

# Planning Committee

**10.00, Thursday, 12 June 2014**

## Local Development Plan: Second Proposed Plan

Item number	5.1
Report number	
Executive/routine	
Wards	

### Executive summary

---

The purpose of this report is to seek the Committee's approval of a Second Proposed Plan – the next stage in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) project.

The Council is preparing its first LDP. When adopted it will replace two local plans and will be used to determine planning applications.

Following a major consultation stage in 2011/12, the Council published a Proposed Plan in May 2013, for a period during which representations could be submitted by interested parties. Due to changes in the Strategic Development Plan (SDP) for South East Scotland, the LDP needs to be revised to provide more housing land. The appended Second Proposed Plan does so, having regard to the representations received and in line with the SDP and national planning policy. The appended Plan is accompanied by supporting documents, including a Second Proposed Action Programme.

### Links

---

Coalition pledges	<a href="#">P4</a> , <a href="#">P8</a> , <a href="#">P15</a> , <a href="#">P17</a> , <a href="#">P18</a>
Council outcomes	<a href="#">CO7</a> , <a href="#">CO8</a> , <a href="#">CO16</a> , <a href="#">CO18</a> , <a href="#">CO19</a> , <a href="#">CO22</a> , <a href="#">CO23</a>
Single Outcome Agreement	<a href="#">SO1</a> , <a href="#">SO2</a> , <a href="#">SO3</a> , <a href="#">SO4</a>

## Local Development Plan: Second Proposed Plan

### Recommendations

---

- 1.1 It is recommended that the Committee:
- 1) Approves the Second Proposed Plan, subject to any necessary and minor drafting or technical edits (Appendix 1 and associated Proposals Map), and notes the changes from the first Proposed Plan (Appendix 2).
  - 2) Approves the attached supporting documents (Appendices 3 and 4) and refers the Second Proposed Action Programme (Appendix 4) to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee for its consideration.
  - 3) Approves the new Development Plan Scheme for immediate circulation to interested parties (Appendix 5).
  - 4) Notes the background documents to be published with the Plan.


### Background

---

- 2.1 Edinburgh is a successful, growing city. That growth is driven by the city's assets, which include its citizens, its centres of employment and learning, and its quality of life. That growth needs to be guided and shaped in order to maintain and promote those assets and to deliver the Council's objectives. That is the purpose of development plans.
- 2.2 The Council is preparing its first Local Development Plan (LDP). Following consultation in 2011/12, the Planning Committee approved a Proposed Plan in March 2013. This set out updated policies on a number of issues raised at the earlier consultation stage, and new housing allocations to meet the land requirements in the Proposed Strategic Development Plan (SDP) for South East Scotland.
- 2.3 The Proposed Plan was published for representations at the start of May 2013 – a six week period running to mid-June. The 2,300 responses received were made public in October 2013. A report to the Planning Committee outlined the issues they raised (3 October 2013).
- 2.4 At this stage in an LDP project, the normal expectation is that the Council would consider the representations to a Proposed Plan, but would not necessarily modify the Plan in response to them (see Scottish Government Circular 6/2013).

Instead, the Council would submit the Plan, all unresolved representations and the Council's position on them to be dealt with in an independently-run examination.

- 2.5 In the case of this LDP, the Council cannot do so because the SDP has been approved with major changes and the LDP no longer conforms to it. The SDP changes were summarised in a report to Planning Committee on 23 October 2013.
- 2.6 The changes mean that in order to conform to the SDP, the LDP needs to be revised to provide more housing land. Edinburgh's share of the total amount needed is set in SDP Supplementary Guidance. This has been finalised by SESplan following consultation. It has now been ratified by all six SESplan authorities (see report to Planning Committee - 15 May 2014) and was submitted to Scottish Ministers on 21 May 2014.
- 2.7 The revisions to the LDP mean that supporting documents, including the Proposed Action Programme, need to be updated.
- 2.8 This report seeks the Planning Committee's approval for a Second Proposed Plan and the relevant associated documents.
- 2.9 This diagram explains the overall process in simplified form:



### Overview

- 3.1 The new version of the Plan is titled 'Second Proposed Plan' for reasons given in the Risk, Policy, Compliance and Governance Impact section below. It consists of:
- The Written Statement (Appendix 1); and
  - The Proposals Map (also available in the Group Room and at City Chambers Reception).
- 3.2 Once approved, the Plan will be printed and made widely available. It will also be published online, with the Proposals Map available in interactive form. The Second Proposed Plan retains the format, structure and most of the content of the first Proposed Plan.
- 3.3 In revising the Plan, the Council has to (among other things):
- Ensure its compliance with the approved SDP and its Supplementary Guidance.
  - Have regard to the representations made to the first Proposed Plan in 2013.
  - Take account of the National Planning Framework.
  - Comply with Scottish Planning Policy.
- 3.4 The changes from the first Proposed Plan (March 2013) are listed in Appendix 2.
- 3.5 The reasons for making or not making a change are summarised in Appendix 3. In some cases, they draw upon evidence set out in the Environmental Report – Second Revision, which is available as a background document and will be published alongside the LDP itself.

### Aims

- 3.6 The first Proposed Plan set out five aims. These have received general support, however the opportunity has been taken to add reference to 'health' to Aim 5 and to simplify the wording of Aims 2 and 3 while retaining their full meaning. The Aims now read:
- AIM 1: support the growth of the city economy.
  - AIM 2: help increase the number and improve the quality of new homes being built
  - AIM 3: help ensure that the citizens of Edinburgh can get around easily by sustainable transport modes to access jobs and services



- AIM 4: look after and improve our environment for future generations in a changing climate
- AIM 5: help create strong, sustainable and healthier communities, enabling all residents to enjoy a high quality of life.

## Housing Sites

3.7 The reason for revising the Plan is to provide more housing land. This is a consequence of the Scottish Ministers' approval of the SDP, with major changes, in June 2013. Part 1, Section 3 of the Second Proposed Plan summarises the housing land needed and how it is to be provided from various sources. Further detail, for example on the assumptions about existing supply, demolitions and brownfield and windfall supply, is set out in a background document – the Housing Land Study.

3.8 Key points to note include:

- A generosity margin of 10% has been added to the overall housing land figure in the SDP Supplementary Guidance. This is in line with Scottish Planning Policy and is necessary to ensure a generous supply of land to meet the overall requirement. Draft Scottish Planning Policy (April 2013) defines this margin as being 10 to 20%. The lower end of this range adds 2,950 homes to the target, with further generosity provided through the use of density ranges for site allocations and in a margin of error for the windfall assumption. A higher generosity percentage (i.e. more than 10%) would increase the amount of greenfield land released, which was a concern raised in the representations of many community groups and individuals.
- A much lower number of homes are assumed to be demolished in the relevant time period (2009 – 2024) than is assumed in the SDP Supplementary Guidance. This is based on the information set out in the Housing Land Study. This new assumption reduces the amount of new land which needs to be allocated in the LDP.
- The analysis set out in the Housing Land Study justifies a higher windfall assumption than previously made. Most windfall housing comes forward on brownfield land.
- Taking into account all the above, there is a need for new land allocations to provide for 8,484 homes.
- Priority has been given to brownfield land, mostly in the windfall assumption but also by the allocation of a new predominately brownfield site at Ellen's Glen Road and the mixed use designation at Edinburgh Park / South Gyle.
- Greenfield land has been assessed using criteria which ensure conformity to the SDP and Scottish Planning Policy.

- 3.9 The assessment of greenfield land is set out in the Environmental Report – Second Revision, which is a background document (see its appendices 5-9). The criteria used relate to the three reasons for green belt policy and are listed in Table 1:


<b>Direct Growth to Appropriate Locations and Support Regeneration</b>	
Is the site located on brownfield land?	
Can the site be made available for development?	
1. Does the site have good accessibility to existing public transport?	2. (If not) would sufficient enhancements be feasible?
1. Does the site have good infrastructure capacity?	2. (If not) would sufficient enhancements be feasible?
<b>Protect &amp; Enhance Character, Landscape Setting and Identity of Settlements</b>	
Would the site, if developed, affect the wider landscape setting of the city?	
Would the site enable clear and defensible green belt boundaries to be formed?	
Can the site be integrated into and in keeping with the character of the settlement and local area?	
<b>Protect and Provide Access to Open Space</b>	
Would development of the site avoid impacting upon existing access to countryside recreation?	

Table 1: Housing Site Assessment Criteria (from Environmental Report – Second Revision)

- 3.10 The Environmental Report – Second Revision also assesses the appended LDP proposals in terms of other factors, such as flood risk and cultural heritage.
- 3.11 The new greenfield sites in the first Proposed Plan have been retained. All of these sites were the subject of representations seeking their removal (see 3 October 2013 report for more information). The reasons for their retention are explained in Appendix 3 Issues 7-9 and in the Environmental Report – Second Revision.
- 3.12 The SDP gives priority to defined Strategic Development Areas when allocating new land. Some additional capacity in the West and South East Edinburgh Strategic Development Areas has been identified by counting the mid-point of each site’s capacity range rather than the minimum. This is reasonable, as there is no longer a need to build in such a generosity margin on a site-by-site basis. Additional capacity within the existing boundary of the Maybury site has now been assumed during the LDP period, in line with the assumptions of economic recovery made for the approved SDP.

- 3.13 A new greenfield site has been allocated in South East Edinburgh Strategic Development Area, at Brunstane. This was previously assessed as being landlocked to through-routes for public transport access, and therefore unsuitable for allocation. Further work has demonstrated that there is a feasible solution. The site now performs sufficiently well in the assessment criteria to merit allocation.
- 3.14 The other sites promoted by representations in these Strategic Development Areas do not meet the above assessment criteria used in the Environmental Report – Second Revision and their allocation would not conform to the SDP or Scottish Planning Policy.
- 3.15 Three other sites in the first Proposed Plan have been retained, at Moredunvale Road, Curriemuirend and Riccarton Mains Road. Their capacity (revised in two cases) counts towards the overall housing need. The reasons for their retention are explained in Appendix 3 Issues 10 and 11.
- 3.16 Taken together, the above sites are insufficient to meet the overall requirement, and there is therefore a need to release some land from the green belt outwith the Strategic Development Areas. Previously the Proposed SDP limited such sites to under 50 dwellings but the approved SDP allows them, if appropriate.
- 3.17 The sites outwith Strategic Development Areas have been assessed (see Environmental Report – Second Revision Appendices 7-9). The following sites meet the assessment criteria and are allocated in Table 4 in the appended Plan:
- Builyeon Road, Queensferry
  - South Scotstoun, Queensferry
  - Dalmeny (Bankhead Road)
  - Curriehill Road, Currie
  - Newmills, Balerno

3.18 With all of the above assumptions, retentions and additions, the appended Plan meets the housing land target in a spatial strategy which directs growth to appropriate, accessible locations and maintains the landscape setting of the city and strong long-term boundaries. Figure 1 in the Written Statement summarises the spatial strategy and is reproduced below:



Spatial Strategy Summary figure from Second Proposed Plan (Appendix 1)

### Action Programme and Infrastructure Appraisals

3.19 Many of the representations objecting to the new housing sites in the first Proposed Plan raise concerns about impacts on the transport network and/or school capacities. These are addressed by the actions identified in the Transport Appraisal and Education Appraisal which accompanied the first Proposed Plan. That work has been updated for the additional housing sites. An Addendum to the Transport Appraisal, and a Revised Education Appraisal are available as background documents and will be published alongside the Second Proposed Plan.

3.20 The Second Proposed Action Programme (Appendix 4) includes the measures identified in those appraisals. It has been reformatted to be clearer and to take account of other emerging good practice for action programmes. It will be accompanied by an annex of indicative costs which supersedes the one

approved by the Planning Committee on 27 February 2014 (in a report on developer contributions guidance).

- 3.21 Representations have also raised concerns about the impact of new housing on the capacity of healthcare facilities such as GPs and dentists. Due to the nature of these services as independent and semi-independent professional practices, it is less straightforward to appraise impact and deliver relevant actions. The Second Proposed Plan and Action Programme include policies and actions relating to primary healthcare facilities and work is underway with the Community Health Partnership which may identify site-specific actions for inclusion in future editions of the Action Programme.
- 3.22 It has been agreed that following the adoption of the LDP, the Action Programme would be reported for annual approval by both the Planning Committee and the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee (Report to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee, 4 December 2012). In order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure actions are planned and funded on an appropriate timescale, it is recommended that the appended version of the Action Programme be referred to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee for its consideration at this stage.

### **Other Issues**

- 3.23 The Schedules of Representations (Appendix 3) summarise how the appended Second Proposed Plan addresses issues raised during consultation. These are grouped as follows:
- Introduction, Aims & Strategy (Issue 1)
  - Green Belt and Special Landscape Areas (Issue 2)
  - Other Environmental Issues (Issue 3)
  - Economic Development and Shopping & Leisure (Issue 4)
  - Housing and Community Facilities (Issue 5)
  - Existing Housing Proposals (Issue 6)
  - New housing sites (Issues 7 – 16, *outlined in paras 3.7 – 3.18 above*)
  - Transport and Resources (Issue 17)
  - Strategic Development Areas – other matters (Issue 18)
  - Policies DtS1 + DtS2 on contributions (Issue 19)
  - Design and Environment policies (Issue 20)
  - Employment, Housing and Shopping policies (Issue 21)
  - Transport and Resources policies (Issue 22)

### **Publicity and Engagement**

- 3.24 Once approved and ready for formal publication, the Second Proposed Plan must be made available for a period for representations. The attached

Development Plan Scheme (Appendix 5) includes a participation statement. This is required by legislation and explains when, how and with whom engagement on the Second Proposed Plan will take place.

3.25 As with the first Proposed Plan, this is not a consultation stage in the way that the Main Issues Report was. National advice set out in [Circular 6/2013](#) explains that the character of engagement changes as an LDP project progresses. The MIR stage is the main consultation, when people are asked to respond to proposals and options. The Circular goes on to state:

*Following publication of the Proposed Plan the character of engagement will change again: the authority should have now reached a settled view, and the emphasis should be on providing specific information and facilitating representations. (Para 72)*

3.26 Accordingly, the participation statement in Appendix 5 sets out:

- Actions intended to help the public understand the Proposed LDP and how it has been informed by consultation responses.
- Information on how to make representations.

3.27 All parties on the LDP mailing list, including those who responded to the first Proposed Plan and the Main Issues Report, will be notified of the Second Proposed Plan's publication in advance of the six week period for representations. That period is due to start by 22 August and run to 3 October. This is the statutory minimum six-week period and avoids deadlines during school or public holidays.

3.28 There is a requirement to notify neighbouring properties around LDP site proposals. This is done on a similar basis to neighbour notification for planning applications. This measure is intended to ensure that neighbouring residents are made aware of their opportunity to submit representations. At the first Proposed Plan stage over 12,000 notification letters were sent out. Notification letters will be sent to neighbours of all the proposals in the Second Proposed Plan, i.e. those proposals retained from the first version plus all the additional sites.

3.29 Because the new version is a Second Proposed Plan, rather than a Modified Plan, planning legislation means that the representations made in 2013 cannot be carried forward to examination. This means that parties who still seek change to the LDP will need to submit new representations which relate to the Second Proposed Plan.

3.30 It is recognised that this may prove onerous for some community groups which organised mass responses. For this reason, advance notice of this potential requirement has been given at briefings since November 2013. In addition, it is intended to provide support to such groups through guidance on submitting representations, providing summaries for each Neighbourhood Partnership area and by providing a named contact to help advise groups. The notification letters to neighbours and those on the mailing list referred to above will also provide guidance on this matter.

### **Relationship to other Strategies and Projects**

3.31 The Second Proposed Plan has been prepared with a significant level of corporate joint working. Key Agencies and other partners have provided input and will continue to do so as planning applications are brought forward and the Action Programme is implemented and updated.

3.32 The LDP complements and is supported by the following:

- Economic Strategy for 2012-2017, which identifies the four main development areas which the LDP promotes.
- City Housing Strategy 2012-2017, which identifies the strong need for new housing, including affordable housing, which the LDP helps to meet.
- Local Transport Strategy 2014-2019, which sets the priorities for transport which AIM 3 of the LDP help to meet

3.33 The LDP also complements other Council strategies and projects, including the Council's Strategic Plan 2012- 2017.

### **Measures of success**

---

4.1 The growth of the city is guided and shaped in a way which maintains and promotes the assets which drive Edinburgh's success and which delivers the Council's objectives.

4.2 The Council maintains up-to-date development plan coverage.

4.3 Stakeholders are kept well informed of opportunities to be involved in the LDP process.

### **Financial impact**

---

5.1 There are no direct financial impacts arising from this report. The costs of printing and publishing the Second Proposed Plan and its supporting documents will be met from existing budgets. They are being minimised by reducing the number of printed documents, while still providing them to community councils and libraries.

- 5.2 Indicative costs for infrastructure and other actions which would support the LDP's policies and proposals are set out in the Second Proposed Action Programme. These are subject to change as the LDP proceeds to adoption and the Action Programme is updated with more accurate information on the costs of actions.
- 5.3 This report recommends that the appended Action Programme be referred to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee for its consideration.

## **Risk, policy, compliance and governance impact**

---

- 6.1 Preparing an LDP is a statutory process in which the risk of failure to comply with relevant legislation needs to be managed. It is also an activity for which national policy exists and needs to be taken into account.
- 6.2 The appended Second Proposed Plan results from modifications to achieve conformity with the approved Strategic Development Plan and its Supplementary Guidance, as required by the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006.
- 6.3 The modifications result in changes to the underlying spatial strategy of the LDP. Accordingly, it constitutes a new Proposed Plan, rather than a Modified Plan. The main implication of this relates to representations and is explained in the section on Publicity and Engagement above.
- 6.5 Planning legislation requires that LDPs include a schedule of council ownership for sites affected by provisions of the plan relating to development. A large number of sites was identified in the first Proposed Plan (see its appendix D). An updated schedule will be included in the published version of the Second Proposed Plan. It should be noted that one update will relate to the additional housing allocation at Brunstane, which is owned by the EDI Group and hence the Council.
- 6.6 Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation requires that a LDP be accompanied by an Environmental Report identifying the likely significant environmental effects of the plan. The Environmental Report – Second Revision is available as a background document.
- 6.7 The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 places a general duty on local authorities to reduce flood risk. The appended LDP does so by avoiding known areas of fluvial flood risk for new development and through relevant policy measures.
- 6.8 The intended corporate role of the action programme has led to new governance arrangements, through the formation of an officer action group to lead the implementation and annual reporting of the action programme.

## **Equalities impact**

---

- 7.1 An Equalities and Rights Impact Assessment has been carried out for the LDP. Its findings were summarised in the report for the first Proposed Plan (19 March



2013). The report of the assessment has been updated and is available as a background document. It records that the modifications do not result in any significantly different impact in terms of equalities and rights.

## Sustainability impact

---

- 8.1 The impacts of this report in relation to the three elements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 Public Bodies Duties have been considered, and the outcomes summarised below. Relevant Council sustainable development policies have been taken into account.
- The proposals in this report will reduce carbon emissions because the Second Proposed LDP includes policies which require new development to reduce its carbon emissions.
  - The proposals in this report will increase the city's resilience to climate change impacts because the Second Proposed LDP includes policies which manage flood risk and require new development to incorporate adaptations to the impact of climate change.
  - The proposals in this report will help achieve a sustainable Edinburgh because it is one of the stated aims of the Second Proposed LDP to help create strong, sustainable communities, enabling all residents to enjoy a high quality of life. The Second Proposed LDP itself (Appendix 1) explains how in more detail.
  - The proposals in this report will help achieve a sustainable Edinburgh because it is one of the stated aims of the Second Proposed LDP to support the growth of the city economy. The Second Proposed LDP itself (Appendix 1) explains how in more detail.
  - The proposals in this report will help achieve a sustainable Edinburgh because the Second Proposed LDP includes policies which require new development to reduce resource use, protect and enhance biodiversity and which support the national Zero Waste Plan's objectives.

The LDP is also the subject of a statutory Strategic Environmental Assessment process and a Habitats Regulation Appraisal. The former is described above, the latter has been updated and is available as a background document.

## Consultation and engagement

---

- 9.1 The main LDP consultation process was carried out in late 2011 / early 2012 at the Main Issues Report stage (see report to Planning Committee, 19 March 2013 Appendix 3). The findings informed the first Proposed Plan and the appended Second Proposed Plan. Representations to that version have been taken into account as explained in Appendix 3. The public and other stakeholders will have an opportunity to make representations on the Second Proposed Plan as described in the appended Development Plan Scheme.

9.2 The partner organisations which have a statutory role in the preparation of an LDP are defined as Key Agencies. They are:

- NHS Lothian
- Scottish Enterprise
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- Scottish Natural Heritage
- Historic Scotland
- Transport Scotland
- SEStran
- Forestry Commission

### **Background reading / external references**

---

LDP Development Plan Scheme, Report to Planning Committee, [23 October 2013](#).

Strategic Development Plan Supplementary Guidance on Housing Land , reports to Planning Committee, [15 May 2014](#) and [23 October 2013](#)

Local Development Plan Update, Report to Planning Committee, [3 October 2013](#)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan (March 2013) – Report to Planning Committee, 19 March 2013

[http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/meetings/meeting/2944/planning\\_committee](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/meetings/meeting/2944/planning_committee)

(project documents and map available at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan))

Local Development Plan - Aims and Delivery, Report to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee ([4 December 2012](#))

Edinburgh Local Development Plan [Main Issues Report](#) (October 2011)

[Circular 6/2013 – Development Planning](#), Scottish Government

### **John Bury**

Acting Director of Services for Communities

Contact: Ben Wilson, Principal Planner

E-mail: [ben.wilson@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:ben.wilson@edinburgh.gov.uk) | Tel: 0131 469 3411

<b>Coalition pledges</b>	<p>P4 Draw up a long-term strategic plan to tackle both over-crowding and under use in schools</p> <p>P8 Make sure the city's people are well-housed, including encouraging developers to built residential communities, starting with brownfield sites</p> <p>P15 Work with public organisations, the private sector and social enterprise to promote Edinburgh to investors</p> <p>P17 Continue efforts to develop the city's gap sites and encourage regeneration</p> <p>P18 Complete the tram project in accordance with current plans</p>
<b>Council outcomes</b>	<p>CO7 Edinburgh draws in new investment in development and regeneration</p> <p>CO8 Edinburgh's economy creates and sustains job opportunities</p> <p>CO16 Well-housed – People live in a good quality home that is affordable and meets their needs in a well-managed neighbourhood</p> <p>CO18 Green – We reduce the local environmental impact of our consumption and production</p> <p>CO19 Attractive Places and Well Maintained – Edinburgh remains an attractive city through the development of high quality buildings and places and the delivery of high standards and maintenance of infrastructure and public realm</p> <p>CO22 Moving efficiently – Edinburgh has transport system that improves connectivity and is green, healthy and accessible</p> <p>CO23 Well engaged and well informed – Communities and individuals are empowered and supported to improve local outcomes and foster a sense of community</p>
<b>Single Outcome Agreement</b>	<p>SO1 Edinburgh's economy delivers increased investment, jobs and opportunities for all</p> <p>SO2 Edinburgh's citizens experience improved health and wellbeing, with reduced inequalities in health</p> <p>SO3 Edinburgh's children and young people enjoy their childhood and fulfil their potential</p> <p>SO4 Edinburgh's communities are safer and have improved physical and social fabric</p>
<b>Appendices</b> *	<p>Appendix 1: Second Proposed Plan – Written Statement (Proposals Map available separately)</p> <p>Appendix 2: Changes to LDP</p> <p>Appendix 3: Schedules of Representations</p> <p>Appendix 4: Second Proposed Action Programme</p> <p>Appendix 5: Development Plan Scheme – June 2014</p>

Background documents to be published with Second Proposed Plan:

- Environmental Report – Second Revision
- Housing Land Study
- Revised Education Appraisal
- Transport Appraisal – Addendum
- Revised draft Habitats Regulation Appraisal
- Equalities and Rights Impact Assessment update

Appendix 1 – Second Proposed Plan – Written Statement

EDINBURGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

SECOND PROPOSED PLAN



12 June 2014

**Link to Proposals Map:**

The Proposals Map will be published as an interactive webpage by the start of the period for representations. It will be available in the interim as a set of pdfs at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan)

**Formatting Note – this version of the Second Proposed Plan for Committee approval is a word document presented in portrait format. The published document will be in a desktop published landscape format which makes use of large maps and a different style of presentation to distinguish different parts of the document's structure.**

**CONTENTS**

• <b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
• <b>Part 1 Strategy and Proposals</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Section 1 - Aims and Strategy</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Section 2 - A Plan to Protect and Enhance the Environment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Section 3 - A Plan to Provide Jobs, Homes and Services in                     the Right Locations</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Section 4 - A Plan that can Deliver</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Section 5 - A Plan for All parts of the City</b>	<b>50</b>
• <b>Part 2 Policies</b>	
<b>Section 1 - Delivering the Strategy</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Section 2 - Design Principles for New Development</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Section 3 - Caring for the Environment</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>Section 4 - Employment and Economic Development</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Section 5 - Housing and Community Facilities</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Section 6 - Shopping and Leisure</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Section 7 - Transport</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>Section 8 - Resources and Services</b>	<b>136</b>
<b>Appendix A Conservation Area Boundaries</b>	
<b>Appendix B Shopping Centres</b>	
<b>Appendix C Glossary</b>	
<b>Appendix D Schedule of CEC Ownership <i>(to be inserted after Committee)</i></b>	
<b>Appendix E Index of Policies <i>(to be inserted after Committee)</i></b>	

## 1 - INTRODUCTION

1. For the first time in over 30 years, Edinburgh has one plan covering the whole of the Council area. Across Edinburgh's Old and New Towns, from the Waterfront areas of Granton and Leith to the Pentland Hills, from Queensferry and Kirkliston to Craigmillar and Newcraighall and many other places in between, the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) provides a clear and consistent planning framework. Once adopted, the LDP will replace two local plans – Edinburgh City Local Plan and Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan.

