

Choices for City Plan 2030 Responses

A city where you don't need to own a car to move around

Aim – to realise the lifelong health benefits of walking and cycling by creating streets and public spaces for people over cars and improving and expanding sustainable transport.

Choice 5 – Delivering Community Infrastructure.

5A We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated (deliverable within the plan period), encouraging improvements

Total responses - 766

Agree 92% (702)	Disagree 8% (64)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proactive forward planning is needed to ensure capacity is managed. Provide an explicit 'infrastructure first' policy. Recognises the strain of new development on existing services. Given that resources are constrained, and likely to be so in the future also, it's important to concentrate them as effectively as possible. Logical approach and one which is supported by Scottish Planning Policy and the current LDP. Positive outcome to deliver within communities, helps social cohesion and empowerment especially if integrating choices 1, 6, 7 and 8. Strong support for new non-denominational Primary Schools and a new Secondary school in North Edinburgh – Leith specifically. Supports and encourages the approach to align spatial planning with future community health and social care needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs of the motorist must to be considered and that road infrastructure improvements will be required and must be implemented before development starts in many rural areas. No reference to healthcare or assisted living of the elderly as a key infrastructure with shortage of provision. Not deliverable because it will not provide a range and choice of housing types and tenures across the City . The planning of future health care services is a matter the NHS Lothians to address and not developers. Subsequently, contributions should not be sought. Do not think extending the tram should be part of the network. Spend that money on resourcing electric bus development - and green electricity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites with planning permission in principle should not have new requirements retrofitted at detailed or reserved matters application stage. Too great a burden on developers affects viability and may result in sites withdrawn from the market. What's needed is a regional strategic statutory plan for the Lothians planning housing and therefore infrastructure at a regional level not local level. What about places that don't have infrastructure which is badly needed, shouldn't these locations also be considered? Unfair to add any more pressure to our primary healthcare system by unnecessary development in Edinburgh South in particular.

5A We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated (deliverable within the plan period), encouraging improvements

Total responses - 766

Agree 92% (702)	Disagree 8% (64)	Comments / other issues raised
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support sites that demonstrate early delivery of infrastructure. • High density, mixed use development reduces the need to travel and is infrastructure efficient, especially if supported by increased public infrastructure provision. Relate density levels to high public transport accessibility. Mass rapid transit reliant on move away from low density suburban housing model. • More residents' homes in city centre reduces pressure on transport infrastructure from commuting patterns. • Public transport works best when development is concentrated at nodes. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Futureproof new infrastructure as much as possible since the capital outlays for new infrastructure can be considerable within the limited budgets. • Have the plans taken into account the pandemic? Are they based on assumptions about where and how we will work, move, be educated? Surely a city immobility plan is more likely to be on the agenda. Less space will be required for healthcare if more virtual meetings take place. • Existing roads and transport are at maximum capacity so there could well be an argument to move new development to other areas with new transport links which might also relieve the existing routes. • Transport infrastructure should include on-street e-bike and cargo bike secure storage, particularly in tenement areas / for those living in shared buildings. • Integrated transport is a must - allow bicycles on buses, ensure more bicycle spaces on trains. • Burnshot Road is currently experiencing a traffic volume of 2.5 times the national average. Need a solution to Kirkliston congestion, and more reliable bus services.

5A We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated (deliverable within the plan period), encouraging improvements

Total responses - 766

Agree 92% (702)	Disagree 8% (64)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start up a Council run area of goods delivery, a complete ban on coaches within the city. • Private schooling is a big issue in Edinburgh and those schools must ensure they also support environmentally friendly transport on a daily basis, if more children went to local schools it would make a big difference to traffic and air pollution. • If the local area is attractive and has the amenities people need it will encourage people to live and work locally. • The effect of any infrastructure changes will impact the city for many decades to come. You should be planning out to 2050 as a minimum. • Move the hospitals back into 'central locations • LJV boards should be set up to provide all current and future transport provision; probably for all the Lothians, not just Edinburgh. • Edinburgh is severely lacking in accessible public transport: Lothian buses do not allow mobility scooters on-board, pavements are in very poor condition for wheelchairs, walkers/rollators. All this contributes to the isolation of elderly people who don't have

5A We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated (deliverable within the plan period), encouraging improvements

Total responses - 766

Agree 92% (702)	Disagree 8% (64)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<p>cars, and to the increased use of cars and taxis.</p> <p><u>Transport Corridors:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over ESSTS corridors deliverability due to changing economic circumstances. Focus on more relevant walking primarily, then cycling routes. • All four corridors identified in ESSTS should be identified and planned for in City Plan 2030, and development on these corridors should be supported. • Fundamental arterial route into Edinburgh (A90 from Fife) has been ignored in in the ESSTS. • ESSTS doesn't adequately consider existing rail capacity, e.g. Curriehill services. • Corridor 8 misalignment between mapping in Map 3 in Choices and Figure 9.1 in the study, affecting the housing study assessment/Strategic Environmental Assessment. • ESSTS lacks sustainable orbital movement options, linking park and ride sites and key employability sites across an east-west arc.

5A We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated (deliverable within the plan period), encouraging improvements

Total responses - 766

Agree 92% (702)	Disagree 8% (64)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over the timescales to deliver and fund tramline 3 and risk that development precedes transport solutions. • Corridor 3 is only part of the transport infrastructure on SE Edinburgh - heavier traffic arrives via the Fairmilehead and Straiton routes at rush hour. Kaimes and Fairmilehead junctions are identified in the City Mobility plan as congestion areas, but equally poor is the complex junction at the foot of Liberton Brae. Corridor 3 should have 3 souther forks, via Straiton, Sherriffhall and Fairmilehead. • In line with Edinburgh’s vision of decarbonizing, the Edinburgh South Suburban Railway would be able to play a major role in connecting the suburbs with the city centre and each other. With clever re-arrangement of transport services and with the use of transport interchanges at key locations, there will be no need for a significant amount of trains to pass through to Waverley. • Extend tram to Portobello. <p><u>Education:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish education infrastructure appraisal in advance of the Proposed Plan.

5A We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated (deliverable within the plan period), encouraging improvements

Total responses - 766

Agree 92% (702)	Disagree 8% (64)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise sites within the Council’s ownership. Don’t adopt a standard land transfer cost or expectation, as the current Local Development Plan does, because every site is different. • Welcomes the proposed provision of new education infrastructure in Kirkliston. • Recognise that social housing is likely to house considerably more adults and children than an area with an equivalent density elsewhere. Therefore, base any density standards on the number of bedspaces per hectare rather than dwellings to take into account full occupancy of social housing. • Justify education contributions and pupil product: high-density developments at over 65 units per hectare is unlikely to be deliver family housing; likewise where age profile of the development doesn’t merit. • Significant uncertainty as to the ability to deliver new high schools in the plan period, despite Housing Study concluding some sites as being ‘potentially suitable for development’.

5A We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated (deliverable within the plan period), encouraging improvements

Total responses - 766

Agree 92% (702)	Disagree 8% (64)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New schools should not be built on greenspace, instead should provide new greenspace and growing/planting space. • Urban school sites may have restricted outdoor space whereas greenfield sites can deliver community based facilities for greater community use. • Active travel planning for access to schools is fundamental from outset. • Ensure no school catchment area changes. Split sites or use Compulsory Purchase Order powers to extend if necessary e.g. Kwik Fit buildings adjacent to Boroughmuir. • South Edinburgh needs a new High School. • Significant expansion of Gaelic language school provision. • Not clear from the Council's assessment that the cumulative impact of current large-scale housing developments in South East Edinburgh have been adequately dealt with.

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

Total responses – 770

Agree 95% (735)	Disagree 5% (35)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary healthcare needs to be accessible for public and staff, and for health and wellbeing, active travel and public transport routes are key. • Safe active travel as a default option when accessing community infrastructure and use national user hierarchy for streets. • To minimise carbon emissions and create a healthier and pleasant living environment. • Important that investors and developers are as certain as possible about the requirements that will be required for new developments. • Where possible provision for parking AND electric car charging should be included. Cars will not stop being part of this city's transport infrastructure and support for electric cars is crucial to reduce carbon and local emissions. • Having community facilities well connected to active and public transport facilities makes them more accessible to a wider proportion of the public. Those already experiencing social isolation, for example, might be even more put off from accessing the facilities they need if they are difficult to travel to. • It's an equality issue really - if there's no public transport then the poor, the disabled and the elderly are less able to make use of facilities, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing infrastructure already exists around current catchment areas - any solutions should be based on existing catchments. The council must future proof new schools to ensure there's the potential for expansion. If there's not, new houses should not be built within catchment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent public transport will reduce the need for private journeys, but good quality roads are also essential for times where public transport is not appropriate. Careful consideration should also be given to the traffic impact of new developments on existing traffic flows - e.g. Junctions/Interchanges. • *existing* community facilities should be upgraded wherever possible, to alleviate the pressure on areas that have already accommodated additional development. • Need to consult with local community groups or will it be top down telling people what they think. • While there is an emphasis on active travel, the current crisis is showing that we can work a lot more from home and need to source local food, access local natural amenity and are able to interact in the local community more. We need to consider how home working and localism is accommodated. The community facilities need to be near to people and in the hub of the community. • The active travel routes must be direct, dedicated, segregated, and high quality

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

Total responses – 770

Agree 95% (735)	Disagree 5% (35)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
and if they're not connected to active travel routes then there is a public health aspect that has not been optimised.		(unlike the wavy surface of, for instance, the cycle track at St Leonard's by the police station). Use proper design policies, and set out standards based on already established active transport guidance from successful places in Europe. Integrate this in the main road design policy, and ensure that all developments are done bearing in mind active transport. An active transport road design committee should be set up that overlooks the implementation of these policies in all future projects, and ensures that these are delivered properly.

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

Total responses - 766

Agree 93% (713)	Disagree 7% (53)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports a high walk-in population and reduced need to travel, and the less need for car ownership. • Aids successful placemaking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The volume of travel to these facilities doesn't justify much expansion. There are already many local offices delivering these services in Edinburgh. Also many of these services could be done online now which requires no travel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice of active travel can be more inclusive. Provision of share bikes and e-bike share could help those that cannot walk quite so far.

