

Customer Ref: **Response Ref:**

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **1 A**

We want to connect our places, parks and green spaces together as part of a city-wide, regional, and national green network. We want new development to connect to, and deliver this network. Do you agree with this? - Select support / don't support

Short Response

Explanation My response is predicated on developers not being allowed to undermine existing green spaces. For example, the neglect of the field on the corner of Alnwickhill Road and Liberton Drive, which Crudens are allowing to deteriorate by banning horse grazing. They have recently gutted the one house on the field to make it uninhabitable, and are preparing yet another attempt to build on this part of the Greenbelt, having been rejected by the reporter over 10 years ago. Collusion between landowners and developers to degrade green spaces so that they can advance arguments for development based on enhancing the area should be ignored and rejected by planning authorities.

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice **1 B**

We want to change our policy to require all development (including change of use) to include green and blue infrastructure. Do you agree with this? - Support / Object

Short Response

Explanation New developments should respect the existing environment, which may mean reducing the scale of proposed developments. Some proposals, such as those recently put forward by Barrrett/David Wilson homes for development on fields adjacent to an important flood management area south of Frgogston Road East, should be abandoned as they pose significant risk of increasing floods and creating polluted run-off water emptying into Burdiehouse Burn. I also note the identification within the Choices document of the Inch Nursery as a brownfield development site. This area was previously designated as part of a green space, and its reclassification as a brownfield site is puzzling. The nursery (the site of the notorious bench burning fiasco) is sited within the former walled garden of Inch House, a Grade A listed building and in a park of great amenity to the people of Gilmerton and Liberton. It also lies adjacent to two areas important for flood management, in an area where flooding has occurred in recent years. Development here would degrade the area, both in amenity and environmentally. It is disappointing to see soulless and environmentally insensitive nature of the the developments on Lang Loan and nearby; I hope developments of this nature will not be repeated in future.

Choice **1 C**

We want to identify areas that can be used for future water management to enable adaptation to climate change. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Rather than funnelling rainwater away, water should retained it for use, e.g. in irrigating gardens and urban farms, and perhaps replacing or replenishing the water used to flush toilets. There needs to be better separation of rainwater from the sewerage system, which becomes overwhelmed when there is heavy rain. We need sustainable drainage systems, including permeable pavements and roadside greenery. Green streets protect water quality in rivers and streams by removing up to 90% of pollutants. They replenish groundwater supplies, absorb carbon, improve air quality and neighborhood aesthetics, and provide green connections between parks and open space. Vegetated curb extensions improve pedestrian and bicycle safety, and calm traffic.

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 1 D

We want to clearly set out under what circumstances the development of poor quality or underused open space will be considered acceptable. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Existing public parks and land designated as green belt should not include permanent residential or commercial buildings. Open spaces should be clearly defined both in area and their status - there are too many contradictory documents that define areas in overlapping categories. As mentioned earlier, lack of upkeep by landowners/developers should be better scrutinised by the CEC, and addressed through existing powers.

Choice 1 E

We want to introduce a new 'extra-large green space standard' which recognises that as we grow communities will need access to green spaces more than 5 hectares. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation This is to be welcomed in principle, but needs to be very well defined. Access needs to be for all, but any such creation of large open spaces the size of the Meadows should respect the natural features of the area and its surroundings, be fit for purpose and not seen as an afterthought. Development should have this space at its core, with housing and other properties designed around it rather than before it.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 1 F

We want to identify specific sites for new allotments and food growing, both as part of new development sites and within open space in the urban area. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 1 G

We want to identify space for additional cemetery provision, including the potential for green and woodland burials. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 1 H

We want to revise our existing policies and green space designations to ensure that new green spaces have long term maintenance and management arrangements in place. Do you agree with this? - Yes/No

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **2 A**

We want all development (including change of use), through design and access statements, to demonstrate how their design will incorporate measures to tackle and adapt to climate change, their future adaptability and measures to address accessibility for people with varying needs, age and mobility issues as a key part of their layouts. - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Our buildings need to be sustainable to meet our aspiration to become net-zero for all greenhouse gases by 2045 under the Climate Change Act 2019. I support this policy. Everyone has a right to adequate housing. City of Edinburgh Council should sign up to #MakeTheShift, along with forty other cities around the world. At least 10% of any major new development should be accessible, and we should strive to re-purpose properties or make them accessible. The Equality and Human Rights Commission describe the shortage of accessible housing as “Scotland’s Hidden Crisis”. The Equality and Human Rights Commission recommends that a minimum of 10% of new housing is built to wheelchair-accessible standards. Glasgow City Council have already done this.