2. The LDP sets out policies and proposals relating to the development and use of land in the Edinburgh area. The policies in the LDP will be used to determine future planning applications. The planning system rests on the powers which planning authorities have to manage development and to take enforcement action against breaches of planning control. When appropriate, the Council will remove, modify or stop unauthorised developments and changes of use. These powers are used at the discretion of the Council.

3. The LDP will also inform decisions on investment opportunities and the provision of infrastructure and community facilities. It is hoped that local residents and community groups use the LDP to better understand and get involved in the planning issues affecting their areas.

4. There are two main parts to the LDP:

### Part 1 – Strategy and Proposals

This explains what the LDP means for Edinburgh over the next 5 to 10 years. It sets out the plan's five core aims and anticipated land use changes – the main development proposals and where they are expected to take place. It also includes site briefs and development principles to guide some proposals. Part 1 highlights which areas and features of the city will be protected and, where possible, enhanced.

### Part 2 - Policies

This sets out the policies which the Council will use to ensure that development helps meet the core aims of the LDP. Planning applications will be assessed against relevant policies. The policies are presented in 8 sections:

- Delivering the Strategy
- Design Principles for New Development
- Caring for the Environment
- Employment and Economic Development
- Housing and Community Facilities
- Shopping and Leisure
- Transport
- Resources and Services

The LDP also includes a Proposals Map which illustrates the policies and proposals on an Ordnance Survey base map.

5. The LDP itself cannot make development happen. Investment is needed from private sector developers and a range of public sector organisations to bring forward development proposals and supporting infrastructure. The LDP is accompanied by an Action Programme which sets out how the Council intends the plan to be implemented. It includes a list of actions required to deliver the policies and proposals, including who is to carry out the action and the timescales involved.

6. In Scotland's four city regions, the development plan is made up of a Strategic Development Plan (SDP) as well as the LDP. The SDP for the Edinburgh city region has been prepared by SESPlan, the Strategic Development Planning Authority for Edinburgh and South East Scotland. SESplan comprises six member authorities – The City of Edinburgh, East Lothian, Fife, Midlothian, Scottish Borders and West Lothian.

7. The SDP vision is that:


“By 2032, the Edinburgh City Region is a healthier, more prosperous and sustainable place which continues to be internationally recognised as an outstanding area in which to live, work and do business”.

It includes eight aims and a spatial strategy aimed at meeting three key challenges - climate change, demographic change and sustainable economic growth.

8. Edinburgh's LDP is consistent with the SDP and its Supplementary Guidance on Housing Land and has a key role in helping to meet its aims and deliver its strategy.

The first Proposed LDP (March 2013) was prepared on the basis of the Proposed SDP. A representation period followed from 1 May – 14 June 2013. On 30 June 2013, Scottish Ministers approved the Strategic Development Plan and required SESplan to prepare Supplementary Guidance to distribute an increased overall housing requirement amongst the six Council areas. The finalised version of the Supplementary Guidance has been approved and submitted to Scottish Ministers.

The main stages in the LDP programme are summarised below



9. The Council is preparing supplementary guidance in connection with Policy Emp2 Edinburgh BioQuarter and Policy Ret8, in relation to alternative uses in town centres. This approach allows more detailed consideration of these topics in consultation with all interested parties. Once adopted, this supplementary guidance will form part of the development plan and be treated as such in determining planning applications.



10. In addition, the Council will continue to prepare, use and review its non-statutory guidelines (referred to collectively as Council guidance in this plan), development briefs and frameworks to provide detailed advice on a range of planning matters.

**PART 1 – STRATEGY AND PROPOSALS****SECTION 1 - AIMS AND STRATEGY**


11. The challenge for this Local Development Plan (LDP) is to help make Edinburgh the best place it can be, for everyone, now and in the future. This is not an easy challenge. We are living in tough economic times when difficult choices have to be made between competing priorities. In facing this challenge, the LDP aims to

1. support the growth of the city economy
2. help increase the number and improve the quality of new homes being built
3. help ensure that the citizens of Edinburgh can get around easily by sustainable transport modes to access jobs and services
4. look after and improve our environment for future generations in a changing climate and
5. help create strong, sustainable and healthier communities, enabling all residents to enjoy a high quality of life.

These aims are inter-linked and each can have impacts, both positive and negative, on the other four. The role of the LDP is to balance these aims to maximise the benefits of development for the good of Edinburgh. The LDP aims support the vision and outcomes outlined in the Council's Strategic Plan 2012-2017.

12. The Strategic Development Plan for Edinburgh and South East Scotland (SDP) identifies four Strategic Development Areas in Edinburgh. These will be the biggest areas of change over the next 5-10 years, providing a focus for new housing development, investment opportunities and job creation in locations with good accessibility to existing or planned public transport services. The LDP includes significant development proposals in these areas. It also supports change elsewhere in the city, for example, regeneration opportunities, redevelopment of vacant sites, green network improvements, new uses for empty commercial units and increased densities in appropriate locations.

13. The LDP supports Edinburgh's role as Scotland's capital city and recognises its importance as a key driver of the Scottish economy. Whilst the LDP promotes change and supports the growth of the city, it also places considerable importance on retaining and where possible enhancing Edinburgh's built and natural assets for future generations. The green belt plays an important role in directing the planned growth of the city and supporting regeneration. The quality of Edinburgh's buildings, streets and spaces influences the wellbeing of people living and working in the city and helps attract investment and create jobs. The LDP policies to protect and enhance the built and natural environment are therefore an integral part of the overall strategy. Figure 1 summarises the LDP's spatial strategy and shows what it means for different parts of the city.



**Figure 1 LDP Spatial Strategy Summary Map**

14. Edinburgh is a successful and growing city. The LDP strategy directs future growth to four Strategic Development Areas – major redevelopment opportunities in the **City Centre**, continuing regeneration at **Edinburgh Waterfront**, urban expansion with new tram and rail infrastructure at **West Edinburgh** and housing and business development on a range of sites in **South East Edinburgh**. In addition to new greenfield housing allocations in West Edinburgh and South East Edinburgh Strategic Development Areas, new sites have also been identified at Queensferry, Currie and Balerno.

15. The plan continues to promote the reuse of previously developed land and relies on windfall sites to contribute to meet the city's housing requirement. Potential large scale regeneration opportunities are shown on Figure 1. These are supported by the LDP's policies and some have masterplans or development briefs to guide their development. Prior to identifying additional greenfield housing sites, consideration has been given to potential new brownfield opportunities within the existing urban area. The LDP maintains a green belt around Edinburgh whilst ensuring the strategic growth requirements of the SDP can be accommodated. Key elements of the Green Belt controlling the outward growth of the city are identified on Figure 1.

16. The LDP strategy directs new housing to sites which best meet a range of assessment criteria including landscape impact, green belt boundaries, accessibility to public transport and infrastructure capacity. One of the new housing sites (at Brunstane) will result in further coalescence between Edinburgh and Musselburgh. Whilst development resulting in the coalescence of settlements is not normally supported, it is justified in this instance because this site compared favourably to

other possible options in the housing site assessment - see Volume 2 of the Environmental Report Second Revision.

## SECTION 2 - A PLAN TO PROTECT AND ENHANCE THE ENVIRONMENT

### 1) Climate Change

17. The Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 and the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 place a duty on the Council to act in the best way to reduce emissions, adapt to climate change and prepare development plans to further sustainable development. Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) also requires development plans to ensure that the siting, design and layout of all new development will limit likely greenhouse gas emissions.

18. The Council's commitment to fulfilling these duties is evident throughout the LDP, with policies addressing both the reduction of greenhouse emissions and the ability to adapt to a changing climate. The LDP;

- promotes development in sustainable locations and requires new buildings to include carbon reduction measures
- promotes sustainable and active travel
- supports small to medium scale, decentralised and community based renewables, and the greater use of micro-generation of renewable energy
- supports the adaptation of existing homes to reduce energy use, including listed buildings and those located in conservation areas, provided there is no adverse impact on historic character and appearance
- aims to enhance the city's green network by encouraging land management practices which capture, store and retain carbon, prevent and manage flood risk
- supports the delivery of facilities needed to divert waste away from landfill and promote the prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery of materials (including heat from waste), with disposal to landfill as the final option.

TARGETS	
Carbon Dioxide	Reduce carbon emissions by over 40% across the city by 2020 (Sustainable Edinburgh 2020: base year 1990)
Energy Use	Reduce energy consumption by at least 12% by 2020 (Sustainable Edinburgh 2020: base year 1990)
Energy Generation	More renewable energy, with renewable energy technologies contributing at least 40% of energy consumed in the city by 2020 (Sustainable Edinburgh 2020)  Renewable sources to generate the equivalent of 100% of Scotland's gross annual electricity consumption by 2020 (national target)
Heat	Renewable sources to provide equivalent of 11% of Scotland's heat demand by 2020 (national target)
Waste	70% of all waste to be recycled by 20205 (Zero Waste Plan). No more than 5% of all waste going to landfill by 2025 (Zero Waste Plan).

**Figure 2 Current national and city sustainability targets**

### 2) Edinburgh's Environmental Assets

19. Edinburgh's natural and historic environment contributes to its distinctive character, local appeal and world-wide reputation. The City lies between the

internationally important habitat of the Firth of Forth and the dramatic backdrop of the Pentland Hills Regional Park. The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site and Edinburgh's conservation areas comprise architecturally significant neighbourhoods and villages, together with many individual listed buildings. These interact with the city's open hills and wooded river valleys, to create a unique and diverse townscape. The LDP area supports a range of protected plants and animals and also contains archaeological remains providing valuable evidence of how we used to live.

20. Edinburgh's built, cultural and natural heritage are valuable assets which contribute to broader strategic objectives of sustainable economic development, regeneration and community development and provide the context for good urban design. The proper conservation and management of these assets is an integral part of the wider planning function of the Council.

21. The detailed policies in Part 2 Section 3 (Caring for the Environment) will be used to ensure development proposals protect and, where possible, enhance the important features of the historic and natural environment.

### **Historic Environment**

22. Edinburgh contains the greatest concentration of built heritage assets in Scotland. There are many elements of Edinburgh's built heritage worthy of protection;

#### **The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site**

23. One of Edinburgh's most widely acclaimed assets is its World Heritage Site. World Heritage Sites are places of outstanding universal value, recognised under the terms of the 1972 UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. The 'Old and New Towns of Edinburgh' became a World Heritage Site in 1995. The boundaries are shown in Figure 3 and on the Proposals Map.

24. UNESCO requires every world heritage site to have a management plan which says how the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the Site will be protected. OUV is the collection of attributes which make the area special and give Edinburgh its international importance.

25. Edinburgh's World Heritage Site Management Plan has been prepared by a partnership of the Council, Historic Scotland and Edinburgh World Heritage. It provides a link between the international requirements of World Heritage, the planning process and the wider management issues involved in protecting a complex Site like Edinburgh. The Management Plan informs a separate Action Plan and may be a material consideration for decisions on planning matters.



**Figure 3 – The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site**

### **Listed Buildings**

26. Listed Buildings are buildings of special architectural or historic interest. Edinburgh has the greatest concentration of listed buildings in Scotland - around 5000 listed items comprising 31,500 individual buildings. 75% of buildings in the World Heritage Site are listed.

27. Listed buildings have statutory protection which means that listed building consent is required for the demolition of a listed building, or its alteration or extension in any manner which would affect its character. Some proposals may also require planning permission. Development plan policies have a role to play in helping to protect listed buildings, their setting and features of special interest.

### **Conservation Areas**

28. There are currently 49 Conservation Areas (in May 2014) across Edinburgh. These are areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which should be conserved or enhanced. A quarter of Edinburgh's urban area lies within a conservation area. Each conservation area has its own unique character and appearance that is identified in a character appraisal. The underlying principle behind the designation of the conservation areas is to maintain the variety of character that illustrates the history of Edinburgh. An ongoing review of conservation areas will consider amendments to boundaries, opportunities for enhancement, and the designation of new conservation areas. In conservation areas, consent is required for changes such as demolitions and window alterations, which elsewhere in the city wouldn't require permission. This additional level of control helps to ensure that small scale incremental changes do not damage the character of

the conservation areas. The Proposals Map and Appendix A show which parts of the city are covered by conservation areas.

### **Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes**

29. The national Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes is compiled by Historic Scotland and includes 21 sites in Edinburgh. The Inventory sites are identified on the Proposals Map and the Council is required to consult Historic Scotland on proposals affecting these. The Council will protect Inventory sites and consider whether restoration or improvement of historic landscape features can be achieved through development proposals.

### **Archaeology**

30. Edinburgh has a wealth of archaeological resources, from buildings to buried remains and marine wrecks, dating from earliest prehistory to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This archaeological resource is finite and non-renewable. It contains unique information about how the city's historic and natural environment developed over time. In addition to providing a valuable insight into the past, archaeological remains also contribute to a sense of place and bring leisure and tourism benefits. Care must be taken to ensure that these are not needlessly destroyed by development.

31. The Council maintains a Historic Environment Record of known designated and non-designated archaeological remains which in 2013 contains 63 nationally important scheduled monuments protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

32. There may also be many potentially important archaeological features which have not yet been discovered. These are therefore not included in national or local records. Scottish Planning Policy sets out the Government's approach to protecting archaeological remains and the weight to be given to archaeological considerations when assessing against the benefits of development. Detailed advice is provided in Planning Advice Note 2/2011 Planning and Archaeology.

### **Natural Environment**

33. Edinburgh's open spaces and landscape features contribute to the structure and identity of the city, enhance the quality of life of residents and the city's appeal as a place for tourism and investment. The city's natural environment also supports a diversity of habitats, flora and fauna.


### **Green Belt**

34. The Edinburgh Green Belt extends beyond the City of Edinburgh Council area, into East Lothian and Midlothian. Its purpose is to

- direct planned growth to the most appropriate locations and support regeneration
- protect and enhance the quality, character, landscape setting and identity the city and neighbouring towns
- protect and give access to open space within and around the city and neighbouring towns.

Green belt designation can also be used to prevent the coalescence of settlements.





**Figure 4 Edinburgh Green Belt**

35. The LDP defines green belt boundaries to meet these purposes, ensuring that the strategic growth requirements of the SDP can be accommodated. The boundaries of the green belt shown on the Proposals Map are largely unchanged from previous local plans. However, some areas have been taken out of the green belt for the following reasons

- land in West Edinburgh and South East Edinburgh Strategic Development Areas to meet SDP strategic housing requirements
- sites at Queensferry, Currie and Balerno also to meet SDP strategic housing requirements
- Edinburgh Airport, Royal Highland Centre, International Business Gateway, Heriot-Watt Campus and Hermiston Village to accord with Scottish Planning Policy.

36. To ensure the Edinburgh Green Belt continues to meet its objectives in terms of directing planned growth, protecting landscape setting and providing access to open space, the LDP controls the types of development that will be allowed in the green belt. The LDP also promotes opportunities to enhance the appearance of the green belt and to increase countryside access.

### **Landscape**

37. The Council's Natural Heritage Strategy sets out how planning can help meet the objectives of national landscape policy and the commitments of the European Landscape Convention and Scotland's Landscape Charter.

38. Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) are designated to protect locally important landscapes from development which would harm their character and appearance. 22 SLAs are identified on the Proposals Map due to their distinctive characteristics and

qualities, which contribute to the city's unique setting and sense of place. These include examples of Edinburgh's coastal margin, hills, valleys and designed landscapes, which are described in the "Statements of Importance" prepared for each SLA.

39. Outwith the SLAs, a range of design and environmental policies and guidance highlight the value and potential of all landscapes. The LDP recognises that development can bring benefits through conserving and enhancing landscape character and important topographical features and creating future landscapes of quality and character in the provision of new green infrastructure.

### **Trees and Woodland**

40. Trees and woodland make an important contribution to the character and quality of the urban area and countryside providing biodiversity, landscape and cultural benefits. Specific legislation protects trees in conservation areas and those covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The Edinburgh and Lothians Forestry and Woodland Strategy provides a long term vision for woodland creation and management to increase woodland cover and create better links.

### **Biodiversity**

41. The Council's Natural Heritage Strategy sets out how planning can meet the objectives of national policy on biodiversity and fulfil the commitments of the Biodiversity Duty and the Scottish Geodiversity Charter. Planning decisions must comply with environmental legislation on international and national protected sites and species. In addition, Local Nature Reserves and Local Nature Conservation Sites are identified to protect biodiversity at the local level and are shown on the proposals map. The plan includes policies relating to a range of biodiversity designations.

42. LDP policies and Council guidance also recognise the value and potential of biodiversity outwith designated areas and set out key principles for enhancing habitat and ecosystems.

### **Water and Air**

43. The water environment is a key natural resource which requires stringent protection from the potentially harmful effects of new development, both on ecological quality and in adding to flood risk. Within the urban area, some built and some unbuilt areas have experienced flooding in extreme weather conditions. The Council, with others, has a responsibility to reduce overall flood risk. It has completed a flood prevention scheme for the Braid Burn and is implementing one for the Water of Leith. It has also identified unbuilt areas of land which fulfil an important flood function, and which should be allowed to flood in order to protect other, built-up areas from floodwater. These are shown on the Proposals Map as areas of importance for flood management. A flood map published by the Scottish Environment Protection Agency shows some areas on Edinburgh's waterfront potentially at medium to high risk of coastal flooding, taking into account climate change. The LDP does not prevent development in such locations but will require all proposals to consider and address any potential risk of flooding.

44. The planning system has a role to play in the protection of air quality, by ensuring that development does not adversely affect air quality in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) or, by cumulative impacts, lead to the creation of further AQMAs in the city. These are areas where air quality standards are not being met, and for which remedial measures should therefore be taken. AQMAs have been declared for

five areas in Edinburgh - the city centre, St John's Road, Corstorphine, Great Junction Street in Leith, Glasgow Road (A8) at Ratho Station and Inverleith Row/Ferry Road junction. Poor air quality in these locations is largely due to traffic congestion. The Council has prepared an action plan setting out measures intended to help reduce vehicle emissions within these areas. The Council monitors air quality in other locations and may need to declare further AQMAs.

### **3) Creating Successful Places**

#### **Place-making and Design**

45. Edinburgh's distinct geography and rich and varied heritage of buildings and urban design combine to create a cityscape of excellence. New development, through its design and contribution to place-making, should enhance not detract from the city's overall character and quality of environment. Good design can help achieve a wide range of social, economic and environmental goals, creating places that are successful and sustainable. The design of a place can define how people live, how much energy they use, how efficient transport systems are and whether businesses succeed. The LDP's design related policies aim to raise design quality and create successful places. Council guidance supports these policies and provides more detailed information and advice.

46. This LDP is also supported by a wide range of area and site specific design guidance aimed at promoting high quality place-making and design. These frameworks, development briefs and master plans can be viewed on the Council's [website](#). Their role is to guide and control development, taking account of the particular characteristics of a site or area and addressing matters such as mix of uses, form and height of buildings, streets and public spaces. In creating high quality places, the spaces between buildings i.e. streets, civic squares and public realm, should be given as much consideration as the design of buildings.

47. The site briefs and development principles included in Part 1 Section 5 set out key design requirements to guide the development of new housing sites and other major development opportunities. Master plans should be prepared by developers as part of the planning application process to demonstrate how their proposals meet the LDP's design and place-making objectives and any site specific requirements. Master Plans should also provide information on the mix of uses, how a development relates to the surrounding area and, where relevant, proposals on an adjacent site and development phasing.

#### **Green Network**

48. The green network is the linking together of natural, semi-natural and man-made open spaces to create an interconnected network that provides recreational opportunities, improves accessibility within the urban area and to the surrounding countryside and enhances biodiversity and the character of the landscape and townscape, including the setting of new development. Edinburgh's green network forms part of a wider Central Scotland Green Network (CSGN), which is identified as a national development in National Planning Framework 2. The Council is a signatory to the CSGN declaration and is working in partnership with neighbouring authorities and other stakeholders to support and deliver a range of projects.


49. Some parts of the green belt contribute to Edinburgh's green network. Key elements include the Pentlands Hill Regional Park, Bonaly Country Park, Cammo estate, the Water of Leith, the Union Canal, Waterfront Promenade and the proposed South East Wedge parkland.

50. Through various policies, the LDP aims to protect, promote and enhance the wildlife, recreational, landscape and access value of the green network. Developments are expected to incorporate elements that positively contribute to the green network through, for example:

- providing new open space and/or improving the quality of, or access to existing public open space, thus, reducing areas of deficiency
- incorporating existing landscape features in new development and providing new landscape planting and other green infrastructure along water courses, coast and urban edge
- extending and linking to the existing path network where opportunities arise
- providing for a range of different recreational uses which promote healthy living
- providing new and/or enhancing existing wildlife habitats through building and landscape design, thus, preventing habitat fragmentation where possible
- managing surface water drainage, treatment and flood risk through sustainable urban drainage, providing amenity and biodiversity benefits e.g. green roofs, swales and ponds
- mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change e.g. resource efficient design, planting trees to capture carbon, intercept and absorb rainfall.

51. Enhancements of the green network will be required to mitigate any impacts from development on existing wildlife habitats or potential connections between them, or other features of value to natural heritage, green space, landscape and recreation. Developers must ensure that green networks are considered in the preparation of future planning applications. Figure 5 is an indicative map of Edinburgh's green network illustrating existing provision and opportunities to improve and/or extend the network.

52. Development on greenfield housing sites provides opportunities to extend existing green corridors into the wider countryside. Green network enhancement should be an integral part of the new LDP housing proposals. Green network opportunities are highlighted in the housing site briefs in Part 1 Section 5.



**Figure 5 Green Network**

53. In 2010, the Council prepared an Open Space Strategy based on an audit of open space resources across Edinburgh. Its purpose is to ensure a co-ordinated and consistent approach to meeting Edinburgh’s open space needs and protecting and developing the city’s network of open spaces. The Strategy sets standards for the provision of different types of open space and identifies where these standards are not currently met. The Strategy, together with 12 accompanying action plans, identifies opportunities to improve the quantity and quality of open space provision in Edinburgh.

54. The LDP includes 11 greenspace proposals (Table 1). The majority of these relate to the creation of major new greenspace in conjunction with wider redevelopment proposals. These will play an important role in meeting the open space needs of new residents and will also bring benefits for neighbouring existing communities. Where possible, these proposals will be incorporated into Edinburgh’s green network by creating and improving connections to other spaces.

**Table 1: Greenspace Proposals**

Proposal	Comments
<p><b>Reference:</b> GS 1</p> <p><b>Name:</b> Dalry Community Park</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Extension and enhancement of public park</p>	<p>Opportunity to enhance and extend an existing park to meet existing deficiencies in provision and as part of public open space requirements associated with the redevelopment of Fountainbridge.</p>
<p><b>Reference:</b> GS 2</p> <p><b>Name:</b> Leith Western Harbour Central Park</p>	<p>The approved proposals for Western Harbour include a new park with formal and informal recreational facilities for all</p>

<b>Proposal:</b> Provision of 5.2 hectare publicly accessible park	ages.
<b>Reference:</b> GS 3 <b>Name :</b> Leith Links Seaward Extension <b>Proposal:</b> Sports pitches, allotments and other recreational uses laid out in a linear greenspace.	The housing-led redevelopment of former industrial land east of Salamander Place is centred on a linear extension of Leith Links. A landscape design study approved in 2008 shows how the extension can connect with the Links by reshaping and enlarging the existing allotments. This proposal extends to Salamander Street and connects with a cycle/footpath safeguard to the coast.
<b>Reference:</b> GS 4 <b>Name:</b> South East Wedge Parkland <b>Proposal:</b> Parkland, open land and structure planting	Land around Craigmillar/Greendykes retained in the green belt will be landscaped to provide multi-functional parkland, woodland and country paths linking with parallel developments in Midlothian.
<b>Reference:</b> GS 5 <b>Name:</b> Niddrie Burn Parkland <b>Proposal:</b> New park	The Council has carried out work to remove culverts and form a new channel for the Niddrie Burn as part of the urban expansion proposals at Greendykes. This is the first phase in creating a new park.
<b>Reference:</b> GS 6 <b>Name:</b> IBG Open Space <b>Proposal:</b> Three areas of parkland - 1) along A8 corridor; 2) central parkland and 3) archaeology park	The West Edinburgh Landscape Framework (approved in December 2011) identifies strategic landscape design and open space requirements. Three main areas of open space are proposed as key elements of the International Business Gateway.
<b>Reference:</b> GS 7 <b>Name:</b> Gogar Burn <b>Proposal:</b> Diversion of Gogar Burn	Proposed diversion of the Gogar Burn as shown on the Proposals Map. This will bring benefits in terms of reducing flood risk, improving water quality and enhancing biodiversity
<b>Reference:</b> GS 8 <b>Name:</b> Inverleith Depot <b>Proposal:</b> Conversion of service depot into greenspace	The Council is keeping the operational role of its service depots under review. If that process determines that the depot at Inverleith Park is no longer required for depot functions or other services, it can be converted into green space. The type(s) of greenspace should be identified at that stage in consultation with the local community and should take account of local and citywide needs.
<b>Reference:</b> GS 9 <b>Name :</b> Broomhills Park <b>Proposal:</b> New large park in housing-led	The centre of the Broomhills housing site (Proposal HSG 21) is a raised knoll which must remain undeveloped to reduce impact on the landscape setting

development site	of the city. This is an opportunity to create a new community park which benefits from attractive views. It should be landscaped and maintained to meet the Council's large greenspace standard.
<b>Reference:</b> GS 10 <b>Name :</b> Curriemuirend <b>Proposal:</b> Greenspace enhancement	Proposals to enhance existing greenspace in conjunction with housing development on adjacent site (Proposal HSG31). Will include provision of play space and upgrading of football pitch.
<b>Reference:</b> GS 11 <b>Name :</b> Newmills Park <b>Proposal:</b> New linear park	Proposal to create a new 3 hectare linear park in conjunction with housing development on adjacent site (Proposal HSG 37). It should be landscaped and maintained to meet the Council's large greenspace standard.