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

Total responses - 766

Agree 93% (713)	Disagree 7% (53)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-locating community services in some of the new allocations as part of a strategic network of agreed healthcare and other community infrastructure should then be identified in development briefs in City Plan 2030. • This supports the development of a greater number of hubs to deliver social care locally. • People want affordable facilities, open at useful time, within their own communities. • Will support carbon emission strategies and contribute towards effectively building sense of community in new developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralised services are more efficient and provide a higher level of care. Localised services often lead to differences in quality between the services offered depending on the income levels in the area. e.g. dentists/GPs in certain areas, schools reflecting the income levels of the areas they are in. This can reinforce income related stereotypes and social stratification. • We need better online services not more locations. • The centre of Edinburgh is unique and has to be used by the local population. The idea of local community services sounds good, but almost inevitably, they will be starved of the resources they need and we will be left with nothing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like to see the City Plan committed to the idea of a '20 minute neighbourhood'. Its the right method similar to Paris were the plan is to be able to get everything you need within a 15 min walk. • Community services should ideally be within active travel distance of all residents and services hub should be at the heart of each community. • People want to get to services quickly. • Provide on-street logistics hubs (with lockers) to reduce traffic from delivery vans and to support shop deliveries. • It's important that we avoid the need to always travel into city centre for services that could be delivered locally. • Make it easier for low-paid workers to live near their city-centre workplaces. • Primary Care services should be at the heart of communities they serve- both in terms of accessibility for the public to services and for the delivery of services by teams who require to do home visits e.g. GPs, District Nurses, thereby reducing travelling times. • To deliver services locally, hubs for social care staff to interact with communities,

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

Total responses - 766

Agree 93% (713)	Disagree 7% (53)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<p>currently these are larger hubs that serve wide areas where transport is essential to meet people's needs. So redesigning how social care work across the city will be crucial to delivering local services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More imagination about how buildings and facilities are used. • Centralised services has been a disaster for healthcare with long journeys to Western or ERI, same with decentralised to out of town retail. • People working in the services may still need to commute. • It should be recognised in policy that there will be opportunities for smaller scale development to be located in less accessible areas.

5D1: We want to set out where development will be expected to contribute toward new or expanded community infrastructure.

Total responses - 748

Agree 95% (708)	Disagree 5% (40)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome clarity at the plan stage on what infrastructure will be expected to be provided. • Clear and transparent contribution expectations are important for developer and investor confidence and infrastructure requirements should be identified in the LDP and clearly justified. • We support this provided it is clear what the benefit is to that development. • Recognising and addressing the impact of the additional growth on primary care infrastructure through contributions will enable appropriate and timeous delivery response. • A full deliverability and viability assessment should be undertaken to determine whether or not the developer contribution contained within the whole plan are affordable within individual market areas within the city. This will prevent such contributions from precluding much needed development from coming forward and delivering the aims and objectives of the plan. • To be viable, City Plan 2030 should allocate development sites that are strategic in scale and offer the potential for community infrastructure to be required and well utilised. • The level of developer contributions should be raised considerably. We are emphatically clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not agree with contributions being required towards healthcare facilities that are run as private practices. • Concern over the Education Appraisal accompanying Choices in its density assumptions and consequent overestimation of pupil rate, with infrastructure requirements significantly overstated. • Fundamental that new programmed allocations identify what infrastructure is required, when and where, in consultation with Homes for Scotland and its membership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider impacts that new development may have on the existing rail network. Large residential developments that rely upon current rail capacity can both individually and cumulatively impact on the strategic function/capacity of the network. Impact on the network must be assessed as many routes and stations are operating at capacity. Commensurate increases in services or capacity may be required to avoid congestion. • Set out how much delivery will be funded by public funds (understand financing, and financial gap). • Developers can benefit significantly from the enhanced development value of green field sites and, in these circumstances, should be prepared to make appropriate contributions towards the costs of infrastructure. • Infrastructure contributions from developments on brownfield sites need to be carefully assessed so as not to discourage the reuse of such sites by developers. • Community input and engagement is key and critical to success.

5D1: We want to set out where development will be expected to contribute toward new or expanded community infrastructure.

Total responses - 748

Agree 95% (708)	Disagree 5% (40)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>that developers of student accommodation must be required to contribute equally, alongside developers of all other types of housing etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers must be part of the solution to delivering on community aspirations. • Where the plan lays out potential areas for development it should absolutely detail the requirements on the developing of the site- rather than waiting for applications to be submitted and then considering contributions. This would save time and money and would be more transparent. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deal with on a case by case basis commensurate with the location and scale of any particular development. • The current crisis is showing that we can work a lot more from home and need to source local food, access local natural amenity and are able to interact in the local community more. New development need to contribute to community facilities that need to be near to people and in the hub of the community.

5D2 We want to use cumulative contribution zones to determine the infrastructure actions, costs and delivery mechanisms

Total responses - 667

Agree 79% (530)	Disagree 21% (137)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Cumulative contribution zones’ recognizes that developing the city and meeting the challenges faced by this plan is a combined and shared endeavour. • By taking a cumulative approach over an entire zone, the opportunity to avoid delivering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution should be applicable only in the area under development. • Notes complication in the process if developments happen at different times and infrastructure will be held back. There is no doubt that substantial public investment will be needed in infrastructure improvements and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships, using a mixed of funding streams, working together to enhance existing or create new water environments and habitat networks will be a key element for success. • The principle of cumulation should be applied at the proposal and application

5D2 We want to use cumulative contribution zones to determine the infrastructure actions, costs and delivery mechanisms

Total responses - 667

Agree 79% (530)	Disagree 21% (137)	Comments / other issues raised
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>infrastructure because the site is too small to deliver, is reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing of infrastructure costs may unlock development in areas where initial infrastructure investment is too great a burden for one developer. • Where the total cost of delivering necessary infrastructure improvements in a wider area would fall disproportionately on one development then sharing these costs proportionally and fairly between all developments which fall within that area seems appropriate. • Enables a more strategic approach to the location of mobility hubs across a zone. • This will enable optimisation of community infrastructure and ensure consistency. 	<p>expansion and there is a limit to what new development can support without adversely affecting that market and its price structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not support use of cumulative contribution zones, and in order to establish that contributions relate to proposed development or as a direct consequence, a robust evidence base is required to demonstrate this relationship. • For reasons outlined in the Ministers direction January 2020. • Agree in principle the cost of infrastructure should be shared equitably but not all development sites are equal, site specific costs depend on a range of factors and land value. Higher abnormal costs, lower returns. What if the council actively flexed contributions to strategically stimulate housing delivery, effectively cross-subsidising more complex sites from elsewhere across the city? • Complications might arise with the implementation of this proposal, if there is disparity between the viability of the various developers involved in a particular zone. • This has no basis in current planning law and practise and there are a number of legal cases that reaffirm this point. • Recent appeal decisions show that there is a weakness in the current “contribution zone” 	<p>stage with regard to developments over 0.25 hectares.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negates argument of financial viability if costs are shared proportionately. • Onus then on Council to manage contributions and deliver. • Scottish Water has a separate funding mechanism to deliver network and strategic infrastructure. • Full deliverability and viability assessment should be undertaken to determine if contributions are affordable both within the whole plan area and within individual market areas. • Appears like the integrated approach but needs clarity on methodology on how cost is shared equally and what happens when there is a time lag between developments in a zone. • Network Rail would welcome a rail improvement zone approach (see East Lothian) along with Scotrail, are keen to be involved in identifying the infrastructure requirements, costs and delivery mechanisms as a result of new development. • An appraisal should occur of the approaches to planning obligations across the

5D2 We want to use cumulative contribution zones to determine the infrastructure actions, costs and delivery mechanisms

Total responses - 667

Agree 79% (530)	Disagree 21% (137)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
	<p>strategy and without changes in legislation the cumulative approach to contributions will continue to be challengeable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council is therefore needed to demonstrate that its approach to contributions meets the various tests in the Scottish Government Circular including that contributions need to relate to the proposed development and be proportionate. • There is a "danger" that the contribution zones could extend beyond planned areas for new development opening a door for developers to press for development of addition unplanned areas within the cumulative contribution zone. The boundary of contribution zones should coincide with planned development areas. A ten year plan can provide for this by delineating land for development (say) years 0 - 5 and years 6 - 10 and for the contribution zone to coincide with the boundary of land planned for development in years 0 -10 	<p>constituent SESplan authorities. Planning obligations should also be set in context of proportionality and affordability to ensure development viability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to test the infrastructure levy approach including cumulative contribution zones, using existing regional partnership forums. Scope zones with SEStran/infrastructure providers so zones and costs are not established in isolation. • Delivery must be communicated to communities, and don't miss the more immediate off-site requirements for larger cumulative actions. • Affordable housing developments led by housing associations (as opposed to S.75 affordable housing) should be exempt from contributions as in effect they are already providing 100% community infrastructure in the form of affordable housing. • Clarification and simplification is needed on the basis for developer contributions with much better enforcement of agreements. • A transparent pathway of where money is spent, with it being returned to the payee if initiatives are not delivered within a set timescale (3-5 year limit).

5D2 We want to use cumulative contribution zones to determine the infrastructure actions, costs and delivery mechanisms

Total responses - 667

Agree 79% (530)	Disagree 21% (137)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council’s current cumulative methodology has been recently rejected by the Scottish Government. Further work by the Council is therefore needed to demonstrate that its approach to contributions meets the various tests in the Government Circular, and going forward cumulative contribution zones should be influenced by the Chief Planner’s letter. • Clarify how do non-allocated sites with planning permission proportionately pay and if refunds will be made if more development in a contribution zone comes forward. • Clarify it is the equal share of costs is between different developers picking up the whole cost, and not an equal split between the developer and the council. • Cumulative approach spreads the costs of mitigating the cumulative impacts 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. • The identification of infrastructure provides certainty, but the use of contribution zones

5D2 We want to use cumulative contribution zones to determine the infrastructure actions, costs and delivery mechanisms		
Total responses - 667		
Agree 79% (530)	Disagree 21% (137)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<p>is problematic, and cumulative zones are not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Await details of a proposed infrastructure levy and therefore the idea of cumulative contribution zones that may seek a second 'tax' for potentially the same purpose threatens to make development unattractive and potentially unviable in Edinburgh. • Provided also the mechanism does not delay all contributing projects to the date that the last contribution is made.

5E We want to stop using supplementary guidance and set out guidance for developer contributions within the plan, Action Programme and in non-statutory guidance.		
Total responses - 665		
Agree 86% (575)	Disagree 24% (90)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer contributions can have significant implications for the viability and delivery of housing and should be within the LDP and not within Action Programmes or non-statutory guidance. This approach allows for consultation and independent scrutiny, which must be the case for such important matters. • In line with the new Planning Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need the confidence that this has been independently considered prior to adoption, and only applied following adoption. It will not be possible to set out the precise amounts until the content of the plan is approved (otherwise, updates to the Contributions will be required prior to adopting the Plan to reflect changed allocations which could have a bearing on the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure charging mechanisms also need to be agreed to reflect the scale of community infrastructure sought. • The proposed contribution zones and levels should be subject to consultation with the development industry and the methodology should be clear.