However, current CEC Guidance for Businesses section on short stay visitor accommodation incentivises accessible main door, ground floor accessible properties for short-term letting investment, which are the only properties in tenements that are likely to be accessible! Nearly two thirds of the housing stock is in tenements and do not make for easily accessible homes. The design schedule for housing outlines the standards required for properties funded through the Affordable Housing Supply Programme in Glasgow and brings together all of the good practice to set out an exemplar minimum standard for all new build housing in the city. Another issue here, in particular in light of the Covid-19 pandemic, is the convertibility of student accommodation into long term residential use, which may be more likely if student numbers decrease and social distancing remains in place for extended periods. Most student accommodation has not been designed with conversion in mind; in fact most looks designed for maximum profit and housing density. This should be incorporated into any assessment of future student accommodation planning applications as a priority.

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 2 B

We want to revise our policies on density to ensure that we make best use of the limited space in our city and that sites are not under-developed. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation ... and No. This is where the present Covid-19 situation complicates matters; high density development usually implies multi-story, and which may prove difficult if only 2 people can ride in a lift at a time. We've seen what happens when high-rise developments are poorly planned and/or adapted (e.g. Grenfell, plus virtually all UK cities built such blocks in in 1960's/1970's and most have now been demolished). Public transport may see a fall-off in use due to the crowded nature of the buses, trains etc, so this policy will need some serious re-examination. Having said all that, I would also say we may have the opportunity to take back office space in the city, which itself took over large proportions of the city centre from residential use. The University of Edinburgh could well rid itself of e.g. Buccleuch Place and return that to housing, especially if more home working becomes the norm. I suspect hot desking may be a thing of the past too.....

Choice 2 C

We want to revise our design and layout policies to achieve ensure their layouts deliver active travel and connectivity links. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation The priority should be on safe travel for all. Revision of road layouts to include green features such as those seen in Portland, Oregon and elsewhere may improve safety, and provide a pollution-reducing and climate change adaptable environment at the same time. With social distancing and greater emphasis on active travel, we *must* have wider pavements, and better surfaces on this pavements, especially for those with mobility issues and other disabilities such as sight loss. There are too many obstacles, both movable (bins) and fixed (street furniture, signage, mid-crossing staggered pedestrian pens), Pavement and cycling space should be freed up and ideally separated from vehicles wherever possible. Kirk Brae is a disgrace in this respect; an arterial route down which far too much traffic pours, impossible for pedestrians to cross safely, plagued by speeding on a route to school, and lacking a pedestrian crossing sequence at its foot! Shameful oversight.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **2 D**

We want all development, including student housing, to deliver quality open space and public realm, useable for a range of activities, including drying space, without losing densities. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **3 A**

We want all buildings and conversions to meet the zero carbon / platinum standards as set out in the current Scottish Building Regulations. Instead we could require new development to meet the bronze, silver or gold standard. Which standard should new development in Edinburgh meet? - Which standard?

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **4 A**

We want to work with local communities to prepare Place Briefs for areas and sites within City Plan 2030 highlighting the key elements of design, layout, and transport, education and healthcare infrastructure development should deliver. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation This is welcome, but hugely undefined. This sounds like a top-down approach, and who do you define as 'local communities' existing, council-funded organisations like CCs and groups who receive grants from the council, and therefore are beholden to the Council, or more widely such as the Friends groups, residents associations, youth groups, other who have an interest in their local area who don't belong to a specific organisation? Given the Scottish Government's recent overruling of CEC planning decisions I have concerns that local input into Place Briefs will have little influence.

Choice **4 B**

We want to support Local Place Plans being prepared by our communities. City Plan 2030 will set out how Local Place Plans can help us achieve great places and support community ambitions. - How should the Council work with local communities to prepare Local Place Plans?