## SECTION 3 - A PLAN TO PROVIDE JOBS, HOMES AND SERVICES IN THE RIGHT LOCATIONS

### 1) Economic Development

55. The Council's economic strategy seeks sustainable growth through investment in jobs – focussing on development and regeneration, inward investment, support for businesses and helping unemployed people into work or learning. A successful Edinburgh economy will have wider implications across the city region and for Scotland as a whole. The LDP has a key role in helping to deliver this strategy.

56. The strength of Edinburgh's economy is based on a range of key sectors, for example tourism, financial services, life sciences and higher education. Edinburgh also has a wide range of cultural, arts and sports venues which bring economic benefits as well as enhancing the wellbeing of residents and visitors. The LDP supports existing businesses, continues to promote previously identified economic proposals and highlights new investment opportunities.

57. There are many economic development opportunities across the city, available to accommodate businesses of varying types and sizes (see Figure 6). These include seven special economic areas, strategic office locations in the city centre, Leith and Edinburgh Park, and planned industrial estates and areas such as Newbridge.



**Figure 6 Opportunities for Economic Development**

58. Economic growth is a key aim of the Strategic Development Plan. The SDP requires the LDP to retain existing levels of strategic employment land and provide a



generous range and choice of employment sites in accessible locations. It also recognises the important role of the Edinburgh city region as a key driver of the Scottish economy. In Edinburgh, proposals for Edinburgh Airport, the Royal Highland Centre and International Business Gateway have national development status in National Planning Framework 2 and the Edinburgh International Partnership has been set up to implement these proposals. The Scottish Government has also identified two enterprise locations in Edinburgh in recognition of their importance to the national economy - Leith Docks (low carbon/renewables) and Edinburgh BioQuarter (life sciences).

### Edinburgh's Special Economic Areas

59. The LDP identifies seven “special economic areas” (see Table 2), all of which are of national or strategic economic importance, providing or with the potential to provide a significant number of jobs. The plan includes individual policies for six of these sites (Policy Emp2 – Emp7) to ensure development proposals realise their economic potential. A slightly different approach is taken for Leith Docks where economic proposals will be assessed using the general policy Emp8 and the area based Policy Del 4.

**Table 2 Special Economic Areas**

Area	Main Purpose
<p><b>Name:</b> Edinburgh BioQuarter</p> <p><b>Location:</b> East of A7, South East Edinburgh</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 72 ha</p> <p><b>Relevant LDP policy –</b> Emp 2</p>	<p>The Edinburgh BioQuarter (EBQ) aims to become a top 10 global centre of excellence for life sciences offering opportunities for academic, commercial and clinical research and development with health care, teaching facilities and appropriate support services and facilities focused on the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary. Its development is being promoted by a partnership of the Council and Scottish Enterprise, University of Edinburgh, NHS Lothian and an international developer specialising in this sector.</p>
<p><b>Name:</b> Riccarton University Campus and Business Park</p> <p><b>Location:</b> South of A71, South West Edinburgh</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 153 ha</p> <p><b>Relevant LDP policy –</b> Emp 3</p>	<p>The campus comprises Heriot-Watt University and the adjacent business park. A Master Plan was approved in January 2001. In 2013, it was identified as the preferred location for a National Performance Centre for Sport.</p> <p>Its main purpose is academic teaching and research and business uses with a functional link to the University.</p> <p>There is currently 20.28 hectares of undeveloped land available within Riccarton Research Park.</p>

<p><b>Name:</b> Edinburgh Airport</p> <p><b>Location:</b> North of A8, West Edinburgh</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 380 ha</p> <p><b>Relevant LDP policy –</b> Emp 4</p>	<p>The connectivity provided by Edinburgh Airport supports and enhances Scotland's economy. The most recent Airport Master Plan was prepared by the former owner in July 2011 and agreed by the Council in March 2012. The Master Plan sets out development intentions for airport and related uses up to 2020 with more indicative proposals from 2020-2040.</p>
<p><b>Name:</b> Royal Highland Centre</p> <p><b>Location:</b> North of A8, West Edinburgh</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 132 ha</p> <p><b>Relevant LDP policy –</b> Emp 5</p>	<p>The main purpose of the RHC site is for showground uses. Its owners, the Royal Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland, intend to bring forward major proposals to expand and enhance facilities on their current site. A Master Plan has been prepared as part of a planning application. Proposals include a new exhibition hall, Centre for Excellence including retail facilities, Agribusiness and office uses, hotel, improved internal circulation and a new entrance boulevard onto Eastfield Road.</p> <p>The RHC may need to relocate to the south of the A8 in the longer term to allow for airport expansion.</p>
<p><b>Name:</b> International Business Gateway</p> <p><b>Location:</b> North of A8, West Edinburgh</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 136 ha</p> <p><b>Relevant LDP policy –</b> Emp 6</p>	<p>This area was identified for international business development and ancillary uses in the West Edinburgh Planning Framework, a Scottish Government document. It will come forward in a series of phases which may take longer to deliver than previously envisaged because of the global economic downturn. The Edinburgh International Partnership, involving relevant landowners and public sector organisations are working together on proposals for an initial phase of development next to the Eastfield Road tram stop.</p>
<p><b>Name:</b> RBS Headquarters, Gogarburn</p> <p><b>Location:</b> South of A8, West Edinburgh</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 45 ha</p> <p><b>Relevant LDP policy –</b> Emp 7</p>	<p>The main purpose of the site is for single user office development in a high quality landscape setting. A tram stop is to be provided to the north east of the site, increasing accessibility by public transport. Part of the site remains undeveloped and provides the opportunity for additional office and ancillary development.</p>

<p><b>Name:</b> Leith Docks</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Northern and eastern part of Leith Waterfront</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 128 hectares</p> <p><b>Relevant LDP policy –</b> Emp 8 and Del 4</p>	<p>The main purpose of this area is for business and industry.</p> <p>The National Renewables Infrastructure Plan highlights the potential of Leith Docks as a suitable location for the manufacturing and servicing of wind turbines and other equipment to support the off-shore renewables industry.</p>
---	---

## 2) Housing and Community Facilities

60. Edinburgh is a growing city as a result of increased birth rates, residents living longer and people moving into the area for work or study. Its population is now 477,000 (National Records of Scotland, 2011 Census). Population and household changes have implications for housing need which in turn influences the amount of housing land to be identified in LDPs. Providing more and better homes for people is one of the overall aims of the plan, to help meet housing need and support economic growth. The LDP also recognises that a growing population increases the need for local shops and community facilities such as schools, health care services and community centres.

61. A housing needs and demand assessment (HNDA) for South East Scotland was undertaken as part of the preparation of the Strategic Development Plan and local housing strategies across the SESplan area. The SESplan area, which covers Edinburgh, the Lothians, Scottish Borders and part of Fife, functions as one housing market area. This means that some of the housing demand generated by the city can and will be met in the wider city region.

62. The approved SDP indicates that land for a total of **107,560** new homes will be required across the SESPlan area in the period up to 2024. SESPlan has prepared Supplementary Guidance which sets out how much of this requirement should be met in each Council Area. The requirement for the City of Edinburgh Council area is:

2009 - 2019	2019 – 2024	Total 2009-2024
22,300	7,210	29,510

63. It is the role of this LDP to determine how the housing requirement up to 2024 will be met, taking account of the contribution made from existing sites and other allowances such as completions from windfall sites and demolitions. The LDP allocates sufficient land capable of becoming effective and delivering the scale of housing requirements for the periods 2009-2019 and 2019-2024. Figure 7 and the supporting document LDP Housing Land Study explain how the LDP meets its housing requirement. The approach taken to meeting the housing requirement is consistent with the SDP – brownfield sites first, then land within Strategic Development Areas and finally locations elsewhere in the city.

<b>Setting the LDP Housing Land Supply Target</b>	
The City of Edinburgh Council Housing Land Requirement 2009-2024	29,510
+ 10% to ensure a generous supply	+ 2,950
<b>LDP Housing Land Supply Target</b>	<b>32,460</b>
<b>Meeting the LDP Housing Land Supply Target</b>	
Effective Supply	10,975
Constrained Sites coming forward	+4,159
Housing Completions 2009 -2013	+5,642
Windfall	+5,200
Demolitions	- 2,000
<b>Total Supply from Existing Sources</b>	<b>23,976</b>
LDP Housing Land Supply Target	32,460
Total Supply from Existing Sources	- 23,976
<b>Target to be met through new LDP allocations</b>	<b>8,484</b>
<b>New LDP Allocations</b>	
New brownfield allocations	815
Sites in West Edinburgh Strategic Development Area	2,800
Sites in South East Edinburgh Strategic Development Area	3,155
Sites elsewhere in the city	1,760
<b>Total New LDP Allocations</b>	<b>8,530</b>

### Figure 7 Housing Land Needed

64. The Council must maintain a five year's effective housing land supply at all times. Based on the figures in the SESplan Supplementary Guidance and the 2013 Housing Land Audit, the 5 year housing supply target for Edinburgh is 10,850. This equates to 2,170 additional homes each year. Edinburgh's supply of housing land will be monitored through the annual housing audit and will comprise LDP housing proposals, sites already under construction and sites with planning permission.

65. The economic downturn has had a significant effect on the rate that housing sites are being developed which has hampered efforts to maintain an effective five year housing land supply. Recent housing completion figures show that building rates are increasing and the Council is confident that the policies and proposals in this plan will provide sufficient housing land to maintain a five year's effective supply. However, if annual monitoring shows that a five year's effective supply is not being maintained, SDP Policy 7 sets out criteria to bring forward additional greenfield housing sites.

66. The City Housing Strategy 2012 -2017 was approved in December 2011. It aims to deliver three outcomes:

- People live in a home they can afford
- People live in a warm, safe home in a well-managed neighbourhood; and
- People can move if they need to.

This LDP can help meet these outcomes through the identification of sites to increase the housing supply and the inclusion of policies on affordable housing, sustainable building and design and place-making.

67. The proposals listed in Tables 3 and 4 provide a generous supply of land for housing development on a range of sites across the city. Proposals HSG 1 – HSG 18, EW 1a-c, EW 2a-d, CC 2 – CC 4 relate to sites which already have planning permission for housing development or were identified as housing proposals in previous local plans. Sites HSG 19 – HSG 37, Del 5 and Emp 6 are new housing opportunities identified to meet Edinburgh’s housing requirement. Detailed information on these proposals is provided in Part 1 Section 5. Apart from sites identified for development in this plan to deliver the planned growth of the city, housing on greenfield land is unlikely to be supported.

68. The plan aims to ensure that housing development on the sites listed in Tables 3 and 4 and any other site that emerges during the period of the plan, provides for a range of housing needs, meets climate change and sustainable development objectives and is of a high quality in terms of site layout and design. It also includes policies to ensure development doesn’t detract from the appearance of or cause nuisance or disturbance in existing housing areas.

69. Since its introduction in 2001, the Council’s affordable housing policy has delivered nearly 700 new affordable homes. The availability of affordable housing continues to be a major issue in Edinburgh and the Council and its partners are using a range of innovative and flexible approaches to increase the supply of new affordable homes. More information is available in the Council’s [housing strategy](#) 2012 -2017. One element is the LDP requirement for all private development of 12 or more homes to include 25% affordable housing (Policy Hou 6).

70. In addition to providing affordable housing, the LDP also recognises the housing needs of particular groups such as students, gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.

**Table 3 – Existing Housing Proposals**

Housing Proposal	Comments
<p><b>Reference: HSG 1</b>  <b>Name :</b> Springfield, Queensferry  <b>Site area:</b> 13 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b>            150</p>	<p>The site lies on the western edge of the town between existing housing at Springfield and the line of the replacement Forth Crossing. Proposals should include playing fields, changing facilities and amenity open space. Opportunity to create a link road from Bo’ness Road to Society Road should be investigated.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 2</b>  <b>Name:</b> Agilent, South Queensferry  <b>Site area:</b> 14 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 450</p>	<p>Planning permission granted for a housing-led mixed use development on the site of former Agilent plant.</p>

<p><b>Reference: HSG 3</b>  <b>Name:</b> North Kirkliston  <b>Site area:</b> 44 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 680 (390*)</p>	<p>Site identified in previous local plan to meet strategic housing need. Planning permission granted and development underway.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 4</b>  <b>Name :</b> West Newbridge  <b>Site area:</b> 20 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 500</p>	<p>Opportunity for housing-led regeneration in heart of Newbridge. Environmental concerns such as the proximity of the site to industrial uses and impact of aircraft noise must be addressed through a comprehensive master plan for the whole site. Proposals should accord with the West Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 5</b>  <b>Name :</b> Hillwood Road, Ratho Station  <b>Site area:</b> 5 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 50-100</p>	<p>Opportunity for housing development and community facilities (either provided on site or elsewhere in Ratho Station). Proposals should accord with the West Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 6</b>  <b>Name :</b> South Gyle Wynd  <b>Site area:</b> 3 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 180</p>	<p>Housing opportunity on site adjacent to Forrester's and St Augustine's High Schools.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 7</b>  <b>Name :</b> Edinburgh Zoo  <b>Site area:</b> 4 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 80</p>	<p>Land on the western edge of the zoo which is no longer required for zoo purposes. Opportunity for high quality housing development within a mature landscape setting.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 8</b>  <b>Name:</b> Telford College (North Campus)  <b>Site area:</b> 3 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 330 (285*)</p>	<p>Redevelopment of former college site. Planning permission granted and development underway.</p>

<p><b>Reference: HSG 9</b>  <b>Name:</b> City Park  <b>Site area:</b> 2 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 200</p>	<p>A Statement of Urban Design Principles has been prepared by the Council to guide housing development.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 10</b>  <b>Name:</b> Fairmilehead Water Treatment Works  <b>Site area:</b> 11 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 275</p>	<p>Planning permission granted for the redevelopment of the former Scottish Water treatment works. The existing tanks have been decommissioned to make the site suitable for housing use.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 11</b>  <b>Name:</b> Shrub Place  <b>Site area:</b> 2 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 410</p>	<p>Redevelopment of former transport depot and Masonic hall for housing and other uses. A Statement of Urban Design Principles has been prepared by the Council to guide development.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 12</b>  <b>Name:</b> Lochend Butterfly  <b>Site area:</b> 5 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 590 (455*)</p>	<p>Major redevelopment opportunity on land located in the east of the city. Planning permission granted and development underway.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 13</b>  <b>Name:</b> Eastern General Hospital  <b>Site area:</b> 4 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 270 (210*)</p>	<p>Redevelopment on former hospital site. Proposals to retain three existing buildings (two of which are listed). Planning permission granted for housing including 64 affordable units and a care home. The affordable housing is complete and comprises a mix of tenures.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 14</b>  <b>Name:</b> Niddrie Mains  <b>Site area:</b> 21 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 900-1100 (680-880*)</p>	<p>This proposal forms part of the wider regeneration of Craigmillar led by PARC. Development which has already taken place includes housing, two new primary schools, a new neighbourhood office and public library and refurbishment of the White House. Future housing proposals should accord with the Craigmillar Urban Design Framework.</p>

<b>Reference: HSG 15</b> <b>Name:</b> Greendykes Road <b>Site area:</b> 3 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 145	<p>The site is expected to become available for housing once a decision is made on the future of Castlebrae High School. Proposals should accord with the Craigmillar Urban Design Framework</p>
<b>Reference: HSG 16</b> <b>Name:</b> Thistle Foundation <b>Site area:</b> 8 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 170 (135*)	<p>Redevelopment opportunity in heart of Craigmillar. Planning permission granted and development underway.</p>
<b>Reference: HSG 17</b> <b>Name:</b> Greendykes <b>Site area:</b> 12 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 990 (900*)	<p>A vacant site within an established residential area. Its redevelopment forms part of the wider regeneration of Craigmillar. Planning permission granted on part of the site and development underway.</p>
<b>Reference: HSG 18</b> <b>Name:</b> New Greendykes <b>Site area:</b> 26 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 760	<p>Longstanding proposal for new housing on greenfield land to south of Greendykes. Outline planning permission granted in 2010 for 1000 houses. The proposal includes a mix of unit sizes and types, 200 of which are affordable.</p>
<b>City Centre</b>	
<b>Reference: CC 2</b> <b>Name:</b> New Street <b>Site area:</b> 3 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 250	<p>Housing as part of a major mixed use redevelopment opportunity. Proposals should accord with the New Street Development Principles (set out in Table 10).</p>
<b>Reference: CC 3</b> <b>Name:</b> Fountainbridge <b>Site area:</b> 37 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 1170 (640*)	<p>Housing as part of mixed use redevelopment of former brewery site. Development underway with nearly 200 new homes provided. Proposals should accord with the Fountainbridge Development Principles (set out in Table 10).</p>



<b>Reference: CC 4</b> <b>Name :</b> Quartermile <b>Site area:</b> 8 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity</b> 1070 (630*)	Regeneration of the historic Edinburgh Royal Infirmary site creating a sustainable, mixed-use urban community. Nearly 400 homes already built. Further details provided in Table 10.
<b>Edinburgh Waterfront</b>	
<b>Reference: EW 1a</b> <b>Name:</b> Leith Waterfront (Western Harbour) <b>Site area:</b> 49 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity</b> 3000 (2000*)	Major housing-led mixed use regeneration opportunity on land to west of Ocean Terminal shopping centre next to recently built flatted development. Proposals should accord with the Leith Waterfront Development Principles (set out in Table 11).
<b>Reference: EW 1b</b> <b>Name:</b> Central Leith Waterfront <b>Site area:</b> 61 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 4500	The mixed use regeneration of Central Leith Waterfront will provide a significant number of new homes. Proposals should accord with the Leith Waterfront Development Principles (set out in Table 11).
<b>Reference: EW 1c</b> <b>Name:</b> Leith Waterfront (Salamander Place) <b>Site area:</b> 13 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 1500	Housing led regeneration on former industrial land. Planning permission granted on western part of site for 781 units incorporating a wide range of house types. Proposals should accord with the Leith Waterfront Development Principles (set out in Table 11).
<b>Reference: EW 2a</b> <b>Name:</b> Forth Quarter <b>Site area:</b> 45 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity: 1800</b> (1053*)	Major housing-led mixed use regeneration opportunity. Nearly 800 homes already built along with offices, superstore and a new park. Proposals should accord with the Granton Waterfront Development Principles (set out in Table 11).
<b>Reference: EW 2b</b> <b>Name:</b> Central Development Area <b>Site area:</b> 41 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity: 2050</b> (1800*)	Housing –led mixed use development. Some housing completed along a new avenue. Proposals should accord with the Granton Waterfront Development Principles (set out in Table 11).

<b>Reference: EW 2c</b> <b>Name:</b> Granton Harbour <b>Site area:</b> 38 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 3400 (3114*)	Housing –led mixed use development. Some housing development in accordance with an approved master plan. Proposals should accord with the Granton Waterfront Development Principles (set out in Table 11).
<b>Reference: EW 2d</b> <b>Name:</b> North Shore <b>Site area:</b> 16 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 850	Opportunity for housing-led mixed use development. Implementation of this proposal unlikely to come forward in the short term. Proposals should accord with the Granton Waterfront Development Principles (set out in Table 11).

\* homes still to be built (calculated from the 2013 Housing Land Audit)

**Table 4 New Housing Proposals**

Housing Proposal	Comments
<b>Sites in West Edinburgh</b>	
<b>Reference: HSG 19</b> <b>Name:</b> Maybury <b>Site area:</b> 75 hectares <b>Estimated number of houses :</b> 1,700-2,000	Proposal for housing-led development on land to the north and south of Turnhouse Road. Development must accord with the Maybury and Cammo Site Brief
<b>Reference: HSG 20</b> <b>Name:</b> Cammo <b>Site area:</b> 28 hectares <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 500-700	New housing site on land to the west of Maybury Road. Development must accord with the Maybury and Cammo Site Brief
<b>Reference: Policy Emp 6</b> <b>Name:</b> International Business Gateway (IBG) <b>Site area:</b> n/a <b>Estimated number of houses<math>\Delta</math> :</b> 300-400	Housing as a component of business-led mixed use proposals in the IBG will contribute to place making and sustainable development objectives. Housing proposals should form an integrated component of a business-led master plan. Housing only proposals would undermine the main purpose of the IBG and are therefore not acceptable. Proposals must accord with Policy Emp6 and the IBG Development Principles

<p><b>Reference: Policy Del 5</b>  <b>Name:</b> Edinburgh Park/South Gyle  <b>Site area:</b> n/a  <b>Estimated number of houses</b>Δ: <b>450 -700</b></p>	<p>Policy Del 5 supports the introduction of housing and other uses into an area currently dominated by employment uses. This new approach represents the first step in changing the character of the Edinburgh Park/ South Gyle area in line with place making and sustainable development objectives. Proposals must accord with the Edinburgh Park and South Gyle Development Principles</p>
<p>Δ The estimated number of houses expected to be built in the period of this plan i.e. up to 2024. These sites may provide additional housing beyond 2024.</p>	
<p><b>Sites in South East Edinburgh</b></p>	
<p><b>Reference: HSG 21</b>  <b>Name:</b> Broomhills  <b>Site area:</b> 30 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> <b>425-595</b></p>	<p>A site to the West of Burdiehouse Road, incorporating a public park (proposal GS 9). Development must accord with the Broomhills and Burdiehouse Site Brief</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 22</b>  <b>Name:</b> Burdiehouse  <b>Site area:</b> 14 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> <b>250-350</b></p>	<p>Planning permission in principle was granted for housing on the eastern part of the site in 2012. This proposal incorporates additional land to north and east. Development must accord with the Broomhills and Burdiehouse Site Brief</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 23</b>  <b>Name:</b> Gilmerton Dykes Road  <b>Site area:</b> 2.5 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> <b>50-70</b></p>	<p>Small site located to the south of Gilmerton Dykes Road. Development must accord with the Gilmerton Site Brief</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 24</b>  <b>Name:</b> Gilmerton Station Road  <b>Site area:</b> 20 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> <b>350-490</b></p>	<p>Proposals for housing-led development on land to the north of Gilmerton Station Road. Development must accord with the Gilmerton Site Brief</p>

<p><b>Reference: HSG 25</b>  <b>Name:</b> The Drum  <b>Site area:</b> 6 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 125-175</p>	<p>Housing proposal on land to the north of Drum Street Development must accord with the Gilmerton Site Brief</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 26</b>  <b>Name:</b> Newcraighall North  <b>Site area:</b> 9 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 150 - 210</p>	<p>Planning permission was granted for 160 houses on the site in 2012. The site may provide the opportunity for a greater number of houses. Development must accord with the Newcraighall Site Brief</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 27</b>  <b>Name:</b> Newcraighall East  <b>Site area:</b> 17 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 275-385</p>	<p>Planning permission was granted for housing on the majority of the site in 2012. This site is larger with a higher estimated capacity. Development must accord with the Newcraighall site brief</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 28</b>  <b>Name:</b> Ellen's Glen Road  <b>Site area:</b> 4 hectares  <b>Estimated number of houses :</b> 220 - 260</p>	<p>Housing proposal incorporating land currently occupied by the Blood Transfusion Centre of Liberton Hospital and an area of semi-natural open space adjacent to Malbet Wynd. Proposals must accord with the Ellen's Glen Road Site Brief</p>
<p><b>Reference : HSG 29</b>  <b>Name:</b> Brunstane  <b>Site Area:</b> 48 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 950 - 1,330</p>	<p>Proposal for housing-led development on land to the south of Brunstane Burn and north of Newcraighall Road. Development must accord with the Newcraighall/Brunstane site brief.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 30</b>  <b>Name:</b> Moredunvale Road  <b>Site area:</b> 5 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 188</p>	<p>Proposal for housing development and open space improvements. Proposals must accord with Moredunvale Development Principles</p>
<p><b>Elsewhere in the City</b></p>	

<p><b>Reference: HSG 31</b>  <b>Name:</b> Curriemuirend  <b>Site area:</b> 6 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 150 - 180</p>	<p>Proposal for housing and allotments with opportunity to improve the quality of green space at Clovenstone Drive (Proposal GS10). Proposals must accord with the Curriemuirend Development Principles</p>
<p><b>Reference :</b> HSG 32  <b>Name :</b> Builyeon Road, Queensferry  <b>Site Area:</b> 41.5 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 700 - 980</p>	<p>Proposal for housing-led development on land to the south of Builyeon Road. Development must accord with the Builyeon Road Development Principles contained in the Queensferry South site brief.</p>
<p><b>Reference :</b> HSG 33  <b>Name :</b> South Scotstoun, Queensferry  <b>Site Area:</b> 20 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 365 - 510</p>	<p>Proposal for housing development on land to the north of the A90. Development must accord with the South Scotstoun Development Principles contained in the Queensferry South site brief.</p>
<p><b>Reference :</b> HSG 34  <b>Name :</b> Dalmeny  <b>Site Area:</b> 1 hectare  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 12 -18</p>	<p>Proposal for small housing development on land to the west of Bankhead Road. Development must accord with the Dalmeny Development Principles contained in the Queensferry South site brief.</p>
<p><b>Reference: HSG 35</b>  <b>Name:</b> Riccarton Mains Road, Currie  <b>Site area:</b> 1 hectare  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 25 -35</p>	<p>Well contained site on the edge of Currie, located to the west of Riccarton Mains Road. Opportunity to provide additional housing on land within walking distance of schools and local services.</p>
<p><b>Reference :</b> HSG 36  <b>Name :</b> Curriehill Road, Currie  <b>Site Area:</b> 2.5 hectares  <b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 50 - 70</p>	<p>Housing proposal on land to the west of Curriehill Road. Development must accord with Curriehill Road Development Principles contained in the Balerno and Currie Site Brief.</p>

<p><b>Reference : HSG 37</b></p> <p><b>Name :</b> Newmills Road, Balerno</p> <p><b>Site Area:</b> 8 hectares</p> <p><b>Estimated total capacity:</b> 175 - 245</p>	<p>Proposal for housing development on land to the west of Newmills Road. Development must accord with the Newmills Road Development Principles contained in the Balerno and Currie Site Brief.</p>
--	---

#### Schools and Healthcare Provision

71. Table 5 and Proposals SCH1 – SCH10 on the Proposals Map identify school proposals which involve development on new sites. An education assessment was undertaken as part of the preparation of the LDP. This sets out the implications of the proposed housing growth on existing schools and identifies what is needed in terms of new and expanded educational facilities. New primary schools are required in West Edinburgh (SCH6), South East Edinburgh (SCH7, SCH8 and SCH9) and Queensferry (SCH10). The LDP Action Programme sets out the mechanisms for delivering new and expanded education facilities where required in conjunction with LDP housing proposals.