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

Total responses - 665

Agree 86% (575)	Disagree 24% (90)	Comments / other issues raised
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support a clear, integrated approach. More efficient and cost effective when it provides higher developer/investor certainty and confidence and hopefully reduce the s.75 negotiation timescale. • To emphasise the importance of the policy and ensure compliance. • One easy-to-read document, for the benefit of communities and developers alike. Developer contribution expectations must be transparent, understood by communities, in the LDP, with site specific details. • Better for developers to deliver directly. • It must be clear from the start to the developer what their commitment is. Use of supplementary guidance can make it feel like it is not mandatory and can be forgotten or down-graded during the course of the development work - I am confident there are examples where this has happened, particularly with 'softer' items like green management, and with the scale and quality of built infrastructure which is actually delivered. 	<p>amounts identified in the plan). Therefore, the precise contributions should continue to be set out in Statutory Supplementary Guidance prepared following receipt of the Examination Reporters Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not in the interests of a plan led system to defer the inclusion of important policies which will impact on viability to non- statutory guidance with no formal process for adoption. • Only set out guidance for developer contributions within the City Plan 2030 and the associated Action Programme. Guidance for developer contributions should certainly not be set out in non-statutory guidance. • Potential issue with Action Programme also setting out costs and duplication/contradiction between the two documents. • We do not believe that the Action Programme should contain anything other than the Actions required to deliver the plan, and the contributions should be contained in one document. • Developer contribution amounts should be fixed at the level they are at when a planning application has been submitted, and not amended upwards thereafter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with relevant stakeholders, including landowners should take place as part of the Action Programme's preparation and subsequent revision. • Developer contributions should be set out in site briefs. • Supplementary guidance could still be useful if circumstances change during a plan period and existing guidance requires significant amendment. The cumulative impact of policies in the plan on viability should be assessed and policies should clearly outline where further guidance will be required and the scope of this guidance. • Suggestion that there will continue to be a reliance on the Action Programme and non-statutory guidance appears to contradict contribution guidance in the plan. • Resolve existing Supplementary Guidance with the Scottish Government first. • Provided the existing 2018 Supplementary Guidance on Heat Opportunities Mapping is retained which is helpful and identifies opportunity to source significant scale heat for heat networks at Seafield (existing RS-3 allocation of EW 1d for an Energy Recovery Facility). Moving this into the plan would be

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

Total responses - 665

Agree 86% (575)	Disagree 24% (90)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a ten year plan and much can happen in that period and so you may need to issue supplementary guidance. 	<p>beneficial. It should not be done in a way that reduces its significance as a planning consideration in determining applications.</p>

Choice 6 – Creating places that focus on people, not cars

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

Total responses - 826

Agree 82% (679)	Disagree 18% (147)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in line with National Transport Strategy hierarchy with walking as primary mode undertaken and planned for. • Promotes the use of walking and cycling, least carbon intensive transport and contributes towards community health and fitness. • Tackles congestion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough information on what targets will be derived from, justified and monitored. • Unclear how targets will be able to respond to changes in public transport timetables occurring during plan period. Resulting in undue prejudice by decisions outwith the control of the community/developer. • Use PAN 75 Planning for Transport Annex B Personal Accessibility Analysis for accessibility profiles for new development. • Development should not be hindered solely on accessibility grounds. • Would only work if public transport improvements are not just planned but already exist or are underway. • Won't deliver the certainty required for a planning system – relies on too broad a range of assumptions. New developments can subsidise early public transport services, which this approach won't take into account. • Policy would need to be flexible and allow for cross boundary commuting, or it discriminate those needing to travel further for work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure public transport usage of an area and target a percentage increase over plan lifetime. • Don't hold all applications to a single standard. Use a tiered approach to setting targets - city-wide, district and local) for specific types of development. • Could be assessed against ease of access to infrastructure and active travel networks. • Make it clear requirements not targets. • All new developments should have no net car traffic impact; consider zero onsite parking (and Controlled Parking Zone in the whole area) and/or car traffic reducing and public transport measures. • Not just private car use but other commercial vehicles that is causes congestion and air pollution. • Low Emission Zone central zone should be extended. • Take into account bus service frequency, directness and reliability. • Take account of residents and visitors with limited mobility, focus on accessibility for all.

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

Total responses - 826

Agree 82% (679)	Disagree 18% (147)	Comments / other issues raised
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need full understanding of existing mode share and communities' travel patterns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If development is directed to where there is where there is sustainable travel options (Choice 5A), this proposed target should already be met. Seeks clarification at what stage in the planning process would these targets are relevant. • Confirm how targets be monitored and success measured and what happens if targets are not met. • Policies should put in place interventions required to deliver modal shift. • Follow the Sustainable Transport Hierarchy and Sustainable Investment Hierarchy as set out in the National Transport Strategy 2 especially when designing layout of new development. Further consultation on the detail is required prior to Proposed Plan publication. • Would require deregulation of bus services allowing a commitment to deliver services from operators. • Consider factors impacting on bus use e.g. Covid-19 and rerouting of services from the City Mobility Plan/ City Centre Transformation plans to reduce city centre through routes.

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

Total responses - 826

Agree 82% (679)	Disagree 18% (147)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More consideration of creating new routes not just assessment of what exists. • Can't force residents to use one mode. • Majority of households will still want to own a car for some trips. • More important to build at higher densities so there is less need to travel long distances. • Approach may disadvantage areas already deficient in sustainable transport routes. • Update existing policy. • Council policies are too biased towards cyclists. • Plan for car routes to reduce time and emissions.

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 73% (580)	Disagree 27% (218)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place briefs should include information on trips by walking, cycling and public transport as a key element of successful places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No robust data to support or implement this. Methodology and targets needs to be consulted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Place Briefs embed parking standards, they need to be available from the Plan's

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 73% (580)	Disagree 27% (218)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If existing parking spaces are being reviewed, alternative uses for this space including mobility hubs, bike parking and retrofitting green / blue infrastructure should be considered as part of place-making and improving sense of place. • Consider grouping parking spaces away from individual front doors, enabling a better use of outdoor space. Only increase parking restrictions when public and active travel have been improved. • It is part of a suite of measures necessary to create the necessary shift from the use of the private car to the use of public transport as first choice for mobility into, out of and through the city. • Will give local communities and opportunity to have their voices heard. 	<p>on and agreed to have sufficient weight and status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can't support without knowing what the public transport would be. • SPP and other guidance already sets spatial targets for active travel, and parking standards are already in place. • Planning Advice Note 75 Planning for Transport Annex B Personal Accessibility Analysis provides the basis for identifying accessibility profiles for new development. • Use existing policy framework. • Wrong time to be making decisions and setting targets, pandemic will change work and travel patterns, office downsizing, reduced use of public transport. • Not the function of place briefs and too prescriptive. Should be in policy or statutory supplementary guidance; too for briefs, may not be deliverable outcomes without the engagement of landowners and informed by costly detailed site works. Limited status of Place Briefs. • Car may be only option for disabled residents. • Multiple trips rely on private cars e.g. working parents, tradespeople, shift workers 	<p>adoption, otherwise delays to housing delivery targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets should be in the plan, but place briefs can use them. • No reduction in bus stops/spacing. • As other parking is reduced, increase disabled parking and drop off points. • It is important also not to create another layer of hypothetical assessment that has to be undertaken, disputed and debated with every single planning application, to the benefit of nobody except planning consultants. • Rescind its Parking Action Plan • Explore car free streets. • Plant trees and cycle parking instead of car parking. • targets should only be set in relation to planned transit interventions where a financial and legal commitment is in place to deliver them • Place brief should demonstrate that the need to travel generally is reduced. • Master planning exercise to develop connectivity • Use pilot demonstrators to raise awareness of designing in low car use.

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 73% (580)	Disagree 27% (218)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire to retain car ownership for trips away from main centres of population. • EV means car ownership may remain prevalent. Reduce car use to work or city centre but not ability to park at home. • Low levels of parking are a source of objection to planning applications. • Low parking levels may result in less marketable housing, or overspill parking causing conflict with users, and reduced amenity. • If planned public transport intervention does not materialise, some developments will be left without enough parking yet rely on car use. • Employment hubs are dispersed around the fringes of the city, people don't always live near work and public transport won't always link. • Only for strategic development sites. • Zero parking is a challenge to provide for varying needs. • Many variables which need to be considered when establishing appropriate parking levels, some of which will not be known at the Place Brief stage e.g. operational requirements. It is therefore not appropriate to set such targets at this stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will targets be monitored? • Avoid reverse incentive whereby people take cars to work to avoid daytime parking restrictions at their homes.

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with other cities seeking to prioritise walkable urban environments. • Has to be in conjunction with transport interventions. • Transport interventions must be integrated with masterplanning new development • Less pollution will encourage pedestrians and cyclists. • Integrated approach between modes of transport. • As long as there is an understanding of why people are selecting a particular mode of transport. Are schools close to the catchment area? If a parent has to drop of children and then travel to work on the other side of town particularly if they are a single parent this can take much time out of their day. • Would generally support subject to appropriate targets being outlined for family housing where an element of car trips will still be required. • Wider measures to guide people towards public transport and walking/cycling is supported. The proposal at Bankhead can contribute to wider requirements which would include extension of park and ride facilities at Hermiston. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over methodology in determining suitable levels and how assessment of acceptability against targets will be made. • Results in parking in surrounding streets. Increase density/height rather than reduce parking. • Misuses planning policy to restrict car ownership. The rights of citizens to use cars (hopefully EVs) should be respected. • Dependent on new and improved public and active travel infrastructure. No guarantee public transport service can or will be provided in some areas. Needs to be backed up by commitment by (deregulated) operators. • Overly prescriptive. Minimum standards should be reviewed and allow for below the minimum where justified. • Aspirational targets not appropriate. Targets create false impression of success or failure. How will setting a target help? Car ownership does not necessarily equate to car usage. • Modal split is dictated by personal choice and cannot be targeted. People shouldn't be left with no choice but public and active transport if they don't want to or isn't convenient. • Continue with maximum parking standards in the Edinburgh Design Guidance of 2018, in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Advice Note 75 Planning for Transport provides the benchmark for mode share targets (Annex C). • Car-free now common in highly accessible locations, dwelling types should be assessed against target occupiers, location, accessibility of the site by non-car modes to local amenities/ facilities and places of work, measures proposed by the development to minimise car usage, as well as the surrounding context. • Revision to make it clear that there will be no provision in any development for car parking other than for disabled, servicing and essential visitors. • Car free development only possible for brownfield developments, sceptical it can be employed in semi-rural locations. • Targets will need to be enforceable. • Only feasible with step change in public transport provision. • Resolve tension between policy aims and objectives with how developer see their markets. • Consider needs of displaced Small and Medium Enterprises lost to redevelopment.

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets are pointless without providing improved facilities - segregated bike lanes and high quality (covered and secure) bike parking. • Consider requiring developers to consult with the Edinburgh Cycle Hire scheme regarding introducing a cycle hire dock at any large development. • This must be supported with secure bike storage for residents. • Too many cars on the roads. not enough room for public transport to operate effectively. • Good health benefits and all round being. More attractive for visitors. • Roads now need to be used for transport. No longer any room for parking on most of our roads, which now have to provide safe space for cyclists. There might be some Parking Hubs (or Transport Hubs) in the city: attractive multi-storey car parks from where the able-bodied could walk/catch a shuttle bus to offices, shops etc. "Car clubs" should be extended and could be based in multi-storey Hubs. These parking hubs could also be used for residents' parking. • Only if targets are set high enough to ensure there is a significant reduction in car parking throughout the city, not just the city centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overly complex and does not take account of operational or end user requirement. • National Transport Policy stresses adaptability and notes that whilst the desire is for modal shift that may not always be possible. • If evidence base is not available, could lead to inappropriate levels of parking allowed and overspill parking. • Parking constraints especially in suburban development are not effective in transferring demand from private car to public transport. • City Plan may disadvantage the substantial proportion of the population with mobility issues by limiting parking opportunities at such persons' homes and likely destinations. • Change of behaviours should be by improvement of public transport not by making driving by cars more difficult and punitive. • An absolute minimum level should be provided, especially in city centre development. The real issue, however, is the on-street parking controls. Edinburgh residents are becoming victims of the poor policy decisions of CEC, too many cars are driving as close as possible, parking in non-controlled zones. There should be a maximum stay (ranging between 2 to 4 hours) implemented 	<p>Careful balance to still allow some parking to service traders, businesses, retail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to car club and other shared transport services also alleviates level of parking. • Consider underground parking. • Extend and enforce Controlled Parking Zones and permits. • Supported by a gradual removal of existing on-street parking to free up road spaces for public life and planting. • Travel plans to mitigate against car use. • Consideration for parking for social care visits. Continued reliance on retail centres predominantly accessed by car, so reducing parking will disadvantage some to access these facilities. • Current cycle parking standards are too onerous and create dead frontages at ground level or reduce usable outdoor amenity space. • Align cycle parking with BREEAM standards of 50% for student accommodation. • An independent study should be undertaken to inform the level of cycle parking associated with student accommodation and general housing.

