sites. Optimisation of the potential of Option A will depend on the establishment of Place Briefs which fully understand the cultural significance of any heritage assets within or adjacent, and which incorporate robust measures which maximise potential positive effects and minimise potential negative effects. Comments on specific brownfield sites: Site 137: Sandport Place The existing frontage buildings to Quayside street to the North make a positive contribution to the CA and therefore we would recommend their retention. The site is adjacent to Category A listed St Ninians Manse and Quayside Mills. If proposals come forward, we anticipate that development in this area could potentially have negative impacts on the setting of this building. The tower of St Ninian's Manse is a local landmark with views visible across the Water of Leith from Coalhill and Sandport Place & Bridge. Site 146: Logie Green Road This site contains a C listed building (LB52516). We are content with the principle of allocation, provided that the Place Brief requires retention and sensitive reuse of building. The later extension to the listed building and the freestanding house, No.64, could be demolished and redeveloped. Site 147: McDonald Road We would welcome repair and reuse of the B listed building LB44782, which is also a Building at Risk. The building may not immediately lend itself to housing conversion so will need an architect experienced in sensitive conversion. Site 382: Steads Place The two-storey building fronting Leith Walk, along with the abutment to the now removed railway bridge, make a positive contribution to the conservation area. The presumption should be for their retention. Site 369: Murrayburn Road (Murrayburn Motors) Scheduled Monument 11097 (Union Canal Fountainbridge to River Almond) is located partially within this site. We would be content with the principle of development here, if the site boundary were redrawn to omit the scheduled area. This would not necessarily exclude landscaping works that did not affect the archaeological remains of the filled-in section of canal, but we would advise any applicant to engage with us in pre-application discussions to determine what may be acceptable. We would also highlight that we appreciate there may be confusion relating to the fact the scheduled area does not encompass the modern canal which was reinstated in a different location. We would expect to be consulted on any development for our interest in the setting of the monument. Site 406: Crosswinds runway We consider much of the site could be developed but the setting of A listed Castle Gogar should be protected (and mitigated) as far as possible. The A listed building has

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N

Name Virginia Sharp

Response Type Key Agency

On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

Supporting Info

Email virginia.sharp@hes.scot

already seen enabling development in its immediate vicinity. We would expect the listed building to be fully taken account of in any planning and layout of the new site. The first floor former Great Hall of the house was designed to overlook the land to the East and the drawing room (with bay window) to overlook land to the North. New development could be mitigated by leaving open land adjacent to the castle and by respecting the eastern and northern views from the principal first floor rooms by e.g. by leaving corridors of open land across the site and perimeter planting to new housing.

Choice 12 B1

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

Short Response Not Answered

Explanation

Choice 12 B2

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

Short Response Not Answered

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **12 B3**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B4**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B5**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N
Name: Virginia Sharp
Response Type: Key Agency
On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

Supporting Info:
Email: virginia.sharp@hes.scot

Choice 12 B6

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

Short Response:

Explanation

Choice 12 B7

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

Short Response:

Explanation

Choice 12 B8

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

Short Response:

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N

Name Virginia Sharp

Response Type Key Agency

On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

Supporting Info

Email virginia.sharp@hes.scot

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: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N

Name: Virginia Sharp

Supporting Info:

Email: virginia.sharp@hes.scot

Response Type: Key Agency

On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

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

We have the following comments to offer on the proposed greenfield sites: Site 16: Drum South This site is located to the south of the railway line, which forms the southern boundary of the GDL and is just outside the Inventory boundary. This area was historically part of The Drum designed landscape but has been physically separated from it since the railway was constructed in the 19th century. This southern area is important in the understanding of the estate and how it functioned, and development would in effect encircle the estate with housing. If this site was to be developed, it would be essential to retain a green wedge of undeveloped land that runs SE from Drum House. This would ensure that the immediate setting of the Category A-listed mansion house and its GDL was protected, as long views SE towards the Lammermuir Hills are a significant element of the design. On this basis, we are content with the principle of development of this site, subject to appropriate design, layout and screening. If these sites were to be allocated in the LDP, we would be happy to discuss mitigation measures in further detail.