72. Anticipated population growth in Edinburgh and the housing proposals identified in Tables 3 and 4 will have implications for the provision of primary care and other community health services. The Council and NHS Lothian will work in partnership to identify actions to adjust existing health care facilities and services to meet the future needs of Edinburgh's population. This could mean services being provided in a different way or the provision of new facilities.

#### Table 5 School Proposals

School Proposals	
Existing School Proposals	
<p><b>Reference: SCH 1</b></p> <p><b>Name :</b> Portobello High School</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 7.4 hectares</p>	<p>Planning permission has been granted for a replacement school on a site at Portobello Park. Proposal is for a three storey building and two sports pitches.</p>
<p><b>Reference: SCH 2</b></p> <p><b>Name:</b> High School, Craigmillar</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> Not yet determined</p>	<p>A new high school is to be built as part of the ongoing regeneration of Craigmillar. It is anticipated to open in 2020 and to occupy a central location near other local services. The site for the new school has not yet been identified. Proposals should accord with the Craigmillar Urban Design Framework</p>

<b>Reference: SCH 3</b> <b>Name :</b> New Greendykes <b>Site area:</b> Not yet determined	Indicative proposal for new two-stream primary school if required in association with new Greendykes housing proposal HSG 5. Exact location of the site for the new school has not yet been determined.
<b>Reference: SCH 4</b> <b>Name :</b> North of Waterfront Avenue, Granton <b>Site area:</b> 1.2 hectares	New primary school to be provided as part of major housing-led regeneration proposals at Granton Waterfront.
<b>Reference : SCH 5</b> <b>Name :</b> Western Harbour, Leith <b>Site area:</b> 1.1 hectares	New primary school to be provided as part of major housing-led regeneration proposals at Leith Waterfront.
<b>New School Proposals</b>	
<b>Reference: SCH 6</b> <b>Name :</b> Maybury <b>Site area:</b> 2 hectares	New primary school to provide educational facilities in conjunction with housing growth in West Edinburgh.
<b>Reference: SCH 7</b> <b>Name :</b> Gilmerton <b>Site area:</b> 2 hectares	New primary school to provide educational facilities in conjunction with housing growth in South East Edinburgh.
<b>Reference: SCH 8</b> <b>Name :</b> Broomhills <b>Site area:</b> 2 hectares	New primary school to provide educational facilities in conjunction with housing growth in South East Edinburgh.
<b>Reference: SCH 9</b> <b>Name :</b> Brunstane <b>Site area:</b> 2 hectares	New primary school to provide educational facilities in conjunction with housing growth in South East Edinburgh.


<p><b>Reference: SCH 10</b></p> <p><b>Name :</b> Queensferry - South</p> <p><b>Site area:</b> 2 hectares</p>	<p>New primary school to provide educational facilities in conjunction with new housing in Queensferry.</p>
--	---

### 3) Shopping and Leisure

73. Shopping and leisure uses are major providers of jobs, especially for young people, and have strong links with other economic activities, particularly tourism. In Edinburgh, shopping and leisure uses are mainly provided in a network of centres distributed across the city.

- **City Centre:** The retail core of the city centre is the largest shopping centre in the Edinburgh City Region with a wide range of shops and other entertainment, leisure and cultural uses and excellent public transport services.
- **Town Centres:** The other eight town centres serve as a focal point for their local communities providing a diverse mix of shopping facilities and other commercial and community services. Each of the town centres is characterised by traditional shop units under tenements located on main roads with good bus services.
- **Commercial Centres:** Seven shopping malls and retail parks of varying size and character. The individual characteristics of each centre are described in Table 7.
- **Local Centres:** There are 59 local centres (with four more proposed) located across the city. These contribute to the quality of life and sense of identity of neighbourhoods by providing local shops and other services within walking distance. Sizes vary from larger local centres such as Wester Hailes, Easter Road and Davidson's Mains to smaller parades of shops in the villages of Currie and Queensferry.





**Figure 8 Shopping Centres**

**Table 6 Network of Shopping Centres**

<b>1 : City Centre</b>		
Edinburgh City Centre Retail Core		
<b>2 : Other Town Centres</b>		
Corstorphine	Gorgie / Dalry	Leith/Leith Walk
Morningside / Bruntsfield	Nicolson St / Clerk Street	Portobello
Stockbridge	Tollcross	
<b>3 : Commercial Centres</b>		
Cameron Toll	Craigleith	Hermiston Gait
Meadowbank	Newcraighall / The Jewel	Ocean Terminal
The Gyle		
<b>4 : Existing Local Centres</b>		
Ashley Terrace	Balgreen Road	Blackhall
Boswall Parkway	Broughton Street	Bryce Road, Currie
Chesser	Chesser Avenue	Colinton

Comiston Road	Corslet Place, Currie	Craiglockhart
Craigmillar	Dalkeith Road	Davidsons Mains
Drylaw	Drumbrae	Dundas Street
Dundee Street	East Craigs	Easter Road
Ferry Road (East)	Ferry Road (West)	Forrest Road
Gilmerton	Goldenacre	Gracemount
Hillhouse Rd/Telford Rd	Jocks Lodge	Juniper Green
Liberton Brae	Main Street, Balerno	Main Street, Kirkliston
Marchmont North	Marchmont South	Milton Road West
Moredun Park Road	Muirhouse / Pennywell	Oxgangs Broadway
Parkhead	Pentland View Court, Currie	Piershill
Polwarth Gardens	Queensferry (Centre)	Ratcliffe Terrace
Restalrig Road	Rodney Street	Roseburn Terrace
Saughton Road North	Scotstoun Grove, Queensferry	Sighthill
Stenhouse Cross	Viewforth	Walter Scott Avenue
Waterfront Broadway	West Maitland Street	Western Corner
Whitehouse Road	Wester Hailes	
<b>5 : Proposed new Local Centres</b>		
Fountainbridge	Granton Waterfront	Western Harbour
Brunstane		

74. The LDP continues to support the existing network of city, town and local centres. These are important focal points for people who live and work in Edinburgh, providing shopping, leisure and community facilities in locations which can be easily accessed by walking, cycling or public transport. It also recognises the valuable role of commercial centres as popular destinations for shopping and leisure activities.

75. The recession has had a significant adverse impact on many conventional retail businesses. Growth in consumer spending has slowed and it is unlikely that spending rates will increase again in the next 5 years. Some high street brands have gone into administration, leaving empty units. Others are considering cutting floorspace targets or reducing their number of stores. How customers make purchases is also changing, with more on-line spending, which also has implications for how we plan for retail uses.

76. Prioritising the city centre remains a key objective of the LDP. The Council aims to strengthen the position of the city to maintain its shopping role within the region and to attract more investment. The planned redevelopment of the St James Quarter will bring major benefits to the city centre providing additional retailing floorspace, significant environmental improvements and a more vibrant mix of uses. (Proposal CC 1). A change in policy from previous plans aims to improve the overall shopping experience in the city centre by allowing uses other than shops in ground floor units in the retail core. Supplementary Guidance will set out how this change of policy will be applied.

77. Policies will continue to direct new development to existing centres, with town centres being given priority over commercial centres. There is not expected to be sufficient growth in retail spending over the next five years to support further

expansion of commercial centres (over and above that which already has planning permission), whilst also sustaining the existing network of town and local centres. Despite recent economic improvements and some increase in retail spending, the view of retail analysts is that the rate of spending growth will be well below that experienced in recent decades and largely offset by factors such as more efficient use of sales space and the continued increase in internet shopping. Justification for any net increase in retail provision in Edinburgh is expected to come mainly from population growth. However, there may also be opportunities to improve the quality of shopping and leisure facilities, including changes to layout of the centre and unit sizes. Table 7 takes account of these considerations and provides information on each of the commercial centres, including its characteristics, current expansion proposals and anticipated future role.

78. The factors affecting retail spending and provision will be kept under review, particularly as Edinburgh is a growing city where the population is expected to increase. Whilst the city and town centres are likely to remain the preferred locations for new shopping and leisure development, the policies relating to commercial centres may be revised in future plans.

**Table 7 Commercial Centres**

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Existing Role and Characteristics</b>	<b>Current Commitments and Future Role</b>
Cameron Toll	Enclosed shopping centre, built in 1984. Located in South East Edinburgh on major transport intersection well served by bus. 45 units including a superstore.	Permission granted in 2012 for additional 8,600 m <sup>2</sup> retail space and a cinema which will enhance its leisure role.
Craigleith	Retail park opened in 1996. Recently reconfigured with a mix of bulky goods, fashion and large food store (20 units in total). Located in North West Edinburgh close to major transport routes but not well served by buses.	No current proposals for expansion, reconfiguration or enhancement.
Hermiston Gait	Retail park opened in 1995 originally with bulky goods focus. Now includes a food store. Located in West Edinburgh next to City Bypass and M8 motorway, and close to railway station and the tram route. Poor bus service and limited walking catchment. Currently has 10 units.	Permission granted for small retail and food and drink units to serve as a gateway to rail and tram stops and improve public realm and pedestrian links. Main purpose should continue to be for bulky goods.

<b>Centre</b>	<b>Existing Role and Characteristics</b>	<b>Current Commitments and Future Role</b>
Meadowbank	Smaller retail park with supermarket and high representation of homeware and clothing stores. Located in North East Edinburgh on major transport route with good bus services. Opened 1997. Currently has 10 units.	No current proposals for expansion, reconfiguration or enhancement.
Newcraighall / The Jewel	One of the largest out-of-centre shopping areas in UK. Contains a superstore, some retail warehouses and many other shops. Planning permission was recently granted for a multiplex cinema. Located on the edge of the urban area, it provides shopping facilities for the south east of the City and beyond. The first phase was opened in 1989. Although improvements in public transport access have been made, bus and walking catchment is still limited. The centre as a whole now has 60 units.	Planning permission was granted in 2011 to reconfigure the centre. Retail floorspace is capped at 71,502sqm. There is a commitment to limit retail unit sizes and the amount of new floorspace.
Ocean Terminal	Edinburgh's newest shopping mall (opened 2001) offers a range of high street retailing, including an anchor department store, dining and a multiplex cinema over three floors. Serving north Edinburgh and planned as part of the Waterfront regeneration. Well served by buses. 80 units.	Located in Edinburgh Waterfront, an area where significant regeneration is still proposed, although on a smaller scale than envisaged previously. Any future increase in floorspace must reflect the scale and phasing of residential development.
Gyle	Enclosed, managed shopping centre (built 1993) with some ancillary services. Providing shopping facilities in the west of the city, it is located on the urban edge close to the City Bypass and major business park. Well served by buses and next to the tram route. However, its catchment is restricted by rail lines and major roads. 75 units.	Permission granted for 5,000 sq.m. extension to provide a new anchor store. Future opportunity to enhance the community and leisure role of the centre to support housing growth in West Edinburgh.

79. In 2011, the Council approved a town centres strategy and has appointed town centre co-ordinators to support businesses and help deliver improvements identified

in town centre action plans. This plan recognises that Edinburgh's town centres have had varying levels of resilience to the economic downturn. Policy Ret 8 in Part 2 Section 6 indicates the intention to prepare separate Supplementary Guidance for each of the town centres, in consultation with local communities and businesses. These will promote an appropriate mix of uses and set out criteria for assessing change of use proposals in town centres.

80. Table 8 provides information on three new local centres to be provided as part of large mixed use redevelopment proposals at Granton, Leith and Fountainbridge. It also includes a proposal to redevelop and enhance the local centre at Craigmillar, a key component of wider regeneration proposals.

**Table 8 Shopping Proposals**

<b>Shopping Proposals</b>	
<p><b>Reference:</b> S1</p> <p><b>Name:</b> Niddrie Mains Road, Craigmillar</p> <p><b>Proposed Use:</b> Redevelopment and enhancement of local centre</p>	<p>Opportunity to enhance the role of the local centre through the development of new retail units and other local facilities as part of the wider regeneration of Craigmillar.</p>
<p><b>Reference:</b> S2</p> <p><b>Name :</b> Granton Waterfront</p> <p><b>Proposed Use:</b> Creation of a new local centre</p>	<p>The approved master plan proposes a new local centre in the Granton Harbour area as part of the overall regeneration of the area. The location of this centre is shown on the Proposals Map.</p>
<p><b>Reference:</b> S3</p> <p><b>Name :</b> Leith Waterfront – Western Harbour</p> <p><b>Proposed Use:</b> Creation of a new local centre</p>	<p>The approved master plan and framework propose a new local centre as part of the overall regeneration of the area. This has been part implemented by a superstore at Sandpiper Drive.</p>
<p><b>Reference:</b> S4</p> <p><b>Name :</b> Fountainbridge</p> <p><b>Proposed Use:</b> Creation of new local centre</p>	<p>The approved Fountainbridge Development Brief proposes a new local centre as part of the overall regeneration of the area. The indicative location of this centre is shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Two retail units have been secured beneath student accommodation on Fountainbridge North. The masterplan for the outline permission for Fountainbridge South supports active frontages at ground level, including retail units arranged around a new commercial amenity space.</p>

<p><b>Reference:</b> S5</p> <p><b>Name :</b> Brunstane</p> <p><b>Proposed Use:</b> Creation of new local centre</p>	<p>The site brief proposes a new local centre to meet local convenience needs centrally located within the site. The indicative location of this new centre is shown on the Proposals Map and should comprise of commercial units located under flatted development.</p>
---	--

#### 4) Transport

81. Reducing the need to travel and promoting use of sustainable modes of transport are key principles underpinning the LDP Strategy. Future growth of the city based on excessive car use and dependency would have serious consequences in terms of congestion and deteriorating air quality. This will have a knock on effect on the economy and environment and would also disadvantage people who do not have access to a car. An improved transport system based on sustainable alternatives to the car is therefore a high priority for Edinburgh. This is the central objective of the Council's Local Transport Strategy, which proposes continued investment in public transport (including tram), walking and cycling.


82. The policies in Part 2 Section 7 support the transport strategy, by seeking to minimise travel demand and encourage a shift to more sustainable forms of travel. Major travel generating developments should take place in locations well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks, and development in non-central locations with limited sustainable travel options will be resisted. The LDP also helps reduce car dependency by encouraging higher densities in accessible locations and mixed use developments which bring homes, shops and work places closer together, and by paying careful attention to the design of development and to the supply and quality of car and cycle parking provision.

83. A number of public transport improvements have been introduced in recent years, for example, bus priority measures on main roads and park and ride facilities. Other projects have started and will be completed over the next few years. Scottish Government, Network Rail and the Council are all committed to investing further in public transport infrastructure in and around Edinburgh.

84. The re-introduction of tram services will be an important part of an integrated transport network in Edinburgh. The tram link between the city centre and the Airport is nearing completion with services due to begin in summer 2014. The Proposals Map safeguards two routes to extend the tram network. Work is underway on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Improvement Programme to improve rail connections between Scotland's two main cities and includes the new Edinburgh Gateway Station and improvements at Waverley and Haymarket Stations. The Borders railway is now under construction and expected to open in 2015. A new Forth road crossing is due to be completed in 2016. This will become the main route for general traffic allowing the existing Forth road bridge to become a dedicated public transport/walking/cycling corridor.

85. Edinburgh is a compact city and well suited to travel by cycle or on foot. As part of its Active Travel Action Plan, the Council is looking to increase the number of people walking and cycling, both as a means of transport and for pleasure. The LDP includes safeguards for a number of public transport improvements, footpaths and cycleways. The implementation of these proposals will further improve accessibility across the city by sustainable transport modes.

86. There is a clear link between new development and impact on the transport network. As part of the LDP preparation, a transport appraisal has been undertaken to understand the transport effects of the new strategic housing sites and to identify the transport interventions needed to mitigate these. This work builds on previous transport studies which have identified a number of key measures necessary to support existing proposals. For example, the West Edinburgh Transport Appraisal undertaken in 2010 identified the transport measures required to support development proposals at Edinburgh Airport, the Royal Highland Centre and International Business Gateway (policies Emp 3 – Emp 5). These include the tram, Edinburgh Gateway Station and new and widened roads and junction improvements. The North East Edinburgh Transport Appraisal identified the need for a new east-west street at Leith Waterfront to support environmental improvements and accommodate additional traffic. Proposals T17 – T21 are required in conjunction with new housing proposals in West and South East Edinburgh.



**Figure 9 Transport Overview Map**

**Table 9 Transport Proposals and Safeguards**

Transport Proposals and Safeguards	
<b>Public Transport</b>	
<b>Reference: T1</b> <b>Name :</b> Edinburgh Tram	The first phase of the tram line is being constructed between the airport and the city centre. It is due to open in summer 2014. The plan safeguards long-term extensions to the network connecting with the waterfront, to the south east and Newbridge.

<p><b>Reference: T2</b>  <b>Name :</b> Edinburgh Glasgow Improvement Project safeguards</p>	<p>There are two railway safeguards required as part of the Edinburgh Glasgow Improvement Project. The Almond Chord to the south of Dalmeny will allow Glasgow and Dunblane services to access Edinburgh Gateway Station and will increase public transport accessibility to West Edinburgh from West and Central Scotland. The route shown is indicative at this time. Part of the Abbeyhill branchline to the east of the city centre is needed for new turnback facilities to allow reversing of trains.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T3</b>  <b>Name:</b> Rail Halts at Portobello, Piershill and Meadowbank</p>	<p>Required to ensure development does not prejudice future re-use of existing abandoned halts. Re-introduction of passenger services is not currently considered viable by the rail authority but this may change.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T4</b>  <b>Name :</b> Rail Halts on the South Suburban Rail Line</p>	<p>Required to ensure development does not prejudice future re-use of existing abandoned halts. Re-introduction of passenger services is not currently considered viable by the rail authority but this may change.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T5</b>  <b>Name :</b> Orbital Bus Route</p>	<p>The Orbital Bus Route will create an east-west public transport link across the city. A disused railway line between Danderhall and the City Bypass at Straiton is safeguarded for appropriate public transport use or use as a cycle / footpath. The other parts of the orbital bus route are either within the land of existing roads or have yet to be identified in detail and can therefore not be safeguarded in this plan.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T6</b>  <b>Name :</b> Greendykes Public Transport Link</p>	<p>Development led improvement to link with Edinburgh Royal Infirmary and BioQuarter. Contained within proposals for New Greendykes.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T7</b>  <b>Name :</b> Newcraighall to QMUC public transport link</p>	<p>Development led improvement associated with housing development on Newcraighall East (HSG 27). Further information is provided in the Newcraighall Site Brief (pages 72 -73).</p>
<p><b>Active Travel</b></p>	



<p><b>Reference: T8</b>  <b>Name :</b> Various off-road cycle/footpath links</p>	<p>The Proposals Map shows proposed and potential cycle/footpath links and new access points. Many of these are included in the Council's Core Paths Plan and Active Travel Action Plan's "Family Network". The creation of these links will help meet climate change and sustainable development objectives. The proposed coastal footpath and cycle link at Joppa will only be supported if there are no adverse impacts on the nature conservation interests of the Firth of Forth Special Protection Area (see Policy Env13)</p>
<b>Road Access and Capacity</b>	
<p><b>Reference : T9</b>  <b>Name :</b> Eastfield Road and dumbbells junction</p>	<p>Improvements required to support development in West Edinburgh. Dualled road with bus priority and segregated cycle and pedestrian provision along whole length from A8 dumbbells junction to roundabout at the airport. Additional carriageway to be provided on land to east of existing road line. Existing dumbbells to be replaced by upgraded and signalised roundabouts giving bus priority. Widening on A8 approaches to and possibly through junction to provide bus priority.</p>
<p><b>Reference : T10</b>  <b>Name :</b> Gogar Link Road</p>	<p>Required to support long term development in West Edinburgh. Largely single carriageway through IBG with some widening to allow public transport priority. Link may be bus/cycle/pedestrian only.</p>
<p><b>Reference : T11</b>  <b>Name:</b> A8 additional junction</p>	<p>Required to support development in West Edinburgh. New junction on A8 west of dumbbells to serve Royal Highland Centre development north and, potentially in the future, south of the A8.</p>
<p><b>Reference : T12</b>  <b>Name :</b> Improvements to Newbridge Roundabout</p>	<p>Required to support development in West Edinburgh. Improvements to provide public transport priority and/or enhanced lane capacity on M9 and A8.</p>

<p><b>Reference : T13</b>  <b>Name :</b> Improvements to Gogar Roundabout</p>	<p>Required to support development in West Edinburgh. Likely to include extra lane on inside of existing roundabout. May also require some widening of approaches.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T14</b>  <b>Name :</b> Sheriffhall Junction Upgrade</p>	<p>Grade separation of existing roundabout junction on city bypass. Should incorporate bus priority and safe crossing of the bypass for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T15</b>  <b>Name :</b> New Street in Leith Docks</p>	<p>Route for extension of Ocean Drive to support port development. Likely to be required by 2015.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T16</b>  <b>Name :</b> West of Fort Kinnaird road to The Wisp</p>	<p>Link between The Wisp and Newcraighall Road to improve traffic conditions on the approaches to Fort Kinnaird retail park.</p>
<p><b>Reference: T17</b>  <b>Name:</b> Maybury Junction</p>	<p>Proposal to increase junction capacity, including consideration of access from Turnhouse Road, and efficiency of traffic signals. Will provide bus priority and better provision for pedestrians and cyclists. Required to mitigate the impact of new housing development at Maybury (HSG 19) and Cammo (HSG20).</p>
<p><b>Reference: T18</b>  <b>Name:</b> Craigs Road Junction</p>	<p>Proposed improvements to Craigs Road and increased junction capacity/bus priority at junction with Maybury Road. Includes new signalised cross roads allowing bus, pedestrian and cycle access to and from Craigs Road. Required to mitigate the impact of new housing development at Maybury (HSG 19) and Cammo (HSG20).</p>
<p><b>Reference: T19</b>  <b>Name:</b> Barnton Junction</p>	<p>Proposal to increase junction capacity based on increasing the efficiency of the traffic signals. Required to mitigate the impact of new housing development at Maybury (HSG 19) and Cammo (HSG20).</p>
<p><b>Reference: T20</b>  <b>Name:</b> Gilmerton Crossroads</p>	<p>Proposal to increase junction capacity based on improved efficiency of traffic signals. An access and parking strategy for Drum Street is proposed to alleviate congestion caused by parked cars close to the junction. Required to mitigate the impact of new housing development at Gilmerton Station Road (HSG 24).</p>
<p><b>Reference: T21</b>  <b>Name:</b> Burdiehouse Junction</p>	<p>Proposal to increase junction capacity based on improved efficiency of traffic signals to ease congestion and maintain or improve bus priority for north to south traffic. Required to mitigate the impact of new housing development at Broomhills (HSG21) and Burdiehouse (HSG22).</p>

## 5) Resources and Services

87. The LDP has a role in supporting development which meets needs vital to modern life. These include the use of natural resources such as energy and materials, and the provision of network services such as water supply, drainage and telecommunications.