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	Comments / other issues raised
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have to drive a massive reduction in driving through policy setting, we can't wait for people to reduce their vehicle usage as that will not happen without policies pushing it. • Also factor in the demographic; good that student housing is built without car parking spaces. • The usage of cars should be reduced significantly, with access permitted to a limited number of authorised vehicles. • Reduced car use in Edinburgh is both achievable and would improve many quality of life aspects of living in Edinburgh - Amsterdam, Copenhagen and Basel are good examples in my experience. • The student flats that were supposed to be car free, but the students use the side streets to park their cars creating more congestion. Enforce Permit parking all our streets. • Good idea to plan for new developments by arranging suitable alternative transport and communications not requiring cars. On street parking at dwellings is not a particularly useful way to limit car use - which should be controlled by charges for use of cars, and destination parking charges. The cars in controlled zones may well sit outside houses unused. It is possible to build 	<p>to prevent people parking all day for work purposes. All this does is shift the local air pollution issues into residential sites, ironically, where higher numbers of local trips are conducted by walking, cycling, scooting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is discriminatory behaviour. • No parking causes frustration and pollution. • Making trip targets assumes you know who the ultimate user is going to be and fails when dealing with anything beyond what it was designed for. • Number of people no longer come into town because of the endless disruption due to roads being constantly dug up. This affects buses too. • This is flawed and ideological thinking. Setting targets and expecting behaviours to change has been tried and shown to fail. • You can consider a reduction in car usage perhaps, but not an all-out car-free development. There are many car users who are regular walkers and cyclists, cycling could well be there preferred method of getting to work and other places. • Those of us who live outside Edinburgh need to use cars to get into work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of lease agreements in PBSA are used to discourage car ownership. • Agree with controlling on-street parking in problem areas. • Significant reduction in car parking standards may have a number of negative consequences, including providing for varying needs. • Over emphasis on direct cycle trips fails to understand the varied travel patterns of all residents, 'trip chains' around tasks which necessitate bus or car use. • In Tokyo no on street parking is allowed. If you cannot park your car on your property then you are not allowed to have one. The difference between here and Tokyo is that the city has a joined up transport system - all buses every 5 minutes and tubes every 2 minutes. Until there is a massive improvement in the transport system then the idea of banning cars does not make sense and people will not buy properties under the present conditions. The transport has to be in place before properties are built not the other way around. • Does not work for those outside the city bypass, as the alternatives to car use are not there.

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>houses which are aimed at those without cars, provided public transport is frequent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But we need to ensure that public transport options are fit for purpose. We need rapid transit from outer suburbs and dormitory town to encourage use. Taking 1 hour plus to get into the city centre by bus is too long and encourages car use. We also need to widen the bypass to cope with traffic otherwise drivers will opt to use city streets instead. The car (fossil fuel or electric) is here to stay. Accept and plan accordingly. • Less sure, however, that the aspiration to 'car-free developments' is either realistic or desirable. Traffic congestion in, or closer to, the city centre is manifestly a problem but other policies (see 7B, 7C and 7D) would help address this. Conversely, it is not unreasonable for residents to want to use cars for longer journeys and/or journeys outwith Edinburgh which may not be achievable by public transport. The Plan should focus not only on parking levels but on provision of electric car charging points within new developments. • Reduce parking capacity in the city, and increase tax for car parking at work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce permits for students. • The right to be able to drive when needed should be supported by parking. Traffic will only reduce voluntarily when enough other options are available. If not enough parking provided it will only exacerbate the current on street parking situation. • City of Edinburgh Council seems to force to abandon cars rather than promote environmentally friendly transport. When you make conditions for green travel to be attractive you won't have to police cars. • Parking places should be set by area inhabitants. Other measures mean more pay zones. • Create an acceptable alternative and people will use it. Stop treating cars as the problem and fix the public transport and make the City easier to get around which will reduce the amount of time trips take. • Outdated projects like the Tram are not a solution and if anything increase the congestion on the streets. • Lots of people need their cars, especially work vans, give us more park and ride sites to stop 	

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Far too much space given over to parking. With COVID we need less space for parking and more space for active travel. Parking should be permit only. • Strictly controlled residents' parking only. Car numbers expand to fit available parking space. • Main streets should have segregated bike lanes first, then the second consideration should be bus stops, loading, and then finally on-street parking of cars. • We don't have a city in which a car per person is a viable, still less a pleasant, option. I don't think new developments should include any on-street parking. • Parking in high-density population areas, such as the city centre, should be reduced by 3-4% every year in tandem with an equivalent increase in public and active transport developments. Delivery vehicles should have delivery times rationalised to allow re-allocation of space. • Agreeing on the assumption that you are not taking away parking facilities for existing homeowners who have car parking. • The plan would however need to take into account the potential changes in demand in the future, and so allow for potential changes in parking requirements. 	<p>staff from companies parking in our streets and causing annoyance by the residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is not enough car park spaces they will just park on the road which will increase traffic which increases co2 emissions so this will do the opposite effect on our climate than what is intended. • If cars are electric then sufficient parking should be available. • Enough parking should be available to deal with Covid and pandemics. • People need choice. So it is possible to use a car for a large family grocery shop. • There is not enough parking at present and quite enough parking controls. It puts visitors off coming into the city. • Unrealistic given that we will be moving to electric vehicles in any event it has little or no impact. It's potentially very unhelpful. • Cars are still essential for families and working parents. • On-street parking is a scourge. Cars are vitally important to many people and most developments do not adequately provide for car owners. Simply removing the requirement for 	

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But again there is no point restricting car parking places and hoping that those people won't still drive everywhere. • This may be adversely affected by Covid-19. • Should go further. There should be extremely stringent controls on the provision of any parking for any new developments in the city and tightly controlled Parking Zones city wide. • Managing through price is an effective way of achieving targets. Make cars expensive to use and public transport affordable or better still free and watch the use of cars reduce. • Ensure adequate provision of vehicles for shared use. • There should be no resident parking provision in the city centre and inner suburbs other than for disabled parking. • Amsterdam recently removed 18,000 spaces, while Paris achieved similar. We should look to do the same. • Need to make sure the cycle provisions/safe roads for cycling are in place before you can expect a large proportion to go car-free. 	<p>car parking spaces from the developers will place a burden on others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets are very hard to set and to achieve. • If taxis are still allowed and car parking is not available, we will be over run by taxis. • Parking provision assumes that cars enter the city centre. Would prefer that measures are taken to deter them from entering in the first place e.g. a congestion charge or even bans from specific areas. • Needs flexibility needed to respond to changing conditions. • Detest your policy so far of encouraging behavioural change by simply punishing the motorist and trying to beat them into submission. Removing parking spaces won't help. This will just increase congestion as people go looking for a space, increase road rage incidents, make my working day much harder and have an overall negative affect on mental health and the experience of residents. • Prefer a policy of education and pro-healthy transport choices propaganda. Investment in improving public transport routes, i.e. better 	

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We could focus on more access through the use of trams/tube option. So areas need to be allowed to develop more alternative options. • Introducing city wide controlled parking will force an increase in either parking charges which can in return be used to spend on transport infrastructure or a direct reduction in car usage. • Parking levels should be set on the basis of spaces required by people who need to use cars (blue badge, service providers) and delivery and maintenance staff. • Edinburgh Council has just approved an additional 1200 parking spaces in the city centre, working against this strategy. • Residents must start to pay market price for parking within the city. • Development should reduce car ownership, reduce the spaces required and for those who require it a clause could be electric vehicle only with EV charging points provided. • Should provide better public transport hub and spoke provision. • Set parking to an absolute minimum and instead promoted the car club provision in the city. Need to look at decreasing parking provision in existing 	<p>signpost and identify the dedicated cycle lanes that cover the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A scheme to subsidise bus passes or bike ownership for office workers (i.e. not one punishing policy for all, but target those who realistically could increase use of public transport, with positive policies). • We need to ensure people can get to their houses for moving and food deliveries. • Encourage developments in the city to walk or cycle but in outlying villages this is not always possible. Still need to provide adequate parking for residents and visitors so that housing estates don't look full of badly parked cars. This restricts children playing and ruins the aesthetics of the area. • Mobility plan will increase people's desire to own and use a car, not reduce it - because the changed public transport system will be so unusable they will make more trips by car. • You will only create congestion elsewhere. Cars are here to stay and with the recent announcement around no petrol or diesel cars by 2035, this is a short sighted view. 	

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>developments and in streets. Cut down parking in city centres and out of town shopping centres too.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets should be city wide. • We can't get rid of cars in 10 years, like to see adequate parking (underground?) in new developments, so there is no overspill of parking onto surrounding roads. • Need to revisit congestion charging with park and ride at all bypass junctions. Company car spaces should attract a charge. • Current parking restrictions must be enforced by traffic wardens and police officers otherwise people will continue to infringe upon the rules. It is good to have a target, but it must be enforced. • Needs practical solutions for vehicles associated with maintenance and deliveries. • Inequality, as older developments will have different standards. • Need active management of "ad-hoc park and ride" (i.e. commuters parking in suburban developments and completing their journey to the city centre / hospitals by public transport). • Should seek to reduce parking not just "control" it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrealistic to expect residents in particular to give up using their cars. • Traffic congestion in Kirkliston is really bad at peak times, which is mainly caused by traffic trying to get to and from Fife. Consequently bus journeys are delayed or cancelled. People lose faith in the bus services and revert to the car thereby making the problem worse. I've seen nothing in the City Plan that addresses the peak time congestion problem. • Where is the plan for more environment car use, electric and hydrogen vehicles have a part to play. • Targets must not be set too high. Traffic in the city centre must be reduced and more areas pedestrianised. • Arbitrary targets forced upon people does not work without appropriate communication and support. • Impact of Covid-19, can't get rid of cars. • Building houses with no or little on street parking or driveway parking for only 1 car has caused many issues. Made even worse when people had visitors as there was nowhere for them to park. 	