Site 17: Drum North This proposed allocation is composed of 3 separate areas:

- The most northerly area lies to the north of the boundary of the Inventory designed landscape. A stone boundary wall divides this area from the existing Drum policies to the south. This wall was built at some point around 1800 and marks the partial contraction of the designed landscape at that date, when a northern section of the estate was sold off and exploited for coal mining. The wall now divides the core designed landscape from land formerly associated with 19th century colliery workings. We are content with the principle of development in this location, as the area has long been disassociated from the Inventory Designed Landscape and could be perceived as relating more to the urban character of the 20th century housing at Ferniehill to the north, especially given the topography of site which slopes down to the north. There may be some opportunity as part of any housing development to reinstate a lost design element of the 18th century designed landscape. The southern section of the proposed development site immediately adjacent to early 19th century boundary wall was once the location of woodland with allees centred on the now lost outlook tower. This tower, part of Adam's original design, was located at the top of the north avenue and acted as both an eye catcher from the house and a viewpoint from which to survey the panoramic views north over Edinburgh, the Firth of Forth and beyond. There may be some opportunity to replant some woodland with radial vistas as part of any development plans for this site. If this site were to come forward in the LDP, we would be happy to discuss mitigation measures in further detail.
- The second area is located on the SE side of the GDL, within its boundary. The proposed allocation site is located on the SE edge of the GDL in an area bounded by the former railway line to the south, by the estate boundary wall and Dalkeith Road to the east and is bounded to the north by open parkland, currently in agricultural use, and is edged by belts of trees, including some areas of conifer plantations, which together with the proposed development site, form the outer parks of the GDL. A strip of land that runs from the East Drive to the south along the inside of the boundary wall of the estate is also included in this proposed allocation, which may form an access to the development site. Development in this location would have a direct impact on The Drum GDL. It would change the character of this part of the GDL from open fields to developed land. It would also be visible in views from the East Driveway, which is one of the principal planned approaches to the Category A-listed Drum House through the GDL. The East Drive sweeps from the paired classical East Lodges on the Dalkeith Road, along a gently winding drive which is initially wooded but then opens out give views south over open fields and more distant hills, before sweeping back through

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N

Supporting Info

Name Virginia Sharp

Email virginia.sharp@hes.scot

Response Type Key Agency

On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

trees as it approaches the House. The western edge of the site could also be visible from the main southern views from the house itself, a critical part of the designed landscape. We consider that, with adequate mitigation, some housing development could be accommodated in the extreme south-eastern corner of the proposed allocation site without significant adverse impact on the GDL. This should be preferably accessed from Drum South. In order to reduce impacts on views from the East Drive and house, we consider that any development would need to be of a low density, carefully sited and mitigated using a planted buffer. Successful mitigation would be likely to involve significant reduction of indicative housing unit numbers for this site, and this should be taken into consideration if the site is being considered for inclusion in the LDP. If this mitigation cannot be achieved, we would not support the site's allocation.

The final area is located immediately to the SW of the GDL. The GDL lies immediately to the north and east of the proposed site. We understand that this site was subject to a planning permission in principle application which HES did not object to. This application was refused by CEC and the subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Scottish Government in February 2017. This site is immediately adjacent to the boundary of the GDL, and forms part of the view towards the designed landscape from Gilmerton Road. We consider that, with adequate mitigation, some housing development could be accommodated without significant adverse impact on the setting of the GDL. In order to reduce impacts on views towards and out from the GDL (particularly in the West Drive area) we consider that any development would need to be of a low density, carefully sited (focusing on the SE area of the site) and mitigated through the use of a planted buffer. Successful mitigation would be likely to involve significant reduction of indicative housing unit numbers for this site, and this should be taken into consideration if the site is being considered for inclusion in the LDP. If this mitigation cannot be achieved, we would not support the site's allocation.