Short Response

Explanation The problem with this approach is that there are many examples I've seen, where local groups come forward to voice their concerns/suggestions about their local area, but they are over-ruled or ignored by local or central government. Recently, for example, local parents lobbied for the building of a safe crossing on Kirk Brae, or a pedestrian sequence at the traffic lights, only to be fobbed off with a plan for a totally inadequate build-out of the pavement on one side of the road by the City Engineers, based on an inadequate traffic survey, taken at the wrong time of day. Apparently there are not enough children at risk of injury to merit a crossing or a pedestrian sequence at the traffic lights! Self-fulfilling prophecy since parents don't want to risk it, and as a result drive their kids to school.

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 5 A

We want City Plan 2030 to direct development to where there is existing infrastructure capacity, including education, healthcare and sustainable transport, or where potential new infrastructure will be accommodated and deliverable within the plan period. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation There have been missed opportunities to alleviate existing school overcrowding on existing sites. The recent fire at Liberton Primary School was an opportunity to extend and improve an already overcrowded school, but it seems that opportunity will be missed. It's not clear how the recent developments all over South Edinburgh have affected schools' ability to cope with increased student numbers, but the ongoing housing developments along Lang Loan, Burdiehouse/Broomhills etc can only add to the pressure on existing education infrastructure. It is not clear to me from the Council's assessment that the impact of these large scale developments have been adequately dealt with. The Sick Kids Hospital still lies empty more than a year after it should have opened, and local GPs report increasing enrolment of students with illness including mental health problems at surgeries, which are adding to the burden on primary and to some extent secondary healthcare. Combined with a shortage of GPs, it is unfair to add any more pressure to our primary healthcare system by unnecessary development in Edinburgh South in particular. On transport, Route 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 Fairemilehead junctions are identified in the City Mobility plan as congestion areas, but equally poor is the complex junction at the foot of Liberton Brae, without a full pedestrian crossing access and poorly laid out road markings, strangely erratic light sequences, pavement parked cars at traffic/cyclist pinch points and still no ban on right turns, which cause endless tailbacks. Route 3 should have 3 souther forks, via Straiton, Sherriffhall and Fairemilehead.

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

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 5 B

We want City Plan 2030 to set out where new community facilities are needed, and that these must be well connected to active travel routes and in locations with high accessibility to good sustainable public transport services. Do you agree with this? - Yes / NO

Short Response

Explanation Partially explained in 4B. However, *existing* community facilities should be upgraded wherever possible, to alleviate the pressure on areas that have already accommodated additional development. An example would be Inch House, part of which is almost derelict, but which sits at the heart of an area that has seen extensive development over recent years, and which is crying out for more facilities for local people. As banks close, it would be good to keep those buildings for community use - many have ended up as flats and commercial premises, whereas they tend to be at the centre of a local area, could probably act as a commercial social hub and or activity centre, and perhaps even maintain cashpoint facilities where no other free cash machines are available. The Bank of Scotland at Liberton Drive will close on 23rd June, and is a prime example.

Choice 5 C

We want to reflect the desire to co-locate our community services close to the communities they serve, supporting a high walk-in population and reducing the need to travel. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation Good idea, if it can be arranged. Some areas this is easier to design, others where there is a less well-defined centre, might need a cluster of services nearby each other.

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 5 D1

We want to set out in the plan where development will be expected to contribute toward new or expanded community infrastructure. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 5 D2

We want to use cumulative contribution zones to determine infrastructure actions, costs and delivery mechanisms. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 5 E

We want to stop using supplementary guidance and set out guidance for developer contributions within the plan, Action Programme and in non-statutory guidance. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **6 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **6 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation Not sure whether this is the right approach. There should be no increase in parking anywhere, and indeed a large reduction in parking spaces as we make roads more amenable to active travel and social distancing. We need more options for delivery of goods in fewer, smaller vehicles, preferably electric and active reduction in larger more polluting vehicles from the city.