### Sustainable Energy

88. The Council requires new buildings to include carbon reduction measures. This will help meet climate change targets but only by a small amount, at least in the short term. There is also a need to help make existing buildings more efficient and to support new low and zero carbon energy generation developments.

89. The majority of on-shore capacity for meeting national targets will come from large-scale developments such as wind farms. These are not appropriate for location in Edinburgh's urban area or surrounding countryside, much of which is Green Belt and/or is in close proximity to Edinburgh Airport. The LDP instead supports small-scale wind turbines and other forms of low and zero carbon energy generation, including solar panels, combined heat and power, district heating, ground source heat pumps, energy-from-waste and biomass.

### Waste

90. Scotland's national waste strategy, the Zero Waste Plan is based on a waste hierarchy. This means that waste should be:

1. prevented,
2. reused,
3. recycled or
4. recovered, and that the
5. landfilling of waste is the last resort.


The waste hierarchy is being implemented through the Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012. These will lead to a significant increase in the number and range of waste management facilities needed in order to collect, sort and treat all waste (municipal, commercial and industrial) which would otherwise have gone to landfill.

91. The main types of installation that will be needed are: composting and anaerobic digestion facilities; transfer stations; materials recycling facilities; and plants for mechanical, biological and thermal treatment. There will also be opportunities to capture heat and power generated through the waste recovery process. Some developments may include a combination of the above processes.

92. The Zero Waste Plan identifies the total operational capacity for waste management at both national and regional level. In the Edinburgh city region, some of the need will be met by a new waste management facility at Millerhill in Midlothian, dealing mainly with household waste.

93. Edinburgh's household waste is only a quarter of total waste produced in the city, so more new facilities will be needed in the city region. The location of these facilities will depend mainly on the procurement of services from private waste management operators. However, the European Waste Framework Directive establishes the *proximity principle*. This aims to limit the environmental impact of transporting waste by ensuring all waste is managed as near as possible to its place of production.

94. Proximity can be relative – currently some waste types have to be transported elsewhere because the particular material recovery processes do not take place in Scotland. Edinburgh, as a concentration of homes and businesses, generates a significant amount of waste and so, where possible, should make some provision to deal with its own waste. Accordingly, this Plan supports existing and new waste management facilities.



**Figure 10 Waste Management Safeguards**

### Other Resources and Services

95. The Plan also:

- safeguards extraction of economically viable mineral deposits
- ensures that new development is adequately served by water supplies and drainage
- supports expansion of modern telecommunications, including the introduction of public wireless connectivity in public areas.

#### **Section 4 - A PLAN THAT CAN DELIVER**

96. A successful plan is one that achieves the right balance between ambition and pragmatism. This plan is visionary and aims to make Edinburgh the best it can be. But it also takes account of the resources available to implement the policies and proposals, particularly in the context of current economic uncertainty.

97. In identifying new housing proposals, consideration was given to whether the sites can be made available for development and whether any necessary enhancements, in terms of accessibility or infrastructure are feasible.

98. The growth of the city, through increased population and housing, business and other development, will require new and improved infrastructure such as schools, public transport, changes to the road network and access to suitable greenspace. To ensure the city grows in a sustainable way, the infrastructure provision and enhancements associated with new development must be delivered. Otherwise future generations will have to deal with unacceptable levels of traffic congestion and housing areas with poor access to public transport and local services.

99. The plan will help in two ways. Firstly, it provides opportunities for business and service uses to locate close to new housing. The housing site briefs identify suitable locations for commercial units which could be occupied by a range of uses including healthcare practices and local services. Secondly, it is accompanied by an Action Programme which sets out how the infrastructure and services required to support the growth of the city will be delivered

100. The infrastructure requirements for LDP proposals are set out clearly in the Action Programme. These include road and junction improvements, public transport provision and school facilities. The Action Programme identifies an indicative cost, phasing and potential delivery mechanism for the infrastructure requirements. It will be kept under review and updated annually or as further information becomes available.

101. Developer contributions remain an important mechanism for delivering the infrastructure provision and improvements associated with development proposals. However in the current economic climate, it is important that developers aren't overburdened with an extensive list of infrastructure requirements, as this will affect the viability of sites and development won't happen where it should. The Council has reviewed its strategy for developer contributions to ensure a proportionate and realistic approach appropriate for current economic conditions. The main purpose of policies Del 1 and Del 2 in Part 2 Section 1 of this plan is to ensure that landowners/developers have a clear understanding of what is required from them at the outset.

## Section 5 - A PLAN FOR ALL PARTS OF THE CITY

102. The LDP strategy focuses the growth of the city on four Strategic Development Areas. This approach is consistent with the SDP and the Council's economic strategy. This section of the plan sets out the main proposals, anticipated changes and key investment opportunities in each of the four Strategic Development Areas. It also explains what the plan means for others parts of the city, smaller settlements and the countryside.

### City Centre

103. Edinburgh's city centre is the vibrant hub of the city region – it's the regional shopping centre and an important tourist destination with a wide range of entertainment and cultural attractions. It has excellent public transport connections and provides employment for over 80,000 people. Edinburgh city centre's stunning setting and iconic architecture is celebrated internationally. It incorporates Scotland's only urban World Heritage Site and many listed buildings and important green spaces. The city centre is also an area where people live, with a wide range of housing types and styles contributing to its character.

104. The plan aims to ensure that development in the city centre achieves the right balance between a number of competing priorities – from realising its economic potential, to protecting its built and natural heritage, from promoting its role as a capital city to making it an attractive place to live.




Figure 11 City Centre Overview Map

105. This plan provides support for four major development opportunities in the City Centre which were identified in previous plans or through the planning application process (Proposals CC1 – CC4). Table 10 summarises the main elements of these proposals. With the exception of Quartermile where development is well underway, it sets out key development principles to guide any new or revised proposals on these important sites.

106. Other major changes expected to take place in the City Centre in the next five or so years include the introduction of tram services running between York Place and the Airport, further investment and redevelopment along Princes Street, and at Haymarket, West Port/King's Stables and Dewar Place. A number of major public realm projects are also likely to be implemented. All future proposals in the city centre will be assessed in relation to Policy Del 3. Figure 11 illustrates the city centre locations where major change is either proposed or anticipated. There are not expected to be many other large scale redevelopment opportunities in the City Centre in the next five or so years. However, the cumulative effect of a number of smaller developments could bring significant benefits for the City Centre and Edinburgh as a whole.




Table 10 City Centre Proposals - Development Principles

### City Centre Proposals

**Reference:** CC 1

**Location :** St James Quarter

**Description :** Comprehensive redevelopment of the existing shopping mall, hotel, vacant offices and multi-storey car park. A development brief was approved in 2007.



### Development Principles

Proposals should create the opportunity for;

- a more outward-looking and less dominating form of development than currently exists, with new buildings that are well integrated into the surrounding townscape, for example by re-establishing an active frontage to Leith Street
- a significant expansion of retail floorspace
- provision of offices, hotel, housing, leisure and cultural uses
- replacement provision of off-street short stay car parking for public use
- a new civic space and public pedestrian routes to strengthen links with the surrounding area, especially St Andrews Square and Princes Street
- development that enhances local views into and across the site and contributes positively to the historic skyline from more distant views.




Reference: CC 2

Location: New Street

Description : Mixed use redevelopment to create a sustainable and integrated city quarter in the heart of Edinburgh's Old Town. A Master Plan was approved in 2006.

Redevelopment is expected to commence in 2014.



### Development Principles

Proposals will be expected to provide for:

- a mix of uses including housing, offices, small business units, hotels, shops (including a small supermarket), food and drink premises and community facilities
- a close-grained layout which reflects the distinctive spatial pattern of the Old Town, provides a new strategic route between East Market Street and Canongate and includes a new civic space within the site.
- new buildings, including landmark buildings, which respect the form and contours of the Waverley Valley and which preserve or enhance important existing views and the potential to create new views into and across the site.

**Reference:** CC 3

**Location:** Fountainbridge

**Description :** Comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of the land previously occupied by the Fountainbridge Brewery. Located close to the city centre and includes the Edinburgh terminus of the Union Canal. There are two approved development briefs for the site (Fountainbridge, 2005 and Tollcross, 2006). Development is underway.



### Development Principles

Proposals will be expected to:

- provide mixed use development including a local centre, residential, office, small business units, retail, leisure, community and tourist/visitor facilities
- create a layout which integrates with adjoining neighbourhoods in Dalry, Tollcross and Viewforth
- improve north-south linkages, in particular provide a strong pedestrian/cycle link to Haymarket that reduces the barrier effect of the West Approach Road
- create new public spaces and streetscape consistent with the approved Fountainbridge Public Realm Strategy
- proposals should explore potential for expansion of water space and should provide attractive frontages to the canal, safeguarding its nature conservation.
- contribute to the improvement of Dalry Community Park (Proposal GS 1).
- protect and enhance key townscape views.

**Reference:** CC 4

**Location:** Quartermile

**Description :** Redevelopment of the historic Edinburgh Royal Infirmary site to create a sustainable, mixed-use urban community is well underway. The development involves a network of pedestrian routes and landscaped public spaces to draw the park directly into its heart. New development is combined with refurbishment of the historic buildings. On completion, Quartermile will be home to almost 2000 residents with 3000 people employed in its offices, shops, restaurants and a hotel.




### **Edinburgh Waterfront**

107. North Edinburgh has seen 40 years of decline in industrial activity and port-related use of land. This has created an opportunity for mixed-use regeneration on the largest scale and has started to help meet the city's growth needs, particularly for new housing. The regeneration of Edinburgh Waterfront has been guided by masterplans and frameworks prepared in collaboration with the principal landowners.

108. These documents have set out long-term strategies which aim to:

- transform the waterfront into one of the city's landmark features
- attract high quality developments which will contribute towards economic prosperity in the city region
- create distinctive high density urban quarters and build exemplar sustainable communities with a reduction in the influence of the car in design and layout
- support regeneration in adjoining areas and provide an incentive for the construction of the tram





**Figure 12 Waterfront Overview map**

109. For much of the waterfront, the basis for the current vision remains unchanged. There is no identified demand for large-scale industrial uses in Granton or Central and Western Leith. There is still an overall housing need, and the Council still aspires to realise the waterfront's potential as a series of attractive and memorable places.

110. This plan therefore continues to support the regeneration of Granton Waterfront and part of Leith Waterfront for housing and other uses. However, current economic conditions mean that progress on the ground will be slower than envisaged. Policy Del 4 sets out the principles which development must implement, if the full potential of the city's waterfront is to be realised.

111. A new opportunity has emerged in the northern and eastern parts of Leith Waterfront (Leith Docks). The national renewable energy targets referred to in Figure 2 create the prospect of a much larger off-shore renewable energy industry in the North Sea. New large-scale industrial development in suitable ports will be needed to construct and service wind turbines and other equipment. The National Renewables Infrastructure Plan (2010) identifies Leith as the best location to accommodate major operations, supported by other east coast ports.

112. This is an opportunity to realise several LDP aims, in particular growing the number and range of jobs in the city and helping address climate change. The LDP therefore designates the north and eastern docks as a Business and Industry Area in which proposals are assessed using Policy Emp 8 in Part 2 Section 4. Other plan policies will also be relevant, including those which protect nationally and internationally designated nature conservation sites and key views across the city.

113. This change in policy designation means that the docks area of Leith Waterfront will now be unavailable for housing development. The short term implications of this

change are addressed partly through the identification of additional housing opportunities in Leith Waterfront and Granton as described in Table 11. Any longer term implications for the housing land supply across the city region will be considered through the SDP. Figure 12 shows how Edinburgh Waterfront has been subdivided for the purposes of the plan. Proposals in areas EW1a – e should be guided by the Leith Waterfront Development Principles and in areas EW2a-d by the Granton Waterfront Development Principles


**Table 11 Edinburgh Waterfront Development Principles**

**Leith Waterfront Development Principles**

**Reference:** EW 1a

**Location:** Leith Western Harbour

**Description:** Housing-led mixed use development with an approved masterplan. Around a third of the estimated maximum housing capacity has been implemented.



**Development Principles**

Proposals will be expected to:


- complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form
- revise the housing mix towards a greater number of townhouses than identified in the masterplan, where it would be appropriate in terms of placemaking and would accelerate completions,
- meet the Council's Large Greenspace Standard by delivering the Western Harbour Central Park (Proposal GS2)
- complete the partly implemented new local centre by providing smaller commercial units under flatted development on the other corners of the centre's junction
- deliver school provision as specified in the Action Programme
- create a publicly-accessible waterside path around the perimeter of the area, connecting east and west
- design new housing to mitigate any significant adverse impacts on residential amenity from existing or new general industrial development

**Reference:** EW 1b

**Location:** Central Leith Waterfront

**Description:** Area of commercial and housing-led mixed use development sites in various ownerships. The Leith Docks Development Framework (2005) establishes a street layout which coordinates developments and sets building heights which make the most of the area's accessibility and urban character. A public realm improvement

scheme has been designed for Bernard Street. The potential for public realm improvements on Commercial Street and extension of recent improvements of southern section of The Shore northwards has been identified.



#### Development Principles

Proposals will be expected to:

- implement the approved street and block layout
- locate any major office development within the strategic business centre identified on the Proposals Map
- create a publicly-accessible waterside path connecting east and west
- help meet the Council's open space standards through financial contributions to major improvements to or creation of off-site spaces
- design new housing to mitigate any significant adverse impacts on residential amenity from existing or new general industrial development


LDP provisions relating to Ocean Terminal are set out in Table 7 and policy Ret 3.

**Reference:** EW 1c

**Location:** East of Salamander Place

**Description:** Housing-led mixed use development on sites in various ownerships. Housing shown in the Salamander Place Development Brief (2007) is under construction. There is now also an opportunity for housing to the east of the Leith Links Seaward Extension (Proposal GS 3). This land was identified for industry in the previous local plan and the development brief, but is no longer needed due to the increase in industrial land elsewhere in Leith Waterfront.





**Development Principles**  
Proposals should provide for:

- (west) the key streets and frontages set out in the approved development brief.
- implementation of the park extension
- (east) the key streets and frontages identified in the above diagram
- streetscape improvements along Salamander Street
- the design of new housing to mitigate any significant adverse impacts on residential amenity from existing or new general industrial development

**Reference:** EW 1d and e  
**Location:** Seafield (EW 1d) and Northern and Eastern Docks (EW 1e)  
**Description:** Area of general industrial, storage and business development and port-related uses. Identified in this plan as a Special Economic Area. Identified nationally as an Enterprise Area, which has implications for tax and a speedier development management process. There is potential for new deep water berth(s) outside the current port lock gates. In order to provide a flexible context for renewable industry-related developments, this LDP does not set detailed layout or design principles.



### Development Principles

Proposals should take account of the following:

- within the Northern and Eastern Docks (EW1e), proposals will be assessed to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the nature conservation interests of the Firth of Forth Special Protection Area or other relevant Natura 2000 sites. Policy Env 13 will apply.
- the character and sense of place in The Shore is important to the tourism potential of Leith. Views from The Shore will be a factor in considering proposals for new larger buildings.
- the Seafield area (EW 1d) is the subject of a waste management / combined heat and power safeguard (see Policy RS 3).
- existing pedestrian footpaths at Marine Esplanade and Albert Road have the potential form part of a coastal cycle route and be extended to Salamander Street and Leith Links. These routes avoid the secure port area, which is no longer expected to be available as a section of the wider Edinburgh Promenade.

### Granton Waterfront Development Principles

**Reference:** EW 2a

**Location:** Forth Quarter

**Description:** Housing-led mixed use development on land primarily owned by National Grid. An approved masterplan has been partly implemented, with several housing blocks, a major office development, a college and a new large park. A proposed new Local Centre to meet the convenience shopping needs of local residents and workers has been delivered in the form of a large foodstore. Additional housing capacity is now available on land formerly designated as part of a strategic business centre.





### Development Principles

Proposals will be expected to:

- complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form
- provide housing-led development on sites formerly identified for major business-led development
- revise the housing mix towards a greater number of townhouses than identified in the masterplan, where it would be appropriate in terms of placemaking and would accelerate completions
- deliver school provision as specified in the Action Programme

**Reference:** EW 2b

**Location:** Central Development Area

**Description:** Housing-led mixed use development on land assembled by a joint-venture regeneration company. Some housing development has been completed along a new avenue in accordance with an approved master plan. Additional housing capacity is now available on land formerly designated as part of a strategic business centre.



### Development Principles

Proposals will be expected to:

- complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form
- provide housing-led development on sites formerly identified for major business-led development

- revise the housing mix towards a greater number of townhouses than identified in the masterplan, where it would be appropriate in terms of placemaking and would accelerate completions
- deliver school provision as specified in the Action Programme
- complete the relevant section of the waterside Edinburgh Promenade.

**Reference:** EW 2c

**Location:** Granton Harbour

**Description:** Housing-led mixed use development on land owned by Forth Ports Limited and others. Some housing development has been completed in accordance with an approved master plan.



#### **Development Principles**

Proposals will be expected to:


- complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form
- revise the housing mix towards a greater number of townhouses than identified in the masterplan, where it would be appropriate in terms of placemaking and would accelerate completions
- meet the convenience shopping needs of new and future residents by implementing the proposed Local Centre (Proposed S2) in the form of commercial units under flatted development, including a small supermarket (1,500sq.m.).
- complete the relevant section of the waterside Edinburgh Promenade
- provide for retained and improved mooring facilities and retain Middle Pier as a 'working pier'
- include tourism and waterfront-related leisure and entertainment uses

**Reference:** EW 2d

**Location:** North Shore

**Description:** Area identified for housing-led mixed use development in an approved

masterplan. However, the slower pace of development in the waterfront means that the North Shore area is unlikely to be available for residential development within the first half of this LDP period. Temporary consents for light industrial development would allow productive use of this area and address the small business needs targeted by Policy Emp 9 without prejudicing residential amenity in new development to the south.



#### **Development Principles**

Proposals will be expected to:

- be compatible with future residential development in Forth Quarter and the Central Development Area
- complete the relevant section of the waterside Edinburgh Promenade
- avoid prejudicing future housing-led redevelopment on their sites or on adjacent land

### **West Edinburgh**

114. West Edinburgh focuses on land along the A8 corridor and new tram route and around the proposed Edinburgh Gateway inter-modal station at Gogar. It includes a number of major existing uses such as the Airport, Royal Highland Centre, Gyle and Hermiston Gait shopping centres and a range of employment/investment locations as shown on Figure 13. National planning policy identified the potential of this area for nationally important economic development through the enhancement of the Airport and Royal Highland Centre and opportunity for an International Business Gateway. The implementation of already committed public transport proposals, in particular the tram, will greatly enhance the accessibility of the West Edinburgh area.

115. This plan continues to support these important economic development opportunities and also major office development at Edinburgh Park/South Gyle and, previously identified, housing led regeneration proposals at Newbridge and Ratho Station. The Strategic Development Plan identifies West Edinburgh as a strategic growth area. A range of new opportunities for housing development are therefore being brought forward in the LDP. Transport assessments have been undertaken to identify key transport interventions, including measures to encourage public transport use, walking and cycling as well as junction upgrades and other road improvements required to support the proposed development.





**Figure 13 West Edinburgh overview diagram**

116. Housing is proposed on two greenfield sites at Maybury and Cammo and as an integrated component of business led mixed use proposals in the IBG and Edinburgh Park/South Gyle. Proposals must accord with the relevant Site Brief or Development Principles to ensure high quality development consistent with the aims of the plan. All proposals will be required to make appropriate contributions to new and improved infrastructure as specified in the Action Programme. Transport interventions necessary to mitigate the impacts of new housing proposals in West Edinburgh have been identified through the LDP transport appraisal. Transport Assessments will be required at the planning application stage to establish the details of the proposed measures and how mode share targets will be met.

#### Maybury and Cammo Site Brief

##### Description

The Maybury and Cammo sites lie within the Almond basin, set against the backdrop of Lennie Hill with views to the Pentlands to the south. These housing sites are served by bus, rail and tram connections and will be physically integrated with their surroundings by street design and green corridors linking to Cammo Estate Park and the River Almond to the north and the Gyle, Edinburgh Park and IBG to the south. Comprehensive masterplanning and phasing of development will be required drawing upon placemaking and street design principles to create distinctive and sustainable urban communities at the gateway to the City.



## Development Principles

### Maybury (HSG 19)

- development should start in the eastern part of the site forming an extension of the existing built up area.
- pedestrian/cycle bridge must be provided linking site with Edinburgh Gateway Station and providing onward connections to the Gyle and Edinburgh Park to the south and IBG to the west.
- new 30 m wide green network link is to be provided from new pedestrian/cycle bridge through the Maybury site to connect via Cammo Walk and Cammo Estate park to the north. This will provide a new, strategic, north-south green network link to the west of the City. No vehicular access should be taken through the green corridor.
- opportunity to change the character of Turnhouse Rd through street design providing avenue trees, verges and incorporating existing stone walls. New residential development should be positioned to address Turnhouse Road. A new reduced speed limit will be required.
- the entirety of Craigs Road should be widened on the southern edge to facilitate all vehicle movements.
- opportunity for higher density development within 400 metres of pedestrian/cycle bridge.
- site layout must allow bus route to be formed linking Craigs Road with Turnhouse Road.

- development must respect the ridgeline of Craigs Road and elevated slopes within the site
- opportunity to create a community focal point providing local services in a accessible location close to new pedestrian/cycle bridge. This should include a new primary school, civic space and units suitable for local shopping (maximum 800 (gross) sq.m.) and healthcare facilities.
- provision of new woodland and grassland habitat (30m depth) to create a strong green belt boundary adjoining Craigs Rd along the northern edge of the site.
- provision of two new large greenspaces to meet the 2 hectare green space standard as required by the Open Space Strategy. There is potential to create local green space on the high point of the site next to Maybury Road.
- proposals should enable co-ordination with long term redevelopment opportunity of existing industrial/employment sites for high quality employment or residential uses, incorporating pedestrian, cycle and public transport safeguards

### **Cammo (HSG 20)**

- the site layout should provide maximum accessibility by public transport including direct pedestrian links to enhanced bus infrastructure and services on Maybury Road and to the north east corner of the site to minimise distance to bus stops for services along Queensferry Road.
- opportunity to change the character of Maybury Road through street design, to enable and improve path connections across Maybury Road and create residential frontage with reduced speed limit.
- proposals should enable views through the site to focal points of Mauseley Hill, Cammo Water Tower, Cammo Estate Park and the Pentland Hills from within the site and Maybury Rd by means of street design and open space provision.
- the context of the Designed Landscape should be enhanced through sensitively designed development and an appropriate landscape framework.
- provision of new woodland, grassland and wetland habitat (40 m depth) to create strong green belt boundaries along the southern and western edges of the site. This should include a multi user path overlooked by new housing.
- improve the quality of the water environment through works to realign and improve the bank side treatment of the Bughtlin Burn.
- provide green network connections through the site and enhance off-site links to improve the connectivity of the Cammo Estate from the Bughtlin, Drumbrae and East Craigs residential areas to the east and, via changes to Cammo Walk, to the south.



### International Business Gateway Development Principles

**Description:** International business development and ancillary uses, hotel and conference facilities, housing as an integrated component of business-led mixed use proposals. A more detailed vision for the area is set out in the West Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework, approved in May 2010. Policy Emp6 applies.




### Development Principles

- the IBG must be master planned and developed in a phased manner. Master plans should incorporate an appropriate mix of uses to help support the main purpose of the IBG as a location for international business development.
- proposals should contribute to the creation of a sustainable extension of the city based on a grid pattern with a focus on place-making, good public transport and footpath and cycle connections, parkland (Proposal GS6) and a strong landscape structure (see West Edinburgh Landscape Framework).
- the preferred location for initial phases of development is within 250 metres of tram stops. Higher density development and uses which attract high volumes of visitors should be located close to a tram stop.
- the prevailing building height should be four storeys with some higher landmark buildings and lower building heights adjacent to structural green spaces.

### Edinburgh Park/South Gyle Development Principles

**The Vision :** To create a thriving business and residential community, well integrated with the rest of the city through good public transport, pedestrian and cycle connections, a more balanced mix of uses and facilities and high quality public realm and green spaces. Policy Del 5 applies.



## Development Principles

### General

- Proposals should help contribute towards realising the long term vision for Edinburgh Park/ South Gyle.
- Where possible, proposals should incorporate new cycle and pedestrian links through the site and consider how these connect to other uses and routes across the Edinburgh Park and South Gyle area.

### Area EP 1

**Description** – development opportunities in this area include undeveloped land and the potential to reconfigure existing surface car parks to accommodate new buildings.

- proposals should incorporate a mix of business and residential uses and ancillary uses. The creation of a commercial hub adjacent to Edinburgh Park station is supported.
- development should work with and extend the existing grid layout to ensure a cohesive townscape framework and deliver sustainable movement through the site.
- the continuation of the existing north to south greenspace corridor and creation of new pedestrian and cycle links through the site are essential requirements. The potential exists to create a strategic pedestrian/cycle route linking Wester Hailes, Broomhouse and Sighthill to Edinburgh Gateway Station.

### Area EP 2

**Description** – redevelopment opportunity on vacant land and adjacent sites currently occupied by vacant office buildings.



- proposals should incorporate a mix of business and residential uses and create an element of active commercial frontage onto South Gyle Broadway.