Sites 34 and 36: Craigbrae and Conifox A listed Carlowrie House was designed with an approach from the SW with the main elevations taking in views to the SE and more contained views over a formal garden to the W/SW. There would have been limited views from, and to, the House from the W and NW where the two development sites are located. (extensions to Kirkliston). Therefore, we are content with the principle of development but mitigation can be provided by planting anew on the southern and eastern perimeters of site 36 (Conifox). Site 82: Bonnington A listed Bonnington House faces east-west with an approach from the south that passes its entrance elevation. This is a well-used access route to Jupiter Artland. The east-facing elevation of the house is the primary or entrance elevation, with the west-facing elevation the garden front. The proposed development sites are to the West and North West. Bonnington House is shielded to the west and, to a lesser extent, to the north, by an existing established woodland belt, and therefore it is unlikely that any views to or from Bonnington House will be significantly impacted by the proposed development, which is some distance away. However, we would suggest that mitigation in the form of perimeter planting to the new developments should be undertaken to maintain the setting of the house's wider policies.

Site 4: Norton Park B Scheduled Monument 1154 (Easter Norton standing stone) is located within this site. We are content with the principle of development subject to mitigation to protect the SM and its setting. We would recommend early engagement to discuss specific mitigation measures, but these could include consideration of how to incorporate the SM as a positive feature of the wider development; this is likely to include provision for a suitable buffer zone, with appropriate landscaping; and identification of key views that would be protected within any forthcoming development. To achieve this a suitable level of assessment should be undertaken at an early stage in the development process to inform mitigation that integrates the monument and its setting successfully. We would welcome proposals for interpretation of the site that could be implemented as part of any development.

Site 42: East of Riccarton C Scheduled Monument 6190 (Baberton Mains enclosure) is located within the site. We are content with the principle of development subject to mitigation to protect the SM and its setting. We would recommend early engagement to discuss specific mitigation measures. It is possible, for example, that the monument could be preserved as part of a grassed, open area incorporated as a feature in the development. This would require careful design to avoid any ground disturbance that might damage the monument. An understanding of the nature of the enclosure, and how it may have related to the wider landscape should be developed in order to allow important elements of its setting to be preserved in any forthcoming

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

development proposals. To achieve this a suitable level of assessment should be undertaken at an early stage in the development process to inform mitigation that integrates the monument and its setting successfully. We would welcome proposals for interpretation of the site that could be implemented as part of any development.

Choice **12 C**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 C**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
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

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N
Name: Virginia Sharp
Response Type: Key Agency
On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

Supporting Info:
Email: virginia.sharp@hes.scot

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 Site 406: Crosswinds runway. We consider much of the site could be developed but the setting of A listed Castle Gogar should be protected (and mitigated) as far as possible. The A listed building has already seen enabling development in its immediate vicinity. We would expect the listed building to be fully taken account of in any planning and layout of the new site. The first floor former Great Hall of the house was designed to overlook the land to the East and the drawing room (with bay window) to overlook land to the North. New development could be mitigated by leaving open land adjacent to the castle and by respecting the eastern and northern views from the principal first floor rooms by e.g. by leaving corridors of open land across the site and perimeter planting to new housing.

Choice 15 A

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

Short Response:

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 15 B

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 D

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:
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

Choice 15 G

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 A1

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 16 A2

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 A3

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 A4

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: 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? - 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? - 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 It is unclear from the Choices document at what point in the development planning process the identification of sites and locations with office development will take place. If taken forward, it should be ensured that site identification is subject to robust environmental assessment of site proposals (both individually and cumulatively). If the preferred choice is brought forward to the Proposed Plan, we would expect to see greater detail addressing the points above.

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 16 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E1

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E2

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 16 E3

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E4

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E5

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 16 E6

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E7

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E8

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01643 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GWWY-N
Name: Virginia Sharp
Response Type: Key Agency
On behalf of: Historic Environment Scotland

Supporting Info:
Email: virginia.sharp@hes.scot

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 Site 406: Crosswinds runway. We consider much of the site could be developed but the setting of A listed Castle Gogar should be protected (and mitigated) as far as possible. The A listed building has already seen enabling development in its immediate vicinity. We would expect the listed building to be fully taken account of in any planning and layout of the new site. The first floor former Great Hall of the house was designed to overlook the land to the East and the drawing room (with bay window) to overlook land to the North. New development could be mitigated by leaving open land adjacent to the castle and by respecting the eastern and northern views from the principal first floor rooms by e.g. by leaving corridors of open land across the site and perimeter planting to new housing.

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