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider introducing on street parking for parents with kids in car seats that are unable the get out by them self. • The whole city needs to be an active travel zone - with wider pavements and protected cycle routes. • There needs to be incentives to get people to use public transport or to use more shared transport like car pools. But invest in delivering across all commuter links. i.e. don't penalise the poor for trying to access resources. 	<p>As much as it is a great idea to have 'car-free' living it is just not realistic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deters a quick visit to local businesses which is detrimental. • Targets should differ between the working day, working week and other times. • On street parking should only be in city centre. • Encouragement rather than targets, e.g. require showers and drying facilities at work places. • Need accessible public transport first e.g. that meets the needs of those with disabilities. • Needs to be a better balance between practicality and green approaches. • Scotland does not have the climate to encourage most people to walk or cycle to work. • Include new tech options like e scooters and segways. • Existing communities are not all served by sufficient public transport. • Planning based on targets cannot work until behaviour change among the population has been shown to be in line with those targets. • This will affect the poor more, where they are forced to live in high density development. 	

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

Total responses - 798

Agree 69% (554)	Disagree 31% (244)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
	Residents parking fees too high already and unfair.	

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

Total responses - 783

Agree 74% (581)	Disagree 26% (202)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key disincentive to car use. • Supports the creation of healthy inclusive public centre. • Requires infrastructure e.g. public lifts to cater for all mobilities and ability to walk longer distances. • Control of city centre parking is required to deliver City Centre Transformation. • City centre parking reduces land available for housing. • Provides space for planning for climate resilience (space for people, water and wildlife). • Ensure Tra 5 City Centre Public Parking is updated. • Support the introduction of a parking levy on employers and retailers in the City Centre to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only more car parking at a reasonable price will slow the death of the city centre. • We are of the view that restricting city centre car parking simply pushes this out to surrounding areas, with consequential adverse impacts. • Restricts potential investors in Edinburgh • Cost of parking is enough to make it prohibitively expensive to use car, with impact on deterring families from the city centre. • Reducing parking and narrowing streets causes more congestion. • Decide on case by case basis on merit. • Creates parking congestion in commuter areas. • Consider short to medium term behavioural impact of Covid-19 on bus patronage vs private car use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No parking provision other than for disabled, servicing and essential visitors. This must be done in tandem with phasing out on-street parking. • Manage commercial needs – deliveries etc. • Cut down on business travel to the city centre by remote working and meetings. • Provided that social care staff can visit city centre residents. • Must not negatively impact on liveability for city centre residents. • Coordinate strategies to avoid displacing parking elsewhere. • City centre bus services from semi-rural communities will need to be extended, and

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

Total responses - 783

Agree 74% (581)	Disagree 26% (202)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>fund improvements in the public transport provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city spaces should be encouraged to develop existing car use space into more socially positive uses. • Car free is cleaner, quieter and much more healthy. Important to tackle climate change. • Remove current car parking also. We should go further and have targets for reducing car parking across the city. • Consider a small incremental decrease in parking in city centre annually as the Copenhagen approach. • Cars should be banned from city centre. • We need a mindset change, that will happen only if people are given the opportunity to do something different. An example is after a tube strike in London, trips between certain stations remained down by nearly 20% as people realised it was faster to walk than take the tube between certain places. These were experienced commuters, but we just do what we have always done - make us do something different and see. • Car parking is the main factor slowing down transition to public transport / cycling. If ample 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The centre of Edinburgh will die if there are no cars. Cars need to park somewhere. • Punitive policies against car use within the city centre simply deters multi use of the city centre and will continue to push shoppers and diners/leisure pursuers to use out of town facilities. • Cars are often the only option for families or those with disabilities to access the city, both in terms of convenience and cost. People will vote with their feet and shun the city in favour of other locations if it is not possible to park. • Car parking should be available to those that need it (disabled parking, taxi ranks, goods vehicles, etc.), so additional parking may be needed. There should be measures to prevent or reduce private vehicles using such space, however. For example, only cars part of a carpooling program might be allowed in the newer (and some existing) car parks. • How do people carry large items bought in the city home on a bus/ tram? • Don't just protect against additional car parking, but work to reduce existing parking. • New builds could provide underground parking. • Agree that we should be reducing on-street parking and encouraging development without 	<p>long distance safe cycle routes into the city centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider mobility hubs replacing parking see Bremen example with target of removing 6,000 cars from the city. • Clarify that this is 'additional car parking' compared to existing provision. • This should go further than protecting against additional car parking but rather look to reduce the number of available spaces in the city centre, and extremely high car park fees across all operators, not just those subject to workplace parking levy (e.g. discounted multi-storey car parks being used as office car parks). • Important to tax office car spaces, institute road pricing schemes and more efficient public transport to provide alternatives to cars. But the same limits need to be applied to peripheral developments (Gogar, Fort Kinnaird etc) in order that economic activity in the city itself is not diminished unnecessarily. • Plan for more use of shared private vehicles, that won't need to be left until the owner returns, but will be available for re-use (or

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

Total responses - 783

Agree 74% (581)	Disagree 26% (202)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>parking space driving is too convenient, and cycling too inconvenient / dangerous.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhances the quality of life of residents and visitors • The only parking in the city centre should be for blue badge holders. • Provided that it is supported by a robust public transport system that will enable non city dwellers to get around with ease. 	<p>cars. Pricing can control parking but it will not eliminate it in the near future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrianise, be bike friendly, etc, but I think there should be car parking allocation at strategic points to the city centre that allows a 'park and walk' philosophy. And car parks don't need to be ugly, there are numerous examples in Germany where they are attractive infrastructure items. • Need to think of temporary parking for deliveries and tradespeople. Tools cannot be transported on public transport, by bike or on foot. Car free city centre not ideal. • Data should be collected to determine the usage of car parking in the city and when this reduces, then the planning requirements should be relaxed. • If taxis are still allowed and car parking is not available, we will be overrun by taxis! Taxis will be parking on double yellows and sitting waiting for people whilst running their engines. • Best way to encourage people to take the bus is to make it more cost effective. • Might deter companies occupying developments • People need to get to work 24/7 and the transport infrastructure would not meet future needs. • Provide a credible alternative first. 	<p>hopefully, will drive themselves away again).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support subject to protecting car parking for residents. This might be better achieved by the development of a smaller number of designated high density car parks and freeing up on-street space for active travel. • On-street carparking will need to be largely removed in the city centre (e.g. George St.) to allow for physical distancing. • Agree with the exception of the development of new charging hubs for electric vehicles, which are important not just for residents, but for taxis and vans that work in the city. If the Council follow's Dundee, Falkirk and East Ayrshire's lead and develops these charging hubs themselves, then the revenue from them can be reinvested in vital public services and the expansion of infrastructure for safe and enjoyable active travel. • Protections need to be in place to ensure immediate surrounding areas to the city centre do not suffer from overflow. • The plan needs to rethink what type of businesses are in the city centre. If people are doing significant shopping in town they need a means by which to bring their

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

Total responses - 783

Agree 74% (581)	Disagree 26% (202)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is this necessary when we will be moving away from petrol/diesel vehicles to electric or hydrogen? • Provision of more short-term parking for delivery purposes should be a planning priority to maintain residential amenity in the city centre and reduce the need for individual travel. • Purposely making it difficult to find parking will force drivers to park in places they shouldn't or spend longer driving around looking for a space, meaning higher emissions from the cars. • Post Covid many people will not be able to use public transport, so parking needs will change. 	<p>purchases home. If the city centre is designed for entertainment and social purposes and perhaps services then this need diminishes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax workplace parking heavily. • A well developed efficient public transport system should make cars largely unnecessary and unwelcome in the centre. • Japan operates a 'proof-of-parking' model, which requires car owners to prove they can park their vehicle off the street by obtaining a certificate from the local government. We should follow this model. • Sufficient city centre parking at the moment. Just don't reduce it. • Castle Terrace carpark should be unlisted and demolished.

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

Total responses - 796

Agree 82% (650)	Disagree 18% (146)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocating more space to people and plants and less to cars, like widening pavements and planting street trees, “pocket parks” will have a significant benefit. • Reduction in parking spaces, resident and metered, would be a disincentive for car use. • Studies on public transit (busways) in Cambridgeshire have shown that the reduction in car parking spaces can be a powerful incentive for people to change to public transport or active travel. • Copenhagen has demonstrated that restricting free and easily accessed car parking is a necessary element of a strategy to increase active travel and reduce private car use within cities. • Concerned at the reduction in parking spaces when so many older people are not able to travel by public transport into town and cannot walk or cycle. • Must be conscious of congestion, not just air quality. Great, provide for Electric Vehicles but it feels short-term in consideration. There must be an underlying desire to reduce congestion, not just air quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to EV will happen inevitably but until then shouldn't penalise non Electric vehicle cars which are still unaffordable for most people. • Not a progressive tax as until widespread tram route throughout the city, people will require to park cars. • More clarification on management of Electric Vehicle infrastructure. • Cycle parking not used. • Policy should respond to accommodating demand, rather than controlling it. • Users of electric vehicles should not getting free electricity. • Discrimination. Not everyone can afford Electric Vehicles. • No parking charges for those with disabilities or Electric Vehicles. • What about residents in the city centre - there is a shortage of available parking as it is just now. any more restrictions are unworkable. • Not everyone falls into your limited categories and some people need cars. • Many people will not have the resources to change their car to electric while their current car is not old. Discarding perfectly working cars is not good for the environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council could work with developers to offer mobility management: charge a developer for each car park that is built, or allow them to use this 'allowance' to be put into providing public transport, car clubs, cycling infrastructure, etc. • Promote car club as an alternative. • Additional infrastructure needs to be sensitive to the historic environment. • Better bike storage solutions as bike theft is an issue: explore secure cycle parking in back greens. • Include on-street visitor cycle parking requirement. • Electric vehicles: • Any developments should make provision for both current (active) and future (projected) demand for electric vehicle charging infrastructure either on-site or as a contribution to a public charging infrastructure, co-ordinated by the Council in a similar way as it does with contributions towards the City Car Club. • Ensure sufficient capacity within the electricity grid and sub-stations to accommodate demand.