- a mixed use development provides the opportunity to create new pedestrian and cycle routes through the site.

#### Areas EP 3 – EP 5

**Description** – sites occupied by a variety of low density commercial property with the potential for some incremental change over time.

- in EP 3 and EP 4, commercial and mixed use proposals will be supported. Where practicable, development should provide increased permeability, create a direct relationship with South Gyle Broadway and improve the pedestrian and cycling environment along South Gyle Crescent.

- EP5 should remain in predominantly business and industrial use. Where opportunities arise, consideration should be given to improving accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.

#### Gyle Centre

**Description** – commercial centre which currently has 75 units

- any expansion of the Gyle shopping centre to meet the needs of the expanding population in West Edinburgh should provide an active frontage to South Gyle Broadway, contribute to the green network and provide good pedestrian connections to the tram stop and wider area.

- the opportunity exists to create of a new green space incorporating the tram halt and a north-south pedestrian cycle route, framed by additional development to help the centre contribute to the long term vision for the area.

### **South East Edinburgh**

117. South East Edinburgh is expected to experience major change over the next five to seven years. The plan incorporates a number of existing proposals, some of which have started but are not yet completed and others that have still to be implemented. These include housing development at Greendykes, mixed use regeneration at Craigmillar and life sciences related business development at Edinburgh BioQuarter. The LDP allocates a number of additional housing sites across South East Edinburgh to meet SDP requirements – two sites within the existing urban area at Ellen's Glen Road and Moredunvale, two sites along the Burdiehouse corridor, three sites along the Gilmerton corridor and three sites at Newcraighall/Brunstane. It includes sites briefs for the new LDP housing proposals and Development Principles for the BioQuarter. All proposals will be required to make appropriate contributions to new and improved infrastructure as specified in the action programme. Transport interventions necessary to mitigate the impacts of new housing proposals in South East Edinburgh have been identified through the LDP transport appraisal. Transport Assessments will be required at the planning application stage to establish the details of the proposed measures and how mode share targets will be met. Figure 14 shows the areas of South East Edinburgh where major change is expected over the next 5 – 10 years.



Figure 14 South East Edinburgh overview diagram

## Broomhills and Burdiehouse Site Brief

### Description

These sites provide the opportunity to integrate new homes with the existing townscape and landscape setting, whilst enhancing important approaches to the city through street design. The housing sites will support the creation of vibrant urban areas served by public transport.

New open spaces will sit within the context of the Pentland Hills, the city skyline and Burdiehouse Burn valley and provide a focus for community life, enhance habitats and connect to local routes and the Midlothian core path network.



### Development Principles

#### Broomhills (HSG 21)

- vehicular access to be taken from Frogston Road East and Burdiehouse Road with no direct route between the two access points. No vehicular access (including emergency) to be taken from Broomhills Road.
- opportunity to change the character of Burdiehouse Rd through street design, to enable and improving path connections across Burdiehouse Rd, provide street verges and trees, and create residential frontage with a reduced speed limit.
- new 5 hectare public park to be provided on highest part of the site in line with open space proposal GS9 to reflect landscape constraint of elevated terrain and outward views to the Pentland Hills and the city skyline.
- a 50 m wide tree belt should be provided to create a strong green belt boundary to the south and west of the site. This should incorporate existing tree cover, provide habitat enhancements integrated with SUDS provision and include a multi-user path to connect Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park to path networks at Morton Mains and Mortonhall.

- provide a green corridor incorporating pedestrian and cycleway connections through site from Old Burdiehouse Road.

### **Burdiehouse (HSG 22)**

- vehicular access to be taken from Burdiehouse Road. No vehicular access to be taken from the Lang Loan, across land within the green belt.

- opportunity to change the character of Burdiehouse Rd through street design, to enable and improving path connections across Burdiehouse Rd, provide street verges and trees, and create residential frontage with a reduced speed limit.

- site layout must enable a bus route to be formed providing a link from 'The Murrays' to Burdiehouse Road, regulated by bus gate.

- active frontage must be provided onto Burdiehouse Road, incorporating streetscape enhancements.

- 30 m wide tree planting to southwest of site to form a new green belt boundary to the west of Burdiehouse Limekilns.

- provision of new 50m wide tree belt to the southeast of site to form new green belt boundary. This should enhance the connectivity of woodland habitat and incorporate multi-user path link to Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park.

- off-site multi-user path connection to link with the paths network in Midlothian via Straiton Pond, with 4m wide landscape treatment to the west across open ground, including verge, hedgerow and hedgerow trees.

- local open space proposals should :

a) provide amenity greenspace setting and retain views to the category B listed Limekilns

b) improve semi-natural habitat and amenity value of the Local Nature Reserve, extend woodland along the southern bank of the Burdiehouse Burn and incorporate off-road path links to the Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park.


c) integrate the design and layout of the open space with the Area of Importance for Flood Management and beyond this area, provide additional amenity and biodiversity benefits through SUDs. The design should recognise different management and maintenance requirements.



## Gilmerton Site Brief

### Description

A range of sites at Gilmerton of varying sizes and character provide the opportunity to provide new housing and local facilities, well served by public transport and with good connections to existing communities and the surrounding countryside. The new housing and associated landscape framework should enhance the quality and character of the urban edge and respond to the wooded grounds of The Drum and former Gilmerton House.



### Development Principles

#### Gilmerton Dykes Road (HSG 23)

- vehicular access to be taken directly from Gilmerton Dykes Road
- provision of a new tree belt of 20 m (south ) and 30 m (south east) to form a strong green belt boundary and to reflect the policy woodland of the former Gilmerton House.
- opportunity to create path connection to proposal site HSG24

#### Gilmerton Station Road (HSG 24)

- opportunity to change character of Gilmerton Station Rd, through street design incorporating trees and verges and addressed by new residential development.


- provide green network connections linking the site with existing local paths to the north and east.
- include a new primary school towards the north of site.
- provision of new 50 m wide tree belt to west of site to form new green belt boundary, enhancing connectivity of woodland habitat and incorporating a multi-user path link from Gilmerton Dykes Rd to Gilmerton Station Rd (to connect to the transport safeguard along disused Edinburgh, Loanhead and Roslin branch line).
- opportunity to create path connection to proposal site HSG23
- provision of new 2ha public park in accordance with open space strategy standards.
- existing industrial/employment land to south east of site could provide additional housing in longer term, subject to enhancement of existing wooded boundary.

### **The Drum (HSG 25)**

- provide green network connections to Candlemaker's Park and pedestrian/cycle route through the site to link to proposal site HSG24 and the wider path network to the west of Drum Street.
- opportunity to rationalise existing woodland planting on north and west edge of site, to integrate new development, amenity greenspace and existing residential areas
- provision of new tree belt of 30 m depth to the north and east of site to form a new boundary to the green belt and The Drum as a site on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes, and to enhance woodland habitat.

## Newcraighall and Brunstane Site Brief

**Description** – These sites provide the opportunity for new housing together with new and improved school and local facilities on the eastern side of the Council area. The sites are well served by bus and rail connections with the opportunity for these to be further enhanced. Existing and enhanced footpath and cycle links and green corridor proposals will ensure development is well connected between sites and to existing communities.



## Development Principles

### Newcraighall North (HSG 26)

- vehicular access to be taken from Whitehill St / Newcraighall Road at two or three points. No vehicular access to be taken from Gilberstoun.
- layout should create pedestrian and cycleway connections through the site, including one along an east-west green corridor.
- opportunity for retail/commercial units as part of street frontage to Whitehill Street / Newcraighall Road.

### Newcraighall East (HSG 27)

- vehicular access to be taken from Whitehill St / Newcraighall Road at two points.
- site layout should enable a bus route to be formed north-south through the site. It is intended that this connect to QMUC across land allocated for development in East Lothian. A bus gate at the site boundary should prevent general vehicular access through this route.
- layout should create pedestrian and cycleway connections through the site.

- a new green corridor should be created along the course of the power lines running through the site, extending grassland habitat with the opportunity for connections outwith the Council area. This greenspace should be fronted by new development in order to improve community safety and aid placemaking.
- layout should make provision for an extension of Newcraighall Primary School's grounds.
- opportunity for retail/commercial units as part of street frontage to Whitehill Street / Newcraighall Road.

### **Brunstane HSG 29**


- Vehicular access to be taken from Milton Road East and Newcraighall Road, forming a new vehicular crossing over the East Coast railway line. Potential for new pedestrian/cycle bridge to east of the site.
- No vehicular access to be taken from Gilberstoun area.
- Site layout must allow bus route to be formed linking Milton Road East with Newcraighall Road.
- Opportunity to enhance John Muir Way on the northern boundary of the site including pedestrian crossing where vehicular access meets the path.
- New multi-user path links to be formed to the Innocent Railway Core Path along Brunstane Burn Core Path and disused railway line to the north of Newcraighall, with path connections also to housing at Gilberstoun, Newcraighall and Brunstane railway stations.
- Retain open setting to the north and east of Brunstane House and Scheduled Ancient Monument of Brunstane moated site, providing 2 ha public open space to meet large greenspace standard deficiency to southwest of site. Retain open setting to Scheduled Ancient Monument of Brunstane enclosure by means of 1 ha green space. Management proposals to have regard to historic environment assets.
- Establish statutory safeguards to overhead powerlines to the north and south of the site. Design principles should seek to integrate overhead powerlines with site layout. To south, allotment provision should compliment consented allotments at Newcraighall North. To the north, powerline wayleave should be designed to provide for semi natural greenspace and habitat connectivity with informal recreation.
- Expand grassland habitat (under pylons) and provide woodland connectivity across site.
- Streets and open spaces should be designed to benefit from views to the coast to the north, Arthur's Seat to the west and Pentland Hills to the southwest.
- Landscape framework to be provided to boundary of Inventory Site and detailed siting and design of dwellings to respect views to Arthur's Seat from grounds of Newhailes House.



- Opportunity to create a community focal point including a new primary school and local centre.

### Ellen's Glen Road, Site Brief

Description – Proposal (HSG 28) to provide new housing on the site currently occupied by the relocating Scottish National Blood Transfusion Service and semi-natural green space adjacent to Malbet Wynd. The site currently occupied by Liberton Hospital could provide additional housing if the site becomes available in the future.



### Development Principles

- Vehicular access to be taken from Ellen's Glen Road and Malbet Wynd.
- A mix of housing types including detached, semi-detached, terraces, 'colony style' housing and cottage flats.
- New pedestrian/cycle link on land near to Stenhouse Burn to compensate for the narrow footway on Ellen's Glen Road.
- New pedestrian/cycle link from Malbet Wynd through the site to connect via Ellen's Glen Road to the Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park Core Path

- New local greenspace to meet the Council's Greenspace Standard.
- Appropriate retention of trees around pedestrian/cycle link as informed by a tree survey.
- Development to provide residential frontage onto Ellen's Glen Road.

If the site currently occupied by Liberton Hospital becomes available in the future, proposals would be expected to provide for:

- Direct vehicular access from Lasswade Road across the site currently occupied by Liberton Hospital to the Ellen's Glen Road site. Any proposals for the Ellen's Glen Road site should make provision for such an access.
- Appropriate retention of trees along Lasswade Road and elsewhere across the site as informed by a tree survey.

### Moredunvale Development Principles

Description – Proposal (HSG 30) to provide new housing on approximately half of the site and improve the quality of the remaining open space



### Development Principles

- land around the high rise flats to be kept as green space.
- opportunity to provide play space, allotments and growing spaces as green space improvements .



- opportunity to create links to the wider green network
- proposals should provide better pedestrian and cycle access between the site and the surrounding area.
- remediation work may be required to develop the site due to the history of coal and limestone mining.

### Edinburgh BioQuarter Development Principles

#### Description

Edinburgh BioQuarter is a partly-implemented urban extension focused on the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary and the associated medical school. Land has been allocated to create the potential for further clinical and teaching development and related commercial research and development - collectively known as life science uses.

The combination of a major teaching hospital, a leading university and sufficient developable land in one place is rare. It is a unique opportunity to establish a commercial life science centre of a scale comparable with others globally, with major benefits for the city and national economies. To reach that level, a floorspace target of 245,000sq.m. of life science uses has been estimated.



#### Development Principles

- a higher density, more urban form of development than previously planned, with less land taken up by surface car parking is required to realise the BioQuarter's potential. A compact urban approach is also more likely to foster a sense of place, attractive to workers and visitors.
- supporting uses are appropriate to promote place-making and provide local services and evening and weekend activity. However, the type and quantity of ancillary uses must support, not jeopardise, the overall life science purpose of the BioQuarter.

- development at the BioQuarter must respect the site's sensitive location within the wider landscape setting of the city. The extent of development and building heights, particularly on the upper slopes, must be carefully managed.

- the BioQuarter should front onto and connect with the adjacent South East Wedge Parkland (Proposal GS 4), a key element of the Plan's Spatial Strategy (Figure 1)

More detailed development principles are set out in Supplementary Guidance for Edinburgh BioQuarter and the South East Wedge Parkland.

### **Elsewhere across the LDP area**

118. Outwith the areas identified for strategic growth, the LDP has a role to play in promoting development opportunities and protecting and enhancing the environment.

119. An area where significant change is expected is Queensferry. In addition to the Queensferry Crossing due to open by the end of 2016 and development on a number of existing housing sites, the LDP identifies new housing allocations at Builyon Road, South Scotstoun and Dalmeny. New housing is also proposed on sites at Currie and Balerno and an opportunity for housing together with greenspace improvements has been identified at Curriemuirend. Where appropriate to guide development, site briefs and development principles have been prepared for these housing sites

120. Throughout the LDP area, regeneration opportunities will continue to emerge as vacant and underused sites and buildings are brought back into beneficial use. Planning applications will be assessed using relevant policies to ensure these developments help meet LDP objectives.

121. A number of major transport projects, including the Queensferry Crossing and the tram, will be completed in the next few years. The LDP also includes a number of proposals and safeguards for other public transport, footpath and cycle links which, when implemented, will improve connections across the city.

122. Edinburgh's green belt and Countryside area will be protected and where possible enhanced. The LDP directs the planned growth of the city to specified sites and generally supports development within the urban area subject to relevant policy considerations. Major development in the green belt and Countryside will therefore only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.

### Curriemuirend Development Principles

**Description** - Proposal to provide housing and allotments on land at Curriemuirend Park (HSG 31) and to improve the quality of the existing green space at Clovenstone Drive (GS 10).




### Development Principles










- a comprehensive approach to both sites is required, to ensure the allotments and green space improvements are delivered.
- development should create an active street frontage along Wester Hailes Road
- opportunity to create links to the wider green network
- proposals should provide better pedestrian and cycle access to both the allotments and Clovenstone Drive park
- opportunity to reduce the width of Wester Hailes Road to create a more attractive, safe environment for pedestrians.




**Queensferry South Site Brief**



**Bulyeon Road and South Scotstoun, Queensferry**

- |   |                                   |   |                               |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
|    | site boundary                     |    | vehicular access              |
|    | housing                           |    | proposed school (2ha)         |
|   | other redevelopment opportunity   |   | junction improvement          |
|  | street improvement and frontage   | <b>Green network:</b>   |                               |
|  | commercial / retail opportunities |  | new woodland                  |
|   |                                   |  | existing footpath / cyclepath |
|   |                                   |  | new footpath / cyclepath      |

### Builyeon Road Development Principles (HSG32)



- Vehicular access to be taken from Builyeon Road (A904).
- Opportunity to provide pedestrian/cycle bridge linking site to Ferrymuir and further east.
- Opportunity to change the character of the A904, through street design, upgrading bus shelters, responding to new pedestrian/cycle routes resulting from the Forth Replacement Crossing, forming north-south path connections, including reduced speed limit. Use of avenue tree planting and retention/re-use of existing stone wall encouraged.
- Supplement planting along the southern approach road to new Forth Replacement Crossing with new native woodland at the earliest opportunity having regard to any ecological mitigation measures specified as part of the replacement crossing and oil pipeline.
- Provide green corridor linking Echline to Ferrymuir and Scotstoun including pedestrian/cycle link over the A90.
- Landscape effects of any noise attenuation measures to be considered in terms of site design and appearance.
- Opportunity for commercial uses in north west part of the site including potential relocation of petrol filling station.
- Include a new primary school towards centre of site.



- Redevelopment opportunity of existing commercial uses to north of site and redundant northbound carriageway to east of site.

### South Scotstoun Development Principles (HSG 33)



- Vehicular access to be taken from B800 Queensferry - Kirkliston Road and Provost Milne Grove.
- Opportunity to change the character of the B800 through street design and enabling path connections across the B800.
- Retain field trees and supplement tree lined track with new native woodland of minimum 20m depth to extend the existing green network to: provide a multi user path between Dalmeny and Ferrymuir, establish a new green belt boundary to the A90 at the earliest opportunity, and connect woodland habitat. Opportunity to replace coniferous plantation with mixed native woodland and street planting elsewhere on site.
- Landscape effects of any noise attenuation measures to be considered in terms of site design and appearance from A90.
- New development to front onto the green network and provide natural surveillance.
- Provision of new local greenspace in accordance with open space strategy standards.

### Dalmeny Development Principles (HSG 34)

- Vehicular access to be taken from Bankhead Road.




- Pedestrian access to be provided from Main Street.
- Street frontage and high quality stone boundary wall to be provided to Bankhead Road.
- Retention of view corridors from Main Street to Forth Road and Rail Bridge.
- Development subject to a height constraint of 1-1.5 storeys.
- The use of traditional materials and the continuation of traditional rural built form are considered essential.
- Supplement tree and hedge planting to the north of the village to form a defensible green belt boundary.

**Balerno and Currie Site Brief**



**Newmills Road, Balerno and Curriehill Road, Currie**



### Curriehill Road Development Principles (HSG 36)



- Vehicular access to be taken from Curriehill Road.
- Direct pedestrian links to be formed between Curriehill Road and Curriehill Station through the site. Connections also to be made to the Kirknewton Core Path to the west boundary of the site.
- Development to provide a residential street frontage to the railway line and part way along Curriehill Road with part of the hedgerow removed.
- Opportunity for flatted development and commercial/retail units to the north of the site by the railway line.
- Retain hedgerow to the south and tree planting along the western edge of the site to provide an appropriate green belt boundary and undeveloped land adjacent to a minor watercourse.



### Newmills Road Development Principles (HSG 37)



- Vehicular access to be taken from Newmills Road and Lanark Road West.
- New linear park (proposal GS11) of approximately 50m width to be formed to the western edge of the site as part of an off road, multi user path between the Water of Leith Walkway and Kirknewton, in addition to a local path connection to Addistoun Crescent. The new park will address the large greenspace deficiency to the north of Balerno, enhance connectivity of native broadleaf woodland habitat and integrate SUDs measures. It could also provide new allotments.
- Access from Lanark Road West to run along outer eastern edge of linear park. Residential streets to front onto the proposed linear park to the west and Newmills Road to the east.
- New wooded green belt boundary to be formed on prominent break of slope to the north of the site of a minimum 30m depth.

**PART 2 POLICIES**

123. Planning applications will be assessed against the following policies to ensure that future development helps to meet the core aims of the plan. All relevant policies will be considered in assessing each application. Part 2 of the plan is set out in eight sections

Section 1 - Delivering the Strategy

Section 2 - Design Principles for New Development

Section 3 - Caring for the Environment

Section 4 - Employment and Economic Development

Section 5 - Housing and Community Facilities

Section 6 - Shopping and Leisure

Section 7 - Transport

Section 8 - Resources and Services

124. Policies are often expressed positively, in terms of what kinds of development will be permitted or encouraged. Where a policy states that certain types of development will be permitted, it should also be understood that failure to meet the Council's expectations and aspirations may provide grounds for refusal of planning permission."

## **Section 1 – DELIVERING THE STRATEGY**

125. The policies in this section will play a key role in delivering the LDP strategy. It covers developer contributions towards the delivery of infrastructure provision and improvements and provides specific area based policies for three parts of the city to guide major redevelopment and regeneration proposals – the City Centre, Edinburgh Waterfront and Edinburgh Park/SouthGyle.

### **Objectives**

- To implement the Council's approach to on infrastructure provision and improvements associated with development, taking account of current economic conditions.
- To ensure that developers make a fair and realistic contribution to the delivery of necessary infrastructure provision and improvement associated with development.
- To ensure that proposals for mixed use regeneration in the City Centre, Edinburgh Waterfront and Edinburgh Park/South Gyle are appropriate to the character of the area and bring maximum benefit to the city.

### **Developer Contributions**

#### **Policy Del 1 - Developer Contributions**

**Developer contributions will be required from any development if:**

- a) it will have a net impact on infrastructure capacity; and**
- b) it is necessary to mitigate that impact by providing additional capacity or otherwise improving existing infrastructure.**

**For the proposals listed in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 10 and shown on the Proposals Map, planning permission will be granted subject to legal agreements securing contributions towards the relevant actions specified in the Council's Action Programme.**

**For other proposals, individual assessments, including transport and/or education assessments, may be necessary to identify the impacts arising from the development and the mitigation required. Where major development proposals are located in the contribution zone of relevant actions in the Action Programme, planning permission will be granted subject to legal agreements to secure an appropriate contribution to these.**

**In all cases, developer contributions may also be required to enable satisfactory pedestrian, cycle and vehicle movement from a development site.**

126. This policy is intended to ensure that infrastructure is provided to facilitate new development.

#### Action Programme Contributions

127. Tables 2, 3, 4 and 10 and the Proposals Map identify the housing, economic and mixed used proposals to meet the aims of the Plan. The infrastructure

requirements of these proposals are set out in the Action Programme. This will be updated annually to take account of any changing circumstances and to include further details on each action where available. Transport Assessments may be required at the planning application stage to establish the detail of the transport measures included in the Action Programme and how mode share targets will be met.

128. These infrastructure actions include:

- School capacity increases, including new schools
- Traffic management, including junction improvements
- Other transport improvements, including the Edinburgh Tram project and public realm
- Green space actions

129. The Action Programme identifies a number of infrastructure improvements which will help mitigate the effects of new development across a wide area. Each of these actions has an identified contribution zone within which legal agreements will be used to secure developer contributions. The purpose of these agreements is to deliver actions which address the impacts of the developments proposed within the Plan and also the cumulative effect of other major developments which the Plan's policies support.

#### Other Contributions

130. Developer contributions to measures intended to mitigate the net effects of development, other than actions identified in the Action Programme, may also be required. Such contributions are generally expected to be towards actions in the immediate vicinity of a site. However, assessment work may indicate that larger interventions further away are necessary. Where development is proposed on brownfield sites, previously occupied by an existing use which in itself had infrastructure impacts, these will be taken into account when assessing the net impact on infrastructure capacity. Developer contributions will only be required where these are necessary, proportionate and directly related to the impact(s) of the proposed development.

Council guidance provides advice on how policy Del1 will be applied.

#### **Policy Del 2 – Retrospective Developer Contributions**

**Developer contributions will continue to be sought towards the construction of the tram network and other infrastructure identified in the Action Programme, after the construction works are completed and until the associated borrowings have been repaid.**

131. This policy is in addition to, and in support of, Policy Del1. It ensures that, where a completed section of the tram network will support a new development that development will contribute to the cost of constructing that section of the network. The same principle applies to other high cost infrastructure which has been delivered through borrowing. Planning permission for development on these sites will be granted subject to legal agreements securing contributions. The Council's Action Programme and guidance provide details of the contribution amounts and the amount of money borrowed by the Council against future contributions.



## **Area Specific Policies - Opportunities for major mixed use development/regeneration**

132. Policies Del 3 – Del 5 will guide development in three major regeneration areas, the City Centre, Edinburgh Waterfront and Edinburgh Park/South Gyle. These policies aim to ensure that development and regeneration proposals incorporate an appropriate mix of uses consistent with the character of the wider area and its role in meeting the objectives of the plan.

### **Policy Del 3 City Centre**

**Development in the City Centre as defined on the Proposals Map will be permitted which maintains and enhances its character, attractiveness, vitality and accessibility and contributes to its role as a strategic business and regional shopping centre and Edinburgh's role as a capital city. The requirements in principle will be for:**

- a) **comprehensively designed proposals which maximise the potential of the site in accordance with any relevant development principles, development brief and/or other guidance**
- b) **a use or a mix of uses appropriate to the location of the site, its accessibility characteristics and the character of the surrounding area.**
- c) **Where practicable, major mixed use developments should provide offices, particularly on upper floors. At street level, other uses may be more appropriate to maintain city centre diversity, especially retail vitality on important shopping frontages**
- d) **the creation of new civic spaces and traffic-free pedestrian routes where achievable.**

**Housing as part of mixed use development will be encouraged on appropriate sites to help meet housing need and create strong, sustainable communities.**

133. This policy guides development in the City Centre to ensure proposals provide an appropriate mix of uses and are of a high quality of design taking account of the characteristics of the historic environment. Given the demand for office space in the City Centre and the importance of office jobs to the economy, the policy requires office provision to be included in major mixed use development proposals wherever possible. Development principles for the Fountainbridge, St James Quarter and New Street sites are provided in Table 10 (Part 1 Section 5).