Choice **7 A**

We want to determine parking levels in development based on targets for trips by walking, cycling and public transport. These targets could be set by area, development type, or both and will be supported by other measures to control on-street parking. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice **7 B**

We want to protect against the development of additional car parking in the city centre to support the delivery of the Council's city centre transformation programme. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **7 C**

We want to update our parking policies to control demand and to support parking for bikes, those with disabilities and electric vehicles via charging infrastructure. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **7 D**

We want to support the city's park and ride infrastructure by safeguarding sites for new park and ride and extensions, including any other sites that are identified in the City Mobility Plan or its action plan. Do you agree with this?

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **8 A**

We want to update our policy on the Cycle and Footpath Network to provide criteria for identifying new routes. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **8 B**

As part of the City Centre Transformation and other Council and partner projects to improve strategic walking and cycling links around the city, we want to add the following routes (along with our existing safeguards) to our network as active travel proposals to ensure that they are delivered. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **8 C**

We want City Plan 2030 to safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites. We also want the City Plan 2030 to include any new strategic active travel links which may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or which are identified through this consultation. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 9 A

We want to consult on designating Edinburgh, or parts of Edinburgh, as a 'Short Term Let Control Area' where planning permission will always be required for the change of use of whole properties for short-term lets. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 9 B

We want to create a new policy on the loss of homes to alternative uses. This new policy will be used when planning permission is required for a change of use of residential flats and houses to short-stay commercial visitor accommodation or other uses. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice **10 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **10 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 10 C

We want to create a new policy promoting the better use of stand-alone out of centre retail units and commercial centres, where their redevelopment for mixed use including housing would be supported. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 11 A

We want to amend our policy to increase the provision of affordable housing requirement from 25% to 35%. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 11 B

We want City Plan 2030 to require a mix of housing types and tenures – we want the plan to be prescriptive on the required mix, including the percentage requirement for family housing and support for the Private Rented Sector. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **12 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 BX**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **13 A**

We want to create a new policy that provides support for social enterprises, start-ups, culture and tourism, innovation and learning, and the low carbon sector, where there is a contribution to good growth for Edinburgh. Do you agree with this? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 14 A

We want City Plan 2030 to support the best use of existing public transport infrastructure in West Edinburgh and accommodate the development of a mix of uses to support inclusive, sustainable growth. We will do this through ‘an area of search’ which allows a wide consideration of future uses within West Edinburgh without being tied to individual sites. Do you support this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 14 B

We want to remove the safeguard in the existing plan for the Royal Highland Showground site to the south of the A8 at Norton Park and allocate the site for other uses. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 14 C

We want City Plan 2030 to allocate the Airport’s contingency runway, the “crosswinds runway” for the development of alternative uses next to the Edinburgh Gateway interchange. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 15 A

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 B

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 15 D

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 E

We want to support new hotel provision in local, town, commercial centres and other locations with good public transport access throughout Edinburgh. Do you agree with this approach? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 G

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **16 A1**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 A2**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 A3**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 16 A4

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 A5

We want to continue to support office development in other accessible locations elsewhere in the urban area. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 A5

We want to continue to support office development in other accessible locations elsewhere in the urban area. Do you agree? - Do you have an office site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan?

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **16 B**

We want to identify sites and locations within Edinburgh with potential for office development. Do you agree with this? - Yes/No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 C**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 EX**

We want to identify proposals for new modern business and industrial sites to provide necessary floorspace at the following locations. Do you agree? - Explain why

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Supporting Info

Name

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice 16 F

We want to ensure new business space is provided as part of the redevelopment of urban sites and considered in Place Briefs for greenfield sites. We want to set out the amount expected to be re-provided, clearer criteria on what constitutes flexible business space, and how to deliver it, including the location on-site, and considering adjacent uses, servicing and visibility. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 G

We want to continue to protect industrial estates that are designated under our current policy on Employment Sites and Premises (Emp 8). Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 H

We want to introduce a policy that provides criteria for locations that we would support city-wide and neighbourhood goods distribution hubs. Do you agree? - Yes / No

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref:

00393

Response Ref:

ANON-KU2U-GPVA-N

Supporting Info

Yes

Name

David Cavanagh

Email

david.cavanagh@ed.ac.uk

Response Type

Residents Organisation

On behalf of:

Liberton Association