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

Total responses - 796

Agree 82% (650)	Disagree 18% (146)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality secure, covered bike parking should be installed to replace car parking. • How is demand going to be controlled? • Need to increase the charging infrastructure soon. • Greatest priority for disabled and electric vehicles. • In conjunction with safe routes for cycling including access from the outskirts into Edinburgh. • Parking for all types of cycles like adapted bikes and cargo bikes are needed. • Car club electric vehicles should be prioritised. • Parking for bikes is great and should be supported. However, rates of bike theft in Edinburgh are a real deterrent for locking up your bike. The council should consider how to create bike parking which is difficult for bike thieves to target. • It should be made clear that 'electric vehicles' include cycles. • Should be proportionate to demand. • The council could consider providing free electric vehicles offering open-access for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are significant issues with electric cars at the moment – cost, range and battery disposal being just a few. Policies should not be geared too heavily towards electric cars. It also favours the wealthy who can afford electric cars. If people are coming from rural areas it is sometimes not convenient to use park and rides and they live too far away to cycle or to use an electric car as well. • Nothing that uses battery power is environmentally friendly. • Electric will quickly become the norm and therefore shouldn't be used as a means to control parking and reduce cars in the city. Short term impact at best. • Support all types of parking. This sounds like removing parking whilst pretending you are doing so for "justifiable reasons" such as disabled, bikes etc. • Mass cycling is not going to happen here, the urban sprawl and weather act against it. Electric car charging in town is not practical and a better solution is needed for that. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EV in all public parking areas and provide charging stations for electric wheelchairs and mobility scooters, as well as 4 wheeled vehicles. • Must reduce congestion as well as air pollution so Electric Vehicle not the solution, reduce all car dependency. • There must be flexibility within any parking policy to examine the specific nature of the business needs of a proposal, and not just that it falls within i.e. Business and Industrial. • Ensure adequate off-street parking and garages that is fit for purpose. • EV cars are not the solution to achieving carbon neutral status by 2030. • Clear guidance on the requirements and the future liability of EV charging, with Edinburgh Council managing all EV charging points. • Does control demand mean reduce demand? • Preferential tariff for electric cars is a regressive tax solution. When they are cheaper they will replace cars and be back where we started controlling private vehicles.

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

Total responses - 796

Agree 82% (650)	Disagree 18% (146)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>people with disabilities which would follow the main roads in the centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure electric cars pay a realistic sum, not just free parking. • Don't think it's possible to provide enough charging points for all the electric cars that are supposedly going to be the future. • E parking must quickly be profit generating. • All parking should be charged. Charging money for parking is by far the best mechanism to control demand for city parking and car use. Charges should be high and only people with a disability should be allowed free parking. Electric vehicles no longer require free parking because public up-take is now high. Why encourage more cars? • Incentives are the way to go to convince people to change habits, the carrot is way better than the stick that you are suggesting of limiting spaces. Provision should be made for electric cars to use bus lanes and preferential parking with chargers. • Be aware of encouraging journeys being made by car so that the car can be re-charged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wary of inflexibility, how suited are Edinburgh's hilly and narrow streets for cycling, especially of an ageing population. • Bikes can be left in a number of places, cars require parking spaces. • Better provision should also be made for secure motorcycle parking, as they pollute less and ease congestion. • If there are to be significant restrictions in car use in the city centre why do we need electric charging points there? • Its pandering to the minority we need electric vehicles that are affordable to more people to start with. • Parking should be available to charging and non charging cars as it many people have hybrids and it will be a number of years before cars are all non-fuel. • There is a considerable amount of essential travel not covered by the above statement. • More parent/family parking is needed and the bays need to be longer and wider to prevent damage to property. • Cannot see how a change in policy will reduce demand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric cars are less environmentally damaging but not without a carbon footprint, and not the solution to achieving carbon neutral status by 2030. • Current policies are resulting in storage being provided for excessive numbers of bikes in new student accommodation, the occasional disabled vehicle with no space whatsoever for maintenance vehicles or picking up and dropping off points. • Edinburgh is a hilly, wet, windy city with numerous potholes to discourage cyclists and damage vehicles. Doubt whether it would be possible to install enough electric charging points in the short term (10 years) or to build the power stations needed to energise them. Following the Coronavirus (Covid-19) outbreak, some things will get delayed or become commercially uneconomic. We may yet see hydrogen powered vehicles becoming the preferred option so electric charging provision should not be over-hyped. • Bicycles are poor for transporting bulky goods home or transporting people home

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

Total responses - 796

Agree 82% (650)	Disagree 18% (146)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This and many of the other policies in this and other sections will require real political will against people who cannot see the need for things to be different from the way they are. • Policies must also include adequately policed parking in bus and cycle lanes. • However, care must be taken to prevent a proliferation of parking by electric cars occupied by affluent people who can afford to in effect buy a parking space. • Suggest you consider adding CCTV to bike parking areas and electric charging for eBikes as well as cars. • Bike parking is far denser than private vehicle parking - no excuse for not achieving this goal. Many people with disabilities can still cycle adapted bicycles and provision for these should be prioritised within the cycle network as well. • There are not enough disabled parking spaces in the city and there are places that disabled people cannot access because of this. • But you will not get a modal shift to bikes and e-bikes without fit-for-purpose cycle infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting in charging facilities for electric cars in the inner city seems counter productive. Pollution will disappear but congestion will remain. In more outlying centres this proposal would be fine. • There is a lot of disability parking and bike parking without further increases. • Motorists wishing to access the centre of Edinburgh will only use public transport if it is direct and speedy. If they cannot park in the centre they will park in commuter areas causing even more congestion. • Bikes should be charged for parking but provide safe places to do so. • Not until legislation is passed to ensure these forms of transport are safely used both for the riders but also for the general public. • Cyclists are a small minority of traffic. Less than 0.05% yet you are bending over backwards for them . Make travel routes easier for cars to get in and out of the city. Whilst thinking about how to keep cyclists off the roads and pavements. • More incentives, make public transport cheaper to encourage use. 	<p>after a night out. Access to town centres should primarily be via public transport. By all means add charging points for electric cars but that means you must allow electric cars access to the city. Do you know how many electric cars will be in and around Edinburgh by 2030?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again businesses are struggling and it is vital to make it easy for everyone to visit, conveniently and at an affordable cost. Often walking /cycling are completely impractical for people traveling into the city and public transport is both costly and infrequent. • Parking charges could be levied on bike users as they do not pay road tax. • This proposal is too wide ranging and could be used for social engineering and lead to the development of new "elites" with many of the citizens of Edinburgh being barred from using certain forms of transport simply because of their financial situation.

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

Total responses - 796

Agree 82% (650)	Disagree 18% (146)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better make sure that this is matched by electric vehicle ownership. • Should be mobility scooter parking too. • Should limit size of cars too. • Appropriate charging infrastructure needed particularly for multiple occupancy buildings. • Provide or subsidise bicycle storage facilities in and around high-density housing and tenement buildings. • Provided it does not reduce existing parking for new developments. • The problem of bicycles being parked where they shouldn't be simple does not seem to be related to the lack of provision of parking for them. • Ensure all City Car bays are much more clearly marked as most are invisible on wet winter nights and place them separately from metered parking to avoid confusion. • At present existing cycle parking levels can be excessive - can lead to lack of active frontages in new blocks. • In reality, if Edinburgh is to become truly green and carbon neutral etc., then every parking bay should allow for electric and / or petrol / diesel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bikes end up getting stolen and slow up the roads. • Cycling is a non-starter for the majority in Edinburgh. • Those with young children, or who travel across multiple sites in the city for work, are not included in these plans. • Car parking is already an issue. The Council need to be more creative thinking about underground parking. The use of both Charlotte and St Andrew Square areas underground would help rather than building multi-storey car parking. • Nothing wrong with this BUT it wouldn't be such an issue if we had introduced Congestion Charging. • For electric vehicles you would need to provide a safe fully lockable container, as they are a target for theft due to lithium batteries being valuable. These would need to be large enough to contain a mobility scooter, • New student housing often has loads of unused bike parking and often no spaces for cars to even offload. • Too many bikes on the road. 	

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

Total responses - 796

Agree 82% (650)	Disagree 18% (146)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>vehicle parking. It should not be restrictive. Only this way will you enable all commuters and visitors to enjoy the experience of being in Edinburgh.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Converting fuel pumps to hydrogen is a more realistic solution to support green energy. • But not at the cost of penalising drivers who already pay tax etc • The definition of disabilities needs much wider scope than the current blue badge criteria - it needs to include all those who cannot walk more than 1/2 a mile, and all those currently 'sheltering' from Covid-19. • Reasonable charges that ensure people use the paid parking facilities is needed. • Implementing fees not impacting negatively on local residents, losing parking spaces during the day or forcing them to also pay high fees for parking permits for the area they live in would not be right. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charging doesn't deter, and it doesn't change behaviour. It just kills the city centre, which is stifled by lack of parking as it is. Don't increase the amount of parking - let those who can afford it or who need to park have the facility. But change behaviour by improving public transport and giving it priority everywhere. 	

7D We want to support the city’s Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Park and Ride should be encouraged and the provision of more sites close to other transport modes which are easily accessible to the city centre will reduce traffic and carbon emissions throughout the city. • Support for Park and Ride facilities at Hermiston Gait to relieve Lanark Road West congestion; Gilmerton, Lasswade Road and Straiton with the potential to reduce volumes of traffic on three arterial Roads. • The allocation of new housing development should support the provision of park and ride facilities along the transit-based ESSTS corridors. • Essential to minimise the effect of the large volumes of commuter traffic from outside the city. • New developments should prioritise access to the Park and Ride, rather than the city centre. • Park and Ride are an essential bridge between rural and urban travellers. Rural travellers cannot always be expected to travel by public transport but that should be the case at the city boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of ambition, 10 sites with a capacity of 10,000 would be a good target for today’s volume plus growth. Mass commuting underpins flexible workforce. Challenge for transport will be space, not air quality as technological advances continue. • Safeguarding is a constraint on flexibility. • Gilmerton proposed site is permitted for mixed use development, do not support formal park and ride. • Could encourage driving, increase demand for parking and contribute little to carbon reduction. • May ultimately encourage car ownership in the landward areas. • The current usage of Park and Ride is impacted by congestion that builds up in the lead up to these sites. The suggestions presented are still within the extent of congestion, reducing the effectiveness to reduce congestion. • As lock-down has clearly demonstrated, technology now allows for seamless home working, and policies should support this, not over-provision of park and ride facilities, as these still take up land very unproductively, and are basically unpleasant tarmac slabs sterilising land 	<p>OTHER SUGGESTED SITES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional parking capacity at Ingliston is urgently needed to avoid the current problems which can also result in overspill parking in and around the tram corridor. Likely to need further enhanced connections to the A8. • Consideration should therefore be given to safeguarding provision for a park and ride / interchange facilities at: Newbridge / Broxburn; the A90 at Craigiehall; Leith at end of tram route; on the A70 along with radical rethinking of bypass provision for the Water of Leith traffic corridor; Craigiehall makes provision for a 500-600 space Park and Ride facility to intercept traffic entering the city centre via the A90; and West Edinburgh associated with transit corridor (extended tram line shown on Map 11). This may assist those approaching Edinburgh from the M8, M9, Broxburn / Uphall and Winchburgh. • Better facilities in the NE of the city, support for Newcraighall extension, and run bus services to north, not just city centre. Or small scale Musselburgh with buses to Leith.