### **Policy Del 4 Edinburgh Waterfront**

**Planning permission will be granted for development which will contribute towards the creation of new urban quarters at Leith Waterfront and Granton Waterfront (specifically EW 1a, b & c and EW 2 a -d on the Proposals Map). The requirements in principle will be for:**

- a) **comprehensively designed proposals which maximise the development potential of the area**
- b) **the provision of a series of mixed use sustainable neighbourhoods that connect to the waterfront, with each other and with nearby neighbourhoods**
- c) **proposals for a mix of house types, sizes and affordability**

- d) the provision of local retail facilities and leisure and tourism attractions, including water related recreation in and around retained harbours**
- e) transport measures agreed with the Council, including a contribution to the proposed tram network and other necessary public transport improvements, the eastwards extension of Ocean Drive and the provision of a network of paths for pedestrians and cyclists, including an east-west path that will form part of the city-wide coastal promenade (safeguarded routes for these are shown on the Proposals Map).**

**In Seafield and Leith's northern and eastern docks (EW 1d and e), planning permission will be granted for industrial and port-related development and compatible uses provided it complies with other relevant policies in this plan.**

**Development should accord with the Leith Waterfront or Granton Waterfront Development Principles.**

134. The purpose of this policy is to ensure the regeneration of Edinburgh's Waterfront comes forward in a planned manner within the context of a long term vision. It sets out key development principles to guide housing led regeneration on large parts of the site, with more detailed guidance provided in the relevant site briefs. The policy also recognises that some parts of the Waterfront will remain in business and industrial uses. Development Principles for Leith Waterfront and Granton Waterfront are set out in Table 11 (Part 1 Section 5).

#### **Policy Del 5 Edinburgh Park/South Gyle**

**Within the boundary of Edinburgh Park/South Gyle as shown on the Proposals Map, planning permission will be granted for development which maintains the strategic employment role of the area and also introduces a wider mix of uses. The requirements in principle will be for;**

- a) comprehensively designed proposals which maximise the development potential of the area**
- b) development for office and other business uses as part of mixed use proposals**
- c) housing as a component of business- led mixed use proposals**
- d) the creation of a new commercial hub adjacent to Edinburgh Park Station**
- e) additional leisure and community uses at Gyle shopping centre**
- f) an extension of the existing green space corridor (known as the Lochans) space**
- g) improved pedestrian and cycle links through the site and to provide strong, safe connections with services and facilities in the surrounding area**

**Development should accord with the Edinburgh Park/South Gyle Development Principles.**

135. This policy aims to promote a better mix of uses in Edinburgh Park/South Gyle and still retain its important role as a strategic business location. The vision is to change the character of the Edinburgh Park/South Gyle area over time from a business dominated environment with limited evening and weekend activity to a thriving mixed use and well integrated part of the city. The Edinburgh Park/South

Gyle Development Principles set out in Part 1 Section 5 provide guidance on how development can help deliver the long term vision for this area.

## Section 2 – DESIGN PRINCIPLES FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

136. The Council encourages innovation and well designed developments that relate sensitively to the existing quality and character of the local and wider environment, generate distinctiveness and a sense of place, and help build stronger communities. Policies Des1 – Des13 will be used to assess planning applications to meet the following objectives. More detailed advice on how to interpret and apply these policies can be found in Council guidance.

### Objectives

- To ensure that new development is of the highest design quality and respects, safeguards and enhances the special character of the city
- To ensure that the city develops in an integrated and sustainable manner
- To create new and distinctive places which support and enhance the special character of the city and meet the needs of residents and other users

### Policy Des 1 Design Quality and Context

**Planning permission will be granted for development where it is demonstrated that the proposal will create or contribute towards a sense of place. Design should be based on an overall design concept that draws upon positive characteristics of the surrounding area. Planning permission will not be granted for poor quality or inappropriate design or for proposals that would be damaging to the character or appearance of the area around it, particularly where this has a special importance.**

137. This policy applies to all new development, including alterations and extensions. The Council expects new development to be of a high standard of design. The Council's policies and guidelines are not to be used as a template for minimum standards. The purpose of the policy is to encourage innovation in the design and layout of new buildings, streets and spaces, provided that the existing quality and character of the immediate and wider environment are respected and enhanced and local distinctiveness is generated.

### Policy Des 2 Co-ordinated Development

**Planning permission will be granted for development which will not compromise:**

- a) the effective development of adjacent land; or**
- b) the comprehensive development and regeneration of a wider area as provided for in a masterplan, strategy or development brief approved by the Council.**

138. This policy applies to all development involving one or more new buildings. The Council encourages a comprehensive approach to redevelopment and regeneration wherever possible, and the preparation of development frameworks or masterplans, to identify the full design potential for creating successful places. Piecemeal development is less likely to lead to the creation of well-defined and cohesive networks of streets and spaces. In exceptional cases, it may be necessary for the

Council to use its powers of compulsory purchase to assemble a site for development and enable a satisfactory outcome to be achieved.

### **Policy Des 3 Development Design – Incorporating and Enhancing Existing and Potential Features**

**Planning permission will be granted for development where it is demonstrated that existing characteristics and features worthy of retention on the site and in the surrounding area, have been identified, incorporated and enhanced through its design.**

139. This policy is relevant for all new development involving one new building or more. Its aim is to ensure that development proposals are informed by a detailed analysis and understanding of the site. The incorporation of existing features including built structures, archaeology, trees and woodland, landscape character, views and biodiversity can enhance a development's sense of place and contribution to the wider habitat and green network. Where practicable, proposals should provide new habitat to further the conservation of biodiversity.

### **Policy Des 4 Development Design – Impact on Setting**

**Planning permission will be granted for development where it is demonstrated that it will have a positive impact on its surroundings, including the character of the wider townscape and landscape, and impact on existing views, having regard to:**

- a) height and form
- b) scale and proportions, including the spaces between buildings
- c) position of buildings and other features on the site
- d) materials and detailing

140. This policy applies to all new development of one or more buildings. Where the built environment is of high quality and has a settled townscape character, new development proposals will be expected to have similar characteristics to the surrounding buildings and urban grain. Where the surrounding development is fragmented or of poor quality, development proposals should help repair the urban fabric, establish model forms of development and generate coherence and distinctiveness – a sense of place. The siting and design of development should also be guided by views within the wider landscape and an understanding of local landscape character, including important topographical features, e.g. prominent ridges, valleys and patterns of vegetation.

### **Policy Des 5 Development Design – Amenity**

**Planning permission will be granted for development where it is demonstrated that:**

- a) the amenity of neighbouring developments is not adversely affected and that future occupiers have acceptable levels of amenity in relation to noise, daylight, sunlight, privacy or immediate outlook
- b) the design will facilitate adaptability in the future to the needs of different occupiers, and in appropriate locations will promote opportunities for mixed uses

- c) community security will be promoted by providing active frontages to more important thoroughfares and designing for natural surveillance over all footpaths and open areas**
- d) a clear distinction is made between public and private spaces, with the latter provided in enclosed or defensible forms**
- e) refuse and recycling facilities, cycle storage, low and zero carbon technology, telecommunications equipment, plant and services have been sensitively integrated into the design**

141. This policy applies to all new development for one or more new buildings. Buildings must meet the needs of users and occupiers, with consideration given to impacts on neighbouring properties to ensure no unreasonable noise impact or loss of daylight, sunlight or privacy. Buildings should be designed to be flexible in use and interact closely with the street, providing continuity of urban frontage and natural surveillance. Cul-de-sac and single access residential layouts and gated communities should be avoided to help the integration of new development into the wider neighbourhood. Ancillary facilities must be sensitively integrated into the design of buildings to avoid impacting upon the surrounding townscape.

### **Policy Des 6 Sustainable Buildings**

**Planning permission will only be granted for new development where it has been demonstrated that:**

- a) the current carbon dioxide emissions reduction target has been met, with at least half of this target met through the use of low or zero carbon technology.**
- b) other features are incorporated that will reduce or minimise environmental resource use and impact, for example:**
  - i. measures to promote water conservation**
  - ii. sustainable urban drainage measures that will ensure that there will be no increase in rate of surface water run-off in peak conditions or detrimental impact on the water environment. This should include green roofs on sites where measures on the ground are not practical**
  - iii. provision of facilities for the separate collection of dry recyclable waste and food waste**
  - iv. maximum use of materials from local and/or sustainable sources**
  - v. measures to support and encourage the use of sustainable transport, particularly cycling, including cycle parking and other supporting facilities such as showers.**

142. This policy applies to all development involving one or more new buildings. The purpose of this policy is to help tackle the causes and impacts of climate change, reduce resource use and moderate the impact of development on the environment.

143. Buildings account for a substantial proportion of total carbon emissions through the energy they consume. Local authorities, through their planning and building standards responsibilities have a key role in helping to meet the Scottish Government's target for nearly zero carbon homes and buildings by 2016. Scottish Building Standards set carbon dioxide emissions reduction targets. At March 2013, the Building Standards target is a 30% carbon dioxide reduction from 2007 levels. This target figure is expected to rise over the LDP period.



144. To meet criteria a), proposals for new development must accord with the current carbon dioxide emissions reduction target (as set out by Scottish Building Standards) and also demonstrate that at least half of this reduction will be met through low and zero carbon technologies. This specified requirement linked to the anticipated rising Building Standards targets meets the Council's obligations under section 3F of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

145. Low and zero carbon technologies can be renewable energy sources such as solar panels and micro-wind, heat pumps, combined heat and power and district heating infrastructure, and equipment such as mechanical ventilation and heat recovery which uses fossil fuels but results in significantly lower carbon dioxide emissions overall. Existing technologies are able to meet half of the current Building Standards target and the above policy assumes that further innovation will enable such technologies to keep pace with the target as it rises.

146. The Council will set out the up-to-date requirement in the S1 Sustainability Form which applicants are required to complete to demonstrate compliance with the above policy. Further advice is available in Council guidance.

147. Steps must be taken to ensure that the rate of surface water run-off is not increased by the development proposed. This can be achieved by the use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) which is a comprehensive design approach to the management of water on a site, to delay run-off and encourage filtration through the use of porous surfaces, detention ponds, and swales in ways which enhance amenity and biodiversity and avoid pollution effects. Where ground SUDS cannot be provided for practical reasons, then building designs to manage heavy rainfall such as green roofs should be provided. It is also important that new developments create an environment that encourages more sustainable lifestyles, for example, by including waste management facilities that support recycling targets.

### **Policy Des 7 Layout Design**

**Planning permission will be granted for development where:**

- a) a comprehensive and integrated approach to the layout of buildings, streets, footpaths, cycle paths, public and private open spaces, services and SUDS features has been taken**
- b) new streets within developments are direct and connected with other networks to ensure ease of access to local centres and public transport and new public or focal spaces are created where they will serve a purpose**
- c) the layout will encourage walking and cycling, cater for the requirements of public transport if required and incorporate design features which will restrict traffic speeds to an appropriate level and minimise potential conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motorised traffic**
- d) car and cycle parking areas and pedestrian and cycle paths are overlooked by surrounding properties**
- e) safe and convenient access and movement in and around the development will be promoted, having regard especially to the needs of people with limited mobility or special needs**
- f) public open spaces and pedestrian and cycle routes are connected with the wider pedestrian and cycle network including any off-road pedestrian and cycle routes where the opportunity exists.**

148. This policy is relevant for all new development involving one or more new buildings. The layout of development should enhance community safety and urban vitality and provide direct and convenient connections on foot and by cycle. Where new road space is required as an integral and necessary part of new development, layouts should not encourage greater car use or cause or add to congestion in the surrounding area.

### **Policy Des 8 Public Realm and Landscape Design**

**Planning permission will be granted for development where all external spaces, and features, including streets, footpaths, civic spaces, green spaces boundary treatments and public art have been designed as an integral part of the scheme as a whole, and it has been demonstrated that:**

- a) the design and the materials to be used are appropriate for their intended purpose, to the use and character of the area generally, especially where this has a special interest or importance**
- b) the different elements of paving, landscaping and street furniture are coordinated to avoid a sense of clutter, and in larger schemes design and provision will be coordinated over different phases of a development**
- c) particular consideration has been given, if appropriate, to the planting of trees to provide a setting for buildings, boundaries and road sides and create a robust landscape structure**
- d) a satisfactory scheme of maintenance will be put in place.**

149. This policy applies to all development proposing new public space as part of the overall scheme. High quality, well designed public spaces are crucial elements of the urban environment and in making successful places. The Council encourages the preparation of public realm strategies to coordinate design and provide information on future maintenance in other major development schemes.

### **Policy Des 9 Urban Edge Development**

**Planning permission will only be granted for development on sites at the green belt boundary where it:**

- a) conserves and enhances the landscape setting and special character of the city**
- b) promotes access to the surrounding countryside if appropriate**
- c) includes landscape improvement proposals that will strengthen the green belt boundary and contribute to multi-functional green networks by improving amenity and enhance biodiversity.**

150. This policy applies to all new development situated at the edge of the urban area. A clear demarcation between town and country is important to the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary and its objectives.

### **Policy Des 10 Waterside Development**

**Planning permission will only be granted for development on sites on the coastal edge or adjoining a watercourse, including the Union Canal, where the proposals:**

- a) provides an attractive frontage to the water in question**

- b) where appropriate, maintains, provides or improves public access to and along the water's edge**
- c) maintains and enhances the water quality, nature conservation or landscape interest of the water body including its margins and river valley**
- d) if appropriate, promotes recreational use of the water.**

151. This policy applies to all new development adjoining a watercourse. The city's several natural water courses add to the variety of scenery within the urban area and the city's biodiversity interest. They have considerable potential to enhance adjacent development by offering recreational value and contributing to the green network. Proposals along the Firth of Forth may also need to be assessed in terms of any impact on the internationally designated Natura 2000 site – see policy Env13.

### **Policy Des 11 Tall Buildings – Skyline and Key Views**

**Planning permission will only be granted for development which rises above the building height prevailing generally in the surrounding area where:**

- a) a landmark is to be created that enhances the skyline and surrounding townscape and is justified by the proposed use**
- b) the scale of the building is appropriate in its context**
- c) there would be no adverse impact on important views of landmark buildings, the historic skyline, landscape features in the urban area or the landscape setting of the city, including the Firth of Forth.**

152. Proposals for development that would be conspicuous in iconic views of the city will be subject to special scrutiny. This is necessary to protect some of the city's most striking visual characteristics, the views available from many vantage points within the city and beyond, of landmark buildings, the city's historic skyline, undeveloped hillsides within the urban area and the hills, open countryside and the Firth of Forth which create a unique landscape setting for the city. In addition, the height of new buildings may need to be suppressed where necessary so that the city's topography and valley features continue to be reflected in roofscapes. This policy will play an important role in protecting the setting of the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site.

153. A study undertaken for the Council identifies key public viewpoints and is used in assessing proposals for high buildings. Further advice is provided in Council guidance.

### **Policy Des 12 Alterations and Extensions**

**Planning permission will be granted for alterations and extensions to existing buildings which:**

- a) in their design and form, choice of materials and positioning are compatible with the character of the existing building**
- b) will not result in an unreasonable loss of privacy or natural light to neighbouring properties**
- c) will not be detrimental to neighbourhood amenity and character**

154. Every change to a building, street or space has the potential to enrich or, if poorly designed, impoverish a part of the public realm. The impact of a proposal on

the appearance and character of the existing building and street scene generally must be satisfactory and there should be no unreasonable loss of amenity and privacy for immediate neighbours.

### **Policy Des 13 Shopfronts**

**Planning permission will be granted for alterations to shopfronts which are improvements on what already exists and relate sensitively and harmoniously to the building as a whole. Particular care will be taken over proposals for the installation of illuminated advertising panels and projecting signs, blinds, canopies, security grills and shutters to avoid harm to the visual amenity of shopping streets or the character of historic environments.**

155. Shopfront design, shop designs and shopfront advertising play an important role in the visual environment of the city. Important traditional or original features on older buildings, such as stall risers, fascias and structural framing of entrances and shop windows, should be retained and incorporated into the design. In conservation areas and on listed buildings, design and materials used will be expected to be of a high standard, and not damaging to existing fabric of buildings or wider character. Detailed advice on shopfronts is provided in Council guidance.

### **Section 3 – CARING FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

156. Protection of the historic and natural environment for the benefit of future generations is an important role of the planning system. The purpose and context of Edinburgh's most important environmental designations including the World Heritage Site, Conservation Areas and Green Belt are explained in Part 1 of the plan. Policies Env1 – Env22 will be used in assessing planning applications to meet the following objectives;

#### **Objectives**

- To ensure that the unique qualities of the city, its historic environment and the character of its urban areas are safeguarded for the future
- To protect important landscape and natural features of the environment, including the city's Green Belt setting
- To protect and enhance the nature conservation and biodiversity interest of the city
- To protect natural resources

### **THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

157. Policies Env1 – Env6 will be used to assess proposals affecting Edinburgh's world heritage site, conservation areas and listed buildings. The Council's guidance on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings provide further advice. Policy Env7 relates to historic landscapes and policies Env8 and 9 cover archaeological resources.

#### **Policy Env 1 Old and New Towns World Heritage Site**

**Development which would harm the qualities which justified the inscription of the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh as a World Heritage Site or would have a detrimental impact on the Site's setting will not be permitted.**

158. This policy requires development to respect and protect the outstanding universal values of the World Heritage Site and its setting. Setting may include sites in the immediate vicinity, viewpoints identified in the key views study and prominent landscape features throughout the city.

#### **Policy Env 2 Listed Buildings - Demolition**

**Proposals for the total or substantial demolition of a listed building will only be supported in exceptional circumstances, taking into account:**

- a) the condition of the building and the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance and to the value to be derived from its continued use**
- b) the adequacy of efforts to retain the building in, or adapt it to, a use that will safeguard its future, including its marketing at a price reflecting its location and condition to potential restoring purchasers for a reasonable period.**
- c) the merits of alternative proposals for the site and whether the public benefits to be derived from allowing demolition outweigh the loss.**

**Policy Env 3 Listed Buildings - Setting**

**Development within the curtilage or affecting the setting of a listed building will be permitted only if not detrimental to the architectural character, appearance or historic interest of the building, or to its setting.**

**Policy Env 4 Listed Buildings – Alterations and Extensions**

**Proposals to alter or extend a listed building will be permitted where**

- a) those alterations or extensions are justified;**
- b) there will be no unnecessary damage to historic structures or diminish its interest; and**
- c) where any additions are in keeping with other parts of the building.**

159. In determining applications for planning permission or listed building consent, the Council is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. Applications for the demolition or substantial alteration of a listed building must be accompanied by a thorough structural condition report demonstrating that the proposals are necessary or justified. Information must be provided on the proposed replacement building; these should be of comparable quality in terms of construction and design. The loss of a listed building will only be justified in exceptional circumstances. Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) and Council guidance provide further advice for applications relating to Listed Buildings.

**Policy Env 5 Conservation Areas – Demolition of Buildings**

**Proposals for the demolition of an unlisted building within a conservation area but which is considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the area will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and after taking into account the considerations set out in Policy Env 2 above.**

**Proposals for the demolition of any building within a conservation area, whether listed or not, will not normally be permitted unless a detailed planning application is approved for a replacement building which enhances or preserves the character of the area or, if acceptable, for the landscaping of the site.**

**Policy Env 6 Conservation Areas - Development**

**Development within a conservation area or affecting its setting will be permitted which:**

- a) preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the conservation area and is consistent with the relevant conservation area character appraisal**
- b) preserves trees, hedges, boundary walls, railings, paving and other features which contribute positively to the character of the area and**
- c) demonstrates high standards of design and utilises materials appropriate to the historic environment.**



**Planning applications should be submitted in a sufficiently detailed form for the effect of the development proposal on the character and appearance of the area to be assessed.**

160. The purpose of the above policies is to protect and, where possible, enhance the character and appearance of Edinburgh's many conservation areas. By controlling the demolition of buildings and ensuring new development is of appropriate design and quality, their aim is to protect the City's heritage for future generations.

161. Applications for demolition will be permitted only where this does not erode the character and appearance of the conservation area. The general presumption will be in favour of retaining buildings that make a positive contribution to the conservation area, particularly where it can be demonstrated that the building is able to support a new viable use, or might be capable of such in the future. Conservation Area Consent may be subject to conditions or a legal agreement to link demolition works to the provision of the proposed replacement building or, in exceptional circumstances, to require temporary landscaping.

162. A Design Statement is required by law for all development in a conservation area. This statement should include reference to the relevant Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Council guidance on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings and show how these have informed the proposed design.

#### **Policy Env 7 Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes**

**Development will only be permitted where there is no detrimental impact on the character of a site recorded in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes, or upon component features which contribute to its value. Elsewhere, adverse effects on historic landscape features should be minimised. Restoration of Inventory sites and other historic landscape features is encouraged.**

163. This policy aims to protect sites included in the national Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes (shown on the Proposals Map) and other historic landscape features elsewhere across the Council area. An understanding of how the landscape has evolved can help inform a development proposal. A historical landscape appraisal may be requested from applicants to allow full assessment of the implications of development and identify restoration opportunities.

#### **Policy Env 8 Protection of Important Remains**

**Development will not be permitted which would:**

- a) **adversely affect a scheduled monument or other nationally important archaeological remains, or the integrity of their setting**
- b) **damage or destroy non-designated archaeological remains which the Council considers should be preserved *in situ*.**

#### **Policy Env 9 Development of Sites of Archaeological Significance**

**Planning permission will be granted for development on sites of known or suspected archaeological significance if it can be concluded from information derived from a desk-based assessment and, if requested by the Council, a field evaluation, that either:**

- a) **no significant archaeological features are likely to be affected by the development or**

- b) any significant archaeological features will be preserved in situ and, if necessary, in an appropriate setting with provision for public access and interpretation or**
- c) the benefits of allowing the proposed development outweigh the importance of preserving the remains in situ. The applicant will then be required to make provision for archaeological excavation, recording, and analysis, and publication of the results before development starts, all to be in accordance with a programme of works agreed with the Council.**

164. The objective of the above policies is to protect and enhance archaeological remains, where possible by preservation in situ in an appropriate setting. In some cases, depending on the nature of the remains and character of the site, the Council may require provision for public access and interpretation as part of the proposed development. When preservation in situ is not possible, recording and/or excavation followed by analysis and publication of the results will be required.

165. Developers should seek early advice from the Council's Archaeologist for sites where historic remains are known or thought likely to exist. Where a development may affect a scheduled monument or its setting, early contact should be made with Historic Scotland.

## **NATURAL ENVIROMENT**

166. Policies Env 10 – Env 16 will play an important role in ensuring development proposals protect and where possible enhance Edinburgh's natural heritage. Further advice can be found in Council guidance.

### **Policy Env 10 Development in the Green Belt and Countryside**

**Within the Green Belt and Countryside shown on the Proposals Map, development will only be permitted where it meets one of the following criteria and would not detract from the landscape quality and/or rural character of the area:**

- a) For the purposes of agriculture, woodland and forestry, horticulture or countryside recreation, or where a countryside location is essential and provided any buildings, structures or hard standing areas are of a scale and quality of design appropriate to the use.**
- b) For the change of use of an existing building, provided the building is of architectural merit or a valuable element in the landscape and is worthy of retention. Buildings should be of domestic scale, substantially intact and structurally capable of conversion.**
- c) For development relating to an existing use or building(s) such as an extension to a site or building, ancillary development or intensification of the use, provided the proposal is appropriate in type in terms of the existing use, of an appropriate scale, of high quality design and acceptable in terms of traffic impact.**

- d) **For the replacement of an existing building with a new building in the same use provided**
- 1) **the existing building is not listed or of architectural / historic merit;**
  - 2) **the existing building is of poor quality design and structural condition,**
  - 3) **the existing building is of domestic scale, has a lawful use and is not a temporary structure; and**
  - 4) **the new building is of a similar or smaller size to the existing one, lies within the curtilage of the existing building and is of high design quality.**

167. It is necessary to control the type and scale of development in the green belt to enable it to fulfil its important role in terms of landscape setting and countryside recreation as described in Part 1. However, the purpose of the green belt is not to prevent development from happening. This policy sets out the circumstances in which development in the green belt can be supported.

168. In Edinburgh, Countryside areas i.e. land outwith existing settlements, which are not designated green belt are considered to be of equivalent environmental importance. For this reason, it is appropriate to apply the same level of protection to both green belt and Countryside areas.

169. The key test for all proposals in the green belt and Countryside areas will be to ensure that the development does not detract from the landscape quality and/or rural character of the area. The Council's guidance "Development in the Countryside and Green Belt" provides more detailed advice.

### **Policy Env 11 Special Landscape Areas**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would have a significant adverse impact on the special character or qualities of the Special Landscape Areas shown on the Proposals Map**

170. This policy aims to protect Edinburgh's unique and diverse landscape which contributes to the city's distinctive character and scenic value. Special Landscape Areas (SLA) are local designations, which safeguard and enhance the character and quality of valued landscapes across the Council area.

171. A Statement of Importance has been prepared for each SLA and can be viewed on the Council's [website](#). This sets out the essential qualities and characteristics of the area and the potential for enhancement. The Statements of Importance should be used to guide development proposals in SLAs and will be a material consideration in assessing planning applications. A landscape and visual impact assessment is likely to be needed in support of proposals affecting a SLA.

### **Policy Env 12 Trees**

**Development will not be permitted if likely to have a damaging impact on a tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order or other tree worthy of retention unless necessary for good arboricultural reasons. Where such permission is granted, replacement planting of appropriate species and numbers will be required to offset the loss to amenity.**

172. This policy recognises the important contribution made by trees to character, biodiversity, amenity and green networks. In assessing proposals affecting trees, the Council will consider their value, taking into account status such as Tree Preservation Order, heritage tree, Ancient Woodland and Millennium Woodland, and information from tree surveys.