7D We want to support the city’s Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision should be extended to include most key road corridors into the City (e.g. South Queensferry to serve A90, Newbridge to serve M8, Hillend/Fairmilehead to serve A702), City Bypass Lothianburn Junction and extension of the Ingliston site. • Reduces pollution and congestion • In favour of anything that discourages car use. This is providing an incentive rather than imposing. • Park and Ride is still the main way to reduce commuter traffic entering the city. It is a very important facet to our climate plan in the absence of much better and further reaching public transport network. • Needed to prevent drivers parking on residential streets in town. Ideally a pollution charge to enter Edinburgh which encourages park and ride use. 	<p>that could be put to much better environmental uses (specifically food production or afforestation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support if not on green space land. For example, create underground car parks and landscape the area. • Park and Ride sites should all be on the city boundary, not inside it. • Otherwise outlying centres within the city boundary are disadvantaged by poor public transport. • Please commit to public transport for all within city boundary. • That surely encourages car drivers more. Support train expansion. Open suburban rail lines again and use the space wisely. Stop concreting everywhere to squeeze traffic. Contradicts the wish to make use of land. And at present they generate no revenue. • bus times are too long, once you are in your car this is the fastest mode of transport, unless you can start to add train routes and keep the cost down • There are sufficient Park and Ride spaces in and around Edinburgh just improve the bus service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edinburgh Orbital Bus Route (strategic cross-boundary commitment in SESPlan) could link to existing and proposed Park and Ride sites. • Additional Park and Ride for traffic from Queensferry and beyond, a suitable location would be Burnshot in the A90 corridor. • The absence of Park and Ride facilities at Hermiston Gait / Edinburgh for M8 / A720 traffic is a significant gap. • The absence of a tram connection at the Hermiston Park and Ride significantly reduces its usefulness to West Lothian (and CEC) residents. This would greatly reduce the need for car use and create a tram link between HWU and the airport. • Car parks at Ocean Terminal have for the past c 20 years been operating in similar ways, offering free parking to substantial numbers of commuters every day. The introduction of the new Tram extension to Newhaven will create a new interchange and likely draw further demand. Potential for Park and Ride facility in the area to connect active travel, tram, shopping and commuter interchanges.

7D We want to support the city’s Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People do not want bus journeys of 45-60 minutes. They want a better public transport system of trams and trains which are quicker. • Need to identify Park and Ride sites for both the A90 & A702. • Park and Ride shows bad planning and allowing housing to explode before better options are offered. People don't want to have to take 10 extra steps to commute. More work from home and less Park and Rides, • Have you identified why the Park and Ride schemes aren't busier? What's stopping more people using them. Identify this requirement and then take the next steps to solve these problems. • "Safeguarding" is not qualified. Just because a site can be used for Park and Ride, doesn't mean there's not a use which would generate equal or higher amounts of social good. • It would also help if these proposed sites were manned to make them safer for users. • Studies have shown that Park and Ride schemes in the UK can actually increase traffic and have a negative impact on the environment. • Current Park and Ride facilities are too far from the city centre and it takes too long to reach it. They should be located near the rail links, such as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support a new Park and Ride within the old quarry at Dalmahoy Hill for traffic coming mainly from West Lothian (but also from Balerno) with one at a nearby location off Long Dalmahoy Road to access the Edinburgh/Glasgow trains. • Strong argument to have Park and Ride facilities on the outskirts of places like Livingston so that instead of clogging up the A71, their residents could catch a bus instead. However, only a limited amount of City traffic will end up in Park and Ride sites as the workforce is scattered across the City and does not reside solely in industrial estates or big offices. • Park and Ride at Musselburgh railway station and that station should become a parkway station for the ECML and east Lothian / Midlothian. • Kirkliston and Winchburgh should have a railway station with Park and Ride with the Almond cord built as well so easy access into Edinburgh. • Balerno could have a rail station on the Shotts line with car parking and there should be a train station again at Joppa and at

7D We want to support the city’s Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
	Edinburgh Park, Edinburgh Gateway, where reaching city centre on the train will not take more than 10 minutes.	<p>Tynecastle (Hearts FC) so people can use the train to get to the football and the rugby at Murrayfield via the Shotts line or a cross rail train.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fairmilehead should be considered as a strategic site for a new Park and Ride. • Place the sites OUTSIDE the A720! • Strategic Transport Review 2 Case for Change discusses the importance of sustainable travel provision / options for visitors. This should be a key issue for Edinburgh, particularly if the potential for attractions to be more distributed throughout the city is delivered. A networked system of Choose and Ride sites could be integral to achieving this. (see Transport Planning Objectives in table 10) and ensure these inform the Proposed Plan. • Wait to develop these until clear picture of travel patterns post Covid-19. • Some areas of the city (not in Controlled Parking Zone) are already be facto Park and Ride. • Take into account feasibility study into the provision of Park and Ride facilities in north

7D We want to support the city’s Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<p>Midlothian. The proposed safeguarding of sites at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road may have some merit. The success of a Park and Ride site is related to predicted passenger demand and desirability of location, sites too close together are less attractive. Consideration of the impact on existing facilities in neighbouring Council areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-schedule the timetable for new Park and Ride hubs in order to fit with the timescale for the Low Emission Zone and other initiatives. • Function and design of park and ride sites: The existing Park and Ride sites are single function only and have no real sense of place or integration. Develop through a design led approach a concept for how sites can be developed: arrive and choose a range of modes (mobility hub), with integration of green infrastructure. Potential also as peripheral mixed-use hubs and the

7D We want to support the city’s Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<p>implementing proposed retail park regeneration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade over time to provide slow charging facilities at each space. • Ensure surrounding rural landscape character is not compromised, include more screening tree/shrub planting and their maintenance. • Public transport from Park and Ride sites should serve more destinations, not just direct to city centre. Public transport operators must be consulted with in order to determine whether servicing new Park and Ride sites is feasible and/or preferred over expanding existing Park and Ride sites. • The Edinburgh Waverley Western Approaches study now under way create an opportunity for a mainline station at Kirkliston or Winchburgh. • As Park and Ride sites catering for mode shift of commuters and visitors from mostly out with Edinburgh, this needs to be coordinated in line with the Regional Transport Strategy, and build on the findings from the SEStran Regional Park and Ride strategic study.

7D We want to support the city's Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With exception of Sheriffhall, all are oversubscribed. • Recommend that parking provision should allow for Camper Vans as I think the impact of the Coronavirus (Covid-19) and Brexit could see more people having home holidays. (Camper Van sites could be planned to be in close proximity with Park and Ride sites.) • This again strengthens the use of public transport. However the system must be accessible and convenient and easy to use Oyster card type system. • Anyone using Park and Ride can get the bus in and out of town for free. • There are also train and tram possibilities to consider. • As long as greenbelt land isn't used • Park and Rides must be linked by safe and segregated active travel infrastructure. • Not all people arriving at Park and Rides are heading into the city centre. There should be good provision for transport links in the outer parts of the city.

7D We want to support the city’s Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear why requirement at Lasswade Road, so close to Gilmerton, Straiton and Shawfair • It would be helped by having much faster connecting bus routes with dedicated limited-stop buses and REAL priority bus lanes with zero parking in them. Park and Ride buses in Edinburgh at present are incredibly slow across the city due to congestion and buses having to share roadspace with general traffic. • But don't make them too attractive! Ideally there would be alternative public transport options for all legs of the journey • Should have a variety of travel options with travel hubs for public transport, bike share or electric car share options at them. • We also need to ensure the infrastructure is in place for remote working and that working spaces / places are also located at the perimeter of the city. • Why is there no park and ride provision within or near the Edinburgh infirmary planned? • Priority should be given to turning existing park and ride sites into multi-storeys where

7D We want to support the city’s Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<p>possible, provided that they do not provide excessive visual impact; this could be lessened with clever architecture. Solar canopies and external walls could supplement the energy demand of electric vehicle charge points at Park and Rides, which will also have to be fitted with rapid chargers for taxis, vans and passers-by unless suitable charging hub locations can be identified elsewhere in the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All day visitors / tourists should be highly encouraged to make use of Park and Ride and the fantastic bus service. • The Straiton Park and Ride should be reviewed to ensure that busses can effortlessly get past the bypass traffic at peak times. Delays can be extreme resulting in decreased demand for Park and Ride. • Absolutely sensible, but there is no point in expecting people to use Park and Ride facilities if there is no disincentive to driving past them and on into the city, as in so many parts of Edinburgh. • Ingliston Park and Ride is used by West Lothian commuters and as an overflow carpark for the RBS at Gogarburn. Local

7D We want to support the city's Park and Ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new Park and Ride at Gilmerton Road and Lasswade Road and extensions to the current sites at Hermiston and Newcraighall. There is also the potential to safeguard an extension to the park and ride at Ingliston as part of the International Business Gateway masterplan. Policies on Park and Rides will be amended to reference these sites and any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan.

Total responses - 788

Agree 89% (703)	Disagree 11% (85)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		residents have trouble parking there during the day to use the tram.

Choice 8 – Delivering new walking and cycling routes

8A We want to update our policy on the Cycle and Footpath Network to provide criteria for identifying new routes.		
Total responses - 808		
Agree 92% (740)	Disagree 8% (68)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable alternatives supports modal shift from the private car, and reduces impact on key, congested routes, and safeguards the health of citizens and visitors and achieve carbon neutrality. • Active Travel is about improving quality of life and quality of place. • Investing in infrastructure and support for walking and cycling can increase economic growth and vibrancy. Those walking and cycling tend to spend more money locally than drivers. • Potential to improve public and active travel for workers and visitors to industrial sites, for example the Promenade to Seafield site. • The network also needs to protect routes from the city into the surrounding countryside. The recent consultation on the Pentland Hills Regional Park Strategy did not mention this. Safe routes crossing the City bypass are few in number. Working with neighbouring Local Authorities is also very important. • Cycling needs to be a top option and fast direct routes are the way forward. Interconnectivity is key. There is little help in a cycle path that connects to nothing or ends at a barrier. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle network aligned to footpaths is poor. • Cycle paths on road (not segregated) is dangerous and causes congestion. Small minority actually cycle, takes road space away from buses. • Key to delivering your aim of not needing a car to move around the city is public transport - not walking or cycling. Walking and cycling help but don't happen when it is dark or cold or wet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holistic network analysis required looking at arterial routes (with public transport and segregated cycling) and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. • "Delivering new walking and cycle routes" is much less important than improving existing ones: pavement improvements, widening, more road crossings, traffic calming. • Review full network and identify gaps, deficiencies in quality. • Within historic areas an overall reduction in motorised traffic and enhanced and safe mixed cycle and pedestrian areas are a better solution than dedicated cycle only routes. • Over-engineered cycle infrastructure can impact on space and amenity. • Concern that by restricting loading and unloading, arterial cycle-routes could jeopardise the viability of local businesses. • Maintain historic setts to ensure they are safe for cyclists. • The integration of public transport will be important for promoting walking.

8A We want to update our policy on the Cycle and Footpath Network to provide criteria for identifying new routes.

Total responses - 808

Agree 92% (740)	Disagree 8% (68)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be regular and plentiful cycle parking and a major expansion of the hire bikes into these routes. • Routes for walking and cycling should follow existing Lothian Buses routes which should be dedicated bus roads only: one lane both ways for buses, with a cycle lane and a good quality footpath. • On-street parking considerations are less important than the safety of people, and thus road designs should firstly accommodate safe cycling provision, secondly bus stop facilities, on and off loading, and lastly private on street parking. That should be the order of consideration. • Prioritised on main thoroughfares through the city not adding to the circuitous and round the house approach of the current quiet routes network. • Prioritise routes with high potential for increased cycle usage. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create good links to and within areas with high SIMD. • Experiment with temporary infrastructure. • Integrating these routes as elements of the multifunctional green and blue network, so they serve as habitat corridors. • Segregated cycle routes to avoid conflict with pedestrian users. • More joined up cross-boundary routes, which then link to local networks, which have connections to public transport, mobility/choose and ride hubs. • The criteria should be informed by the content of the Strategic Transport Projects Review 2 Case for Change report so that routes address the key issues identified. • Base criteria on taking pedestrians, cyclists, wheelers off the road space, to and through green / blue spaces, Country and Regional Parks, interesting landscapes, easy gradients and avoid poor air quality. • Criteria should assess how routes address gaps and missing links in the existing green / blue network. • Design should prioritise the needs of walkers and cyclists first, then other road users.

8A We want to update our policy on the Cycle and Footpath Network to provide criteria for identifying new routes.

Total responses - 808

Agree 92% (740)	Disagree 8% (68)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routes should conform to the five characteristics in Cycling by Design, and as such should be accessible for use all year round and be wide enough to facilitate social distancing with good signage and provide bins. • Waterfront Promenade should avoid port operational land. The form of the proposed connection will require to take into account physical and amenity constraints. • Clarity should be provided on the responsibility for funding, delivery and maintenance of these routes, and all costs set out in the Action Programme; contributions should be proportionate in line with Circular 3/2012. • Not clear how these routes link to existing network and how these will be prioritised over motorised vehicles. • Size of the City and distances to outlying areas such as Kirkliston requires a combination of travel options to allow full benefits including commuting and leisure trips to be realised. • Clarify if works to complete the River Almond walkway would impact on Craighiehall.

8A We want to update our policy on the Cycle and Footpath Network to provide criteria for identifying new routes.

Total responses - 808

Agree 92% (740)	Disagree 8% (68)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure maintenance of existing routes before extending new routes. • Need a much broader engagement with local people to identify a genuine network of active travel routes. • Clarity is required within City Plan 2030 on potential conflicts with policies and proposals for safeguarding and developing strategic walking/cycling routes and developing new strategic bus or tram routes (e.g. between Roseburn and Granton) as proposed in the City Mobility Plan. • With an ageing population cycling infrastructure will be of limited use in future. • Maintenance is key e.g. keeping routes gritted in the winter, lit at night, rubbish cleaned up, way finding signs cleaned and ensuring the path is free of potholes and resurfaced when necessary. Could a widespread maintenance plan also be added to any new infrastructure? • Where shared provision is made, bring in (and enforce) a code of behaviour with zero tolerance towards aggressive or obstructive cycling. • The whole city needs to be an active travel zone - with wider pavements and protected

8A We want to update our policy on the Cycle and Footpath Network to provide criteria for identifying new routes.

Total responses - 808

Agree 92% (740)	Disagree 8% (68)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
		<p>cycle routes and less space given over to cars - travelling and parked. it needs to happen now to allow social distancing measures to continue safely, especially when more people return to work.</p> <p>Temporary measures for using road space for cycling and walking need to developed immediately and then improved and kept.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise safe cycling for children as this will change adult habits later in the coming years.

8B As part of the City Centre Transformation and other Council and partner projects to improve strategic walking and cycling links around the city, we want to add the following routes (along with our existing safeguards) to our network as active travel proposals for the new plan to assist in delivering.

Total responses - 810

Agree 89% (724)	Disagree 11% (86)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>Specific support identified for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edinburgh Waterfront Promenade, Pilrig Park to Pirrie Street link, A71 Cycle Super Highway • Routes to Curriehill Station and Water of Leith path. • Extend the Edinburgh Waterfront Promenade from Granton to link with the John Muir Way • River Almond Walkway from Cramond Brig to Kirkliston 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle and footpath link from the A90 to the A8 corridor, to enable Barnton/Cramond area and Queensferry NCR1 to travel to Edinburgh Park and transport links. • Waterfront Promenade should avoid Port operational land, take account physical and amenity constraints. • Collaborate with other councils on longer distance routes as a necessary component

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pentlands to Portobello link, and explore extending westwards through Colinton and ending up in South Gyle, and attention to crossing the A702 and A720 roads, and consider links between this route, the Braid Hills area and Burdiehouse Valley Park. • Waverley Valley bridge would be transformational, however St Mary's Street would need to be improved as it is steep and cobbled. 		<p>of modal shift in localised cross boundary journeys and for longer peripheral commuting e.g. connections along The Wisp/A7, the A701 and A702, to Niddrie Bing area, consider Shawfair to Newcraighall Station, junctions on the A720 City Bypass to become more user-friendly for non-motorised transport, grade separation of the Sheriffhall roundabout; A7 active travel super highway, connecting with planned improvements in Midlothian; completion of A8 link, including future links via International Business Gateway; SEStran planned Portobello to Musselburgh connection. Identify the Shawfair to Lasswade Road Cyclepath/Green Network Significant gaps in the routes on the north west side of the city.</p>
---	--	--

8C We want City Plan 2030 to also safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites and/or that may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or submitted through consultation on this document.

Total responses - 758

Agree 87% (659)	Disagree 13% (99)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>Support for: Route towards Newbridge, Livingston and A71 super highway; from Balerno down the old railway line towards Kaimes Quarry for Kirknewton (partially replacing the existing NCR 75, which currently uses the increasingly busy Long Dalmahoy Road and the steeply graded Ravelrig Road); SW Edinburgh area - safe pathway to the Pentland Hills.</p> <p>Suggested new routes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route towards Newbridge, Livingston and A71 super highway. • Balerno down the old railway line towards Kaimes Quarry for Kirknewton (partially replacing the existing NCR 75, which currently uses the increasingly busy Long Dalmahoy Road and the steeply graded Ravelrig Road). • SW Edinburgh area - safe pathway to the Pentland Hills. • Mayfield Rd between George Square and King's Buildings. Could funnel the car traffic to Mayfield Gardens and make Mayfield Rd narrower allowing for some dedicated parking spots, non-parking cycle lane and low speed main road. • New direct routes - Roseburn to Meadows (bridges over railway and Dalry Road) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider the impact of safeguarding these routes for active travel on other travel modes • Specifically protect pedestrians from cyclists on pavements, or narrow footpaths like the canal towpath. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing levels of e-bike ownership are a significant contributing factor in modal shift elsewhere in Europe, and should influence planning for the city region. • Engage with the appropriate parties for clear understanding of land ownership constraints, avoid allocations to deliver off-site links in third party control, unless the Council is prepared to intervene and deliver the link subject to financial contributions. Such contributions must be based on robust cost evidence. • Clarity of funding particularly for cross boundary interventions. The Council consistently interprets 'active travel' as predominantly cycling, and budgets accordingly. • Support for new strategic walking routes, must be in addition to enhancing walking provision throughout the city • The A70 corridor seems once again to be entirely ignored. • How many people do you envisage using the cycle routes? 1%, 2% of the population? 5% by 2030? You are spending money on an elite minority at the expense of others.

8C We want City Plan 2030 to also safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites and/or that may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or submitted through consultation on this document.

Total responses - 758

Agree 87% (659)	Disagree 13% (99)	Comments / other issues raised
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leith Bridge and the Edinburgh High Line City East - West • London Rd from Leith Walk down to Portobello. • Cramond to Joppa • Pentlands through Colinton ending up at South Gyle. • Balerno 'Green Bridge' reinstated. • Please add the 'Education Corridor' incorporating the well-established route along the north side of the Muir Wood field. • There are not many safe routes to cycle especially in south Edinburgh - the Braid Hills are a barrier and only options are main roads on either side to get around them. • Safer routes across south Edinburgh: Safer cycling and links from Gilmerton Road into city centre and Dalkeith Road into city centre • Bike path along the entire length of the bypass to encourage new cyclists to commute East and West. • Widen pavement on George IV bridge to allow for heavy pedestrian traffic volumes. • The Newbridge to South Queensferry cycle route needs investment, maintenance, and extension to Ratho and Ratho Station. • Incorporate cycle lanes into Dundee street, Lothian Road, Princes Street 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-use existing infrastructure (old railways) would be logical, cheaper, less wasteful and practical. Undo the Beeching cuts. • Make sure there are easy ways for bikes, and kids in bikes, to cross the city centre. • We need as many active travel links as possible for the health and wellbeing of the Edinburgh population as well as the environment. Lots of people are getting into walking, running and cycling during the lockdown. It's important to build on this new enthusiasm. • Need to invest in peripheral infrastructure first to help disadvantaged get into town and between neighbourhoods. Too much money is currently going into the city centre. • The impact on the environment and conservation of existing wildlife habitats should be of paramount importance.

8C We want City Plan 2030 to also safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites and/or that may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or submitted through consultation on this document.

Total responses - 758

Agree 87% (659)	Disagree 13% (99)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A segregated cycleway on Silverknowes Road to link to NCN1 to the promenade • If the route around the Salvesen Steps on the River Almond Walkway ever happens this would create a great loop for the local and wider community (or beyond to Kirkliston), along with the Cramond to Joppa route. Upgrade River Almond walkway to tarmac or it won't get much use as a commuting route. • River Almond Walkway but include the section from the Fife Railway/River Almond Bridge east of the Airport to Cramond Brig which remains to be developed along with the section to Kirkliston. Similarly, the Cramond Brig to Cramond section of the Walkway is incomplete for cycling and less mobile users due to the current configuration of the Walkway at the Salvesen Steps. • Improve Holyrood Park bike lane, this should be rationally redeveloped. The roads in Holyrood Park should be closed to vehicle traffic. • Cowgate should be turned into an active travel link (and should not be a through-route for vehicles). • In times of austerity, minor improvements to existing routes should be prioritised, and repairs to existing ones like the Water of Leith Walkway between Damside and Belford Bridge 		

8C We want City Plan 2030 to also safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites and/or that may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or submitted through consultation on this document.

Total responses - 758

Agree 87% (659)	Disagree 13% (99)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<p>where the Walk was closed some years ago due to a landslip, should be dealt with before new ventures are considered. The City Centre doesn't need 'transformation' so much as 'restoration' of the features that appeal to residents, and tourists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safer cycling along South / North Bridge esp when turning from there into Princes Street. • Niddrie Mains Road due to there being essential amenities along this road (healthcare centre, council offices and supermarkets). • Golf courses should be considered for active travel links currently and when any course closes. Local routes will certainly be available, and some on longer routes like the cycle path between the Burgess/Bruntsfield Links society. • Routes between all entrances to the Astley Ainslie site. • Roseburn to Union Canal is critical to provide links across the railway here, and to a track alongside the Western Approach Road. • A complete west-east link through the Royal Edinburgh hospital is necessary, and the path behind Myreside should be upgraded and widened as it is a shortcut to the canal. • A widened shared-use path along Braid Hills Drive 		

8C We want City Plan 2030 to also safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites and/or that may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or submitted through consultation on this document.

Total responses - 758

Agree 87% (659)	Disagree 13% (99)	
Reasons for agreeing	Reasons for disagreeing	Comments / other issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous footpath of 2m width along both sides of Riccarton Mains Road from Weavers Knowe Crescent to the roundabout at the entrance to The Avenue leading into the Heriot-Watt University. The road in the vicinity of the Railway Line needs straightening out for safety reasons. 		