173. Where necessary to protect trees, the Council will use its powers to make and enforce Tree Preservation Orders.

### **Nature Conservation**

#### **Policy Env 13 Sites of International Importance**

**Development likely to have a significant effect on a “Natura 2000 site” will be permitted only if either:**

- a) the development will not adversely affect the integrity of the area; or**
- b) it has been demonstrated that:**
  - i. there are no alternative solutions and**
  - ii. there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest for permitting the development, including reasons of a social or economic nature.**

174. The Plan area covers internationally important sites known as “Natura 2000 sites”, designated under the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations 1994. These are the Firth of Forth, Forth Islands (part), and Imperial Dock Lock Special Protection Areas. Where a proposal may affect an internationally protected site, the Council will carry out a Habitats Regulation Appraisal. If it considers the proposal is likely to have a significant effect, the Council must then undertake an appropriate assessment. The appropriate assessment will consider the implications of the development for the conservation interests for which the area has been designated. Applicants will be required to provide information to inform the appropriate assessment. Development which could harm any of these internationally important areas will only be approved in exceptional circumstances.

#### **Policy Env 14 Sites of National Importance**

**Development which would affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest will only be permitted where an appraisal has demonstrated that:**

- a) the objectives of the designation and the overall integrity of the area will not be compromised or**
- b) any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance.**

175. Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are areas of land (including land covered by water) which are considered by Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) to be of special interest by reason of their natural features, i.e. their flora, fauna or geological or geomorphological features. Development which could harm an SSSI will be required to demonstrate reasons which clearly outweigh the nature conservation interest of the site and justify a departure from the national policy to protect such sites.

### **Policy Env 15 Sites of Local Importance**

**Development likely to have an adverse impact on the flora, fauna, landscape or geological features of a Local Nature Reserve or a Local Nature Conservation Site will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:**

- a) the reasons for allowing the development are sufficient to outweigh the nature conservation interest of the site**
- b) the adverse consequences of allowing the development for the value of the site have been minimised and mitigated in an acceptable manner.**

176. The purpose of this policy is to protect sites of local nature conservation value and designated Local Nature Reserves from damaging development. The network of Local Nature Conservation sites and Local Nature Reserves is shown on the Proposals Map. Many of these provide connectivity between internationally and nationally important sites and contribute to green networks. A Site Report has been prepared for each LNCS.

### **Policy Env 16 Species Protection**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development that would have an adverse impact on species protected under European or UK law, unless:**

- a) there is an overriding public need for the development and it is demonstrated that there is no alternative**
- b) a full survey has been carried out of the current status of the species and its use of the site**
- c) there would be no detriment to the maintenance of the species at “favourable conservation status”**
- d) suitable mitigation is proposed**

177. European Protected Species (EPS) are covered by the Habitats Regulations. EPS found in the Edinburgh area are bats, otters, and great crested newts. Other species-specific legislation to be taken into account includes the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 and those species listed in the Schedules of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. If the presence of an EPS or other protected species is suspected, appropriate survey work must be carried out to enable the Council to assess the likely impact of development on the species.

\* The EU Habitats Directive defines ‘favourable conservation status’ as the distribution and population of the species being at least the same as when the Directive came into force in 1994.

## **COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE**

### **Policy Env 17 Pentlands Hills Regional Park**

**Development which supports the aims of the Pentlands Hills Regional Park will be permitted provided it has no unacceptable impact on the character and landscape quality of the Park.**

178. This policy aims to ensure that proposals for outdoor recreation activities, whilst likely to be supported in principle, do not detract from the special rural character of the Regional Park. Proposals will also be assessed in terms of other relevant policies such as Env10 Green Belt and Env 11 Landscape Quality.

### **Open Space**

179. The Proposals Map shows the significant areas of open space identified in an audit of the city. The criteria in Policy Env18 will be applied to development proposals affecting all such open spaces citywide. Proposals affecting a playing field will be considered against relevant criteria in both Policy Env 18 and Policy Env 19.

#### **Policy Env 18 Open Space Protection**

**Proposals involving the loss of open space will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that:**

- a) there will be no significant impact on the quality or character of the local environment**
- b) the open space is a small part of a larger area or of limited amenity or leisure value and there is a significant over-provision of open space serving the immediate area and**
- c) the loss would not be detrimental to the wider network including its continuity or biodiversity value and either**
- d) there will be a local benefit in allowing the development in terms of either alternative equivalent provision being made or improvement to an existing public park or other open space or**
- e) the development is for a community purpose and the benefits to the local community outweigh the loss.**

180. This policy aims to protect all open spaces, both public and privately owned, that contribute to the amenity of their surroundings and the city, provide or are capable of providing for the recreational needs of residents and visitors or are an integral part of the city's landscape and townscape character and its biodiversity. The Council will only support development on open space in exceptional circumstances, where the loss would not result in detriment to the overall network and to open space provision in the locality. Such circumstances tend to exist where large areas of residential amenity space have been provided without a clear purpose or sense of ownership. The Council's Open Space Strategy sets the standards to be met for open space provision across Edinburgh and will be used to assess whether there is an over provision of open space in the immediate area (criterion b). To accord with criterion d), proposals for alternative provision or improvements to open space should normally address an identified action in the Open Space Strategy.

#### **Policy Env 19 Playing Fields Protection**

**In addition to the requirements of Policy Env 18, the loss of some or all of a playing field or sports pitch will be permitted only where one of the following circumstances applies:**

- a) The proposed development is ancillary to the principal use of the site as a playing field**
- b) The proposed development involves a minor part of a playing field and would not adversely affect the use or potential of the remainder for sport and training**
- c) An alternative playing field is to be provided of at least equivalent sporting value in a no less convenient location, or existing provision is to be significantly improved to compensate for the loss**



- d) The Council is satisfied that there is a clear excess of sports pitches to meet current and anticipated future demand in the area, and the site can be developed without detriment to the overall quality of provision.**

181. Playing field provision must be considered as a city-wide resource and in terms of its contribution to local needs. The Council's assessment of provision in the city as a whole has concluded that the amount of pitches, whether or not in public ownership or publicly accessible, is equivalent to the need. However, there needs to be significant improvements in quality. On this evaluation, the loss of pitches to development cannot be justified in principle. However, the loss might be acceptable if alternative equivalent provision is to be made in an equally convenient location. Development has been allowed where other pitches serving the local community are to be equipped with all-weather playing surfaces. The Open Space Strategy identifies the locations where such investment is to be concentrated in multi-pitch venues.

#### **Policy Env 20 Open Space in New Development**

**The Council will negotiate the provision of new publicly accessible and useable open space in new development when appropriate and justified by the scale of development proposed and the needs it will give rise to. In particular, the Council will seek the provision of extensions and/or improvements to the green network.**

182. This policy ensures that development proposals (other than housing which is covered by Policy Hou 3) include appropriate open space provision and, where the opportunity arises, contribute to Edinburgh's green network. The term "open space" covers green space and civic space.

### **PROTECTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

#### **Policy Env 21 Flood Protection**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development that would:**

- a) increase a flood risk or be at risk of flooding itself**
- b) impede the flow of flood water or deprive a river system of flood water storage within the areas shown on the Proposals Map as areas of importance for flood management**
- c) be prejudicial to existing or planned flood defence systems.**

183. This purpose of this policy is to ensure development does not result in increased flood risk for the site being developed or elsewhere. Identified areas of importance for flood management are identified on the Proposals Map. It is essential to maintain strict control over development in these areas. Proposals will only be favourably considered if accompanied by a flood risk assessment demonstrating how adequate compensating measures are to be carried out, both on and off the site. In some circumstances, sustainable flood management or mitigation measures may not be achievable.

184. Culverting of watercourses can exacerbate flood risk and have a detrimental effect on biodiversity. Any further culverting across the city will be opposed, and the removal of existing culverts will be sought when possible.

185. New development can add to flood risk if it leads to an increase in surface water run-off. It is also at risk from water flowing over land during heavy rainfall. Policy Des

6 states that these risks should be avoided by the use of sustainable drainage techniques (SUDs).

**Policy Env 22 Pollution and Air, Water and Soil Quality**

**Planning permission will only be granted for development where:**

- a) there will be no significant adverse effects for health, the environment and amenity and either**
- b) there will be no significant adverse effects on air, water or soil quality or**
- c) appropriate mitigation to minimise any adverse effects can be provided.**

186. Pollution can arise from many sources and activities including traffic and transport, domestic heating, industrial processes, agriculture, waste disposal and landfill. Air, soil and water quality can all be affected and harmed by some forms of development and land can present a potential pollution threat if it has been contaminated by previous activities. Air, noise and light pollution can also be a source of harm to health and amenity.

187. The potential risk and significance of pollution will be considered when assessing planning applications, in consultation where necessary with relevant agencies, such as Scottish Environment Protection Agency and the Health and Safety Executive. Proposals will be assessed to ensure development does not adversely affect air quality in identified Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) or, by cumulative impacts, lead to the creation of further AQMAs in the city.

## **Section 4 – EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

188. The following policies aim to help deliver the Council's Economic Strategy by promoting economic development in sustainable locations, with a particular focus on opportunities for office development and Edinburgh's "special employment areas". The policies take full account of the need to protect and enhance environmental quality and to protect a range of existing business and industrial sites and premises.

### **Objectives**

- To promote sustainable growth in jobs and investment in Edinburgh's economy
- To protect a range of existing business and industry locations of importance for a mixed and varied economy
- To maintain and enhance the diversity of jobs available in the city, paying special attention to small business needs

## **OFFICES**

### **Policy Emp 1 Office Development**

**High quality, office developments, including major developments, will be supported:**

- a) in the City Centre as identified on the Proposals Map.**
- b) in the other strategic business centres identified on the Proposals Map at Edinburgh Park/South Gyle, International Business Gateway and Leith, preferably as part of business led mixed use proposals.**
- c) at other accessible, mixed use locations in the urban area near to public transport nodes, where the scale of development must be compatible with the accessibility of the location by public transport and the character of the local environment.**

189. This policy supports a range of suitable locations for office development in recognition of the important role of the financial sector and other office based businesses in providing jobs and contributing to economic growth.

190. The city centre remains the prime location for office development, due to proximity to other office, service and transport hubs. There are a number of existing proposals with planning permission which will provide additional office space in the City Centre including the St James Quarter, Caltongate, Haymarket, Fountainbridge and the Exchange District. To meet continuing demand for office space in the city centre, major redevelopment opportunities should include significant office provision, and where possible large, flexible floor-plates as part of the overall mix of uses. A development brief may be prepared when a redevelopment opportunity arises to ensure proposals incorporate an appropriate mix of uses to support economic growth and the important shopping and leisure role of the city centre.

191. The plan identifies three other strategic office locations at Edinburgh Park/SouthGyle, the International Business Gateway (IBG) and Leith. Each is different in character but all are in accessible locations providing readily available opportunities sites for office development. In order to create an attractive place in which to invest, work and visit, proposals should incorporate a mix of uses. Proposals in the IBG should be for international businesses.

192. To meet economic growth objectives, the plan applies a flexible approach to office proposals in other mixed use locations across the city. Such proposals will be supported provided the scale of development is appropriate in terms of accessibility by public transport and the character of the area.

### **SPECIAL ECONOMIC AREAS**

193. Edinburgh has a number of “special economic areas” located across the city. These are areas of national or strategic economic importance, providing or with the potential to provide a significant number of jobs. The “special economic areas” are Edinburgh BioQuarter, Riccarton University Campus and Business Park, Edinburgh Airport, Royal Highland Centre, International Business Gateway and RBS Headquarters at Gogarburn. The growth of these areas, through new businesses and the expansion of existing businesses, will make a significant contribution towards meeting the plan’s economic development objectives. Ancillary uses are likely to be supported in these areas to meet place-making objectives, help attract investment and complement the business uses. However, other uses must not undermine the main purpose of these areas as set out in Table 2 in Part 1 Section 3 and their contribution to the economy of the city region and, in some cases, Scotland as a whole.

#### **Policy Emp 2 Edinburgh BioQuarter**

**Development within the boundary of Edinburgh BioQuarter as defined on the Proposals Map will be granted provided it accords with the approved supplementary guidance for this area and the BioQuarter Development Principles.**

194. Supplementary Guidance will be prepared to support the future development of the Edinburgh BioQuarter for Life Sciences research and directly related commercial developments. Proposals within the BioQuarter will be assessed against this guidance. Proposals will also be assessed against the BioQuarter Development Principles (Part 1 Section 5) and other relevant local plan policies, for example on matters such as design, accessibility, landscaping, biodiversity and relationship with the neighbouring green belt and the South East Wedge Parkland Green Space Proposal GS4.

#### **Policy Emp 3 Riccarton University Campus and Business Park**

**Development for the following purposes will be supported within the boundary of Riccarton University Campus and Business Park, provided proposals accord with the approved masterplan and other relevant local development plan policies.**

- 1. Academic teaching and research**
- 2. Uses ancillary to the University, including student residential accommodation and sport and recreational facilities; and**
- 3. Business uses, including the research and development of products and processes, where a functional linkage with the University’s academic activities can be demonstrated.**

195. This policy support the future development of Heriot-Watt University and expansion of the adjacent business park for research and development and other business uses which have strong links to the University's academic activities. Proposals will also be assessed against other relevant local plan policies, for example on matters such as design, accessibility, landscaping, biodiversity and relationship with the green belt.

#### **Policy Emp 4 Edinburgh Airport**

**The development and enhancement of Edinburgh Airport will be supported within the airport boundary defined on the Proposals Map, provided proposals accord with the approved masterplan. Proposals for ancillary services and facilities will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that these have strong and direct functional and locational links with the airport and are compatible with the operational requirements of the airport.**

**All development proposals within the airport boundary must accord with the West Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework (WESDF) and other relevant local development plan policies. Supporting information will be required to demonstrate how proposals will contribute to meeting the mode share targets set out in the WESDF.**

**Land to the north of the existing airport boundary is safeguarded to provide a second main parallel runway, if required in the future, to meet air passenger growth forecasts. Within this area, green belt policy will apply (policy Env 10). Proposals which would prejudice the long-term expansion of Edinburgh Airport will not be supported.**

196. The purpose of this policy is to guide proposals for airport expansion in accordance with West Edinburgh Planning Framework and the planning guidance set out in the West Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework (WESDF). The policy covers proposals for airport and related uses that require planning permission (some airport proposals are "permitted development" i.e. planning permission is not needed). Compliance with the WESDF and other relevant local plan policies will ensure airport proposals are acceptable in terms of scale and location, accessibility by public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, traffic generation and car parking and other environmental considerations.

#### **Policy Emp 5 Royal Highland Centre**

**The development and enhancement of the Royal Highland Centre (RHC) will be supported within the boundary defined on the Proposals Map, provided proposals accord with the approved masterplan. Ancillary uses will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that these are linked to the primary activities of the RHC.**

**All development proposals within the RHC boundary must accord with the West Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework (WESDF) and other relevant local plan policies. Supporting information will be required to demonstrate how proposals will contribute to meeting the mode share targets set out in the WESDF.**

**Land at Norton Park as shown on the Proposals Map is safeguarded for the future relocation of the RHC and its development as Scotland's National Showground. Within this area, green belt policy will apply (policy Env 10). Proposals which would prejudice the future development of the Norton Park site for showground purposes will not be permitted.**

197. This policy guides proposals for the further development and enhancement of the Royal Highland Centre on land to the north of the A8. Land at Norton Park to the south of the A8 is safeguarded for the longer term relocation of the RHC if required to facilitate airport expansion in accordance with the West Edinburgh Planning Framework WEPF 2008. The Norton Park site will remain in the green belt until required for the relocation of the RHC. Compliance with the WESDF and other relevant local plan policies will ensure RHC proposals are acceptable in terms of scale and location, accessibility by public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, traffic generation and car parking, landscaping, sustainable building, drainage and flood management, habitat protection and enhancement, place-making and design and impact on setting and views, including wider townscape impacts.

### **Policy Emp 6 International Business Gateway**

**Proposals for the development of an International Business Gateway (IBG) within the boundary defined on the Proposals Map will be supported. The following uses are supported in principle:**

- **International business development (*as described below*)**
- **Hotel and conference facilities;**
- **Uses ancillary to international business development, such as child nursery facilities, restaurants and health and sports clubs.**
- **Housing as a component of a business – led mixed use proposal**

**All IBG proposals must accord with the West Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework (WESDF), the IBG Development Principles and other relevant local development plan policies and be consistent with an approved master plan. Supporting information will be required to demonstrate how proposals will contribute to meeting the mode share targets set out in the WESDF.**

198. The purpose of this policy is to support the development of this nationally important economic development opportunity and ensure proposals accord with the West Edinburgh Planning Framework and WESDF. The main purpose of the IBG is to attract inward investment and create new jobs for Scotland. International business development may take various forms, including the development of global/European/UK headquarters and accommodation supporting high-value corporate functions for international organisations. Compliance with the WESDF, the IBG Development Principles (Part 1 Section 5) and other relevant local plan policies will ensure IBG proposals are acceptable in terms of scale and location, accessibility by public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, traffic generation and car parking, landscaping, sustainable building, drainage and flood management, habitat protection and enhancement, place-making and design and impact on setting and views, including wider townscape impacts.

### **Policy Emp 7 RBS Headquarters Gogarburn**

**Office and ancillary development will be supported within the boundary shown on the Proposals Map provided proposals are compatible with the existing**



**headquarters function of the site, are acceptable in terms of impact on green belt objectives and accord with other relevant local development plan policies**

199. This policy supports the future development of this site for economic development purposes, in recognition of its importance to Edinburgh's economy and financial sector in particular. Proposals will also be assessed against other relevant local plan policies, for example on matters such as design, accessibility, landscaping, biodiversity and green belt.

**OTHER BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY SITES**

200. In addition to the special economic areas, other business and industry areas and individual sites play an important role in providing jobs, investment opportunities and valued local services. The plan supports proposals for economic development purposes on all existing employment sites, subject to relevant local development plan policies. A thriving city economy needs an adequate supply of land for business and industry. The plan therefore includes policies to control the redevelopment of employment sites for other uses. Policy Emp 8 covers business and industry areas identified on the Proposals Map. Policy Emp 9 relates to sites larger than one hectare last used for employment purposes - these are not specifically identified on the Proposals Map.

**Policy Emp 8 Business and Industry Areas**

**Planning permission will be granted for business, industrial or storage development on sites identified on the Proposals Map as part of a 'Business and Industry Area'. Development, including change of use, which results in the loss of business, industrial or storage floorspace or potential will not be permitted in these areas.**

201. This policy aims to retain a range of employment sites across the city where new and existing businesses can operate, expand or relocate. It applies to land at Leith Docks, large industrial areas such as Sighthill and Newbridge and other smaller estates dispersed across the city.

202. Leith Docks is of national economic importance, identified in the National Renewables Infrastructure Plan as an opportunity for manufacturing industry to support off shore renewable energy industry. Other business and industry areas are vital to the local economy and have been designed to cater for a diversity of uses and building sizes. Most are in locations which can be easily accessed by heavy goods vehicles which use the trunk road network. Small scale proposals for ancillary uses which support local businesses and provide services for their employees may be supported as an exception to this policy.

**Policy Emp 9 Employment Sites and Premises**

**Proposals to redevelop employment sites or premises in the urban area for uses other than business, industry or storage will be permitted provided:**

- a) the introduction of non-employment uses will not prejudice or inhibit the activities of any nearby employment use;**
- b) the proposal will contribute to the comprehensive regeneration and improvement of the wider area;**

- c) and, if the site is larger than one hectare, the proposal includes floorspace designed to provide for a range of business users.**

**Planning permission will be granted for the development for employment purposes of business and industrial sites or premises in the urban area.**

203. This policy applies to sites or premises in the urban area currently or last in use for employment purposes not covered by Policies Emp2 – Emp8. It provides support for such sites to remain in employment use but recognises the potential benefits of redevelopment for other uses.

204. The policy aims to help meet the needs of small businesses by ensuring that if where large (i.e. greater than one hectare) business or industry sites are to be redeveloped for other uses, proposals must include some new small industrial/business units. The justification for this criteria lies in the Edinburgh Small Business Study, updated in 2011, which identified that businesses with fewer than 10 employees, account for around 14% of the city's employees and that the current supply of suitable premises is insufficient to meet market demand.

205. Redevelopment proposals on all employment sites, regardless of size, need to take account of impact on the activities of neighbouring businesses and any regeneration proposals for the wider area.

#### **Policy Emp 10 Hotel Development**

**Hotel development will be permitted:**

- a) in the City Centre where developments may be required to form part of mixed use schemes, if necessary to maintain city centre diversity and vitality, especially retail vitality on important shopping frontages**
- b) within the boundaries of Edinburgh Airport, the Royal Highland Centre and the International Business Gateway**
- c) in locations within the urban area with good public transport access to the city centre.**

206. Tourism is the third biggest source of employment in Edinburgh, providing jobs for over 31,000 people. Maintaining and developing this key sector in the city's economy relies upon sufficient provision of high-quality tourist accommodation. In 2006 a study looking at tourist accommodation demand and supply was commissioned by the Council and others. The study identified the particular importance of hotels to generating economic benefit from growth in tourism and satisfying the main sources of demand for accommodation. The study identified a theoretical requirement for 4,000 new hotel rooms in Edinburgh by 2015 to help meet predicted growth in demand. The city centre is the preferred location for most visitors, but accessible locations with good public transport accessibility within the urban area also offer opportunities for new hotel development.

## **Section 5 - HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

207. Edinburgh needs more housing to provide homes for an increasing population and support economic growth. More housing increases the need for community facilities such as schools, health care facilities and community centres in easily accessible locations. This plan looks beyond the amount of housing to be provided. It also aims to address issues of quality, affordability, environmental quality in existing housing areas and the housing needs of particular groups such as students, gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. Policies Hou1 – Hou 10 will be used to assess planning applications to meet the following objectives

### **Objectives**

- To meet the requirement for additional housing in Edinburgh whilst protecting environmental quality in established housing areas
- To promote more sustainable, better balanced communities
- To ensure that provision is made for necessary community facilities

### **Policy Hou 1 Housing Development**

**Housing development will be supported:**

- a) on sites allocated in this Plan to meet strategic housing requirements (HSG 19 – HSG 37)**
- b) as part of business led mixed use proposals at the International Business Gateway and Edinburgh Park/South Gyle**
- c) as part of mixed use regeneration proposals at Edinburgh Waterfront (Proposals EW 1a – EW1c and EW2a – 2d) and in the City Centre (Proposals CC2 – CC 4)**
- d) on other sites listed in Tables 3 and 4 and shown on the Proposals Map**
- e) on other suitable sites within the urban area, provided proposals are compatible with other policies in the Plan.**

**Where applicable, proposals must accord with the relevant site briefs and development principles in Part 1 Section 5 of the plan.**

208. The purpose of this policy is to provide a generous supply of housing land across a range of sites throughout the City to enable developers to build homes for existing and future residents. With the exception of the greenfield sites identified through the LDP, new housing should be provided on sites within the urban area. Information on all housing proposals is provided in Table 3 (existing housing sites) and Table 4 (new housing proposals) in Part 1 of the plan. Site briefs and development principles have been prepared for a number of proposals which provide guidance on matters such as mix of uses, public transport routes and green network.

### **Policy Hou 2 Housing Mix**

**The Council will seek the provision of a mix of house types and sizes where practical, to meet a range of housing needs, including those of families, older people and people with special needs, and having regard to the character of the surrounding area and its accessibility.**

209. It is important to achieve a good mix of dwelling types and sizes to avoid the creation of large areas of housing with similar characteristics. This approach supports more socially diverse and inclusive communities by offering a choice of housing and a range of house types to meet the needs of different population groups, from single-person households to larger and growing families.

### **Policy Hou 3 Private Green Space in Housing Development**

**Planning permission will be granted for development which makes adequate provision for green space to meet the needs of future residents.**

- a) In flatted or mixed housing/flatted developments where communal provision will be necessary, this will be based on a standard of 10 square metres per flat (excluding any units which are to be provided with private gardens). A minimum of 20% of total site area should be useable greenspace.**
- b) For housing developments with private gardens, a contribution towards the greenspace network will be negotiated if appropriate, having regard to the scale of development proposed and the opportunities of the site.**

210. This policy ensures an appropriate level of greenspace provision in new housing developments.

211. This policy applies to mainstream housing, whether flatted or otherwise. All mainstream housing should be provided with either individual private gardens or communal areas of greenspace, or a combination of both. In some sites, some of the greenspace provision should be in the form of publicly accessible space to connect with the wider network. The site briefs for the new strategic housing proposals in West and South East Edinburgh show this type of provision.

212. The Council expects most housing development to meet these greenspace requirements in full within the site. However exceptions may be justifiable if there are good reasons why this cannot happen, for example where justified by the following policy on density. The Council's Open Space Strategy sets standards for publicly-accessible large and local greenspace and play space and identifies actions to address any deficiencies or meet other needs. A proposal which does not meet the full requirements of policy Hou 3 on-site may be supported if appropriate provision or financial contribution is made to implement an identified action in the Open Space Strategy which will address a deficiency in the area.

213. The policy does not apply to housing built for occupation by particular groups such as students or the elderly. In these circumstances, provision appropriate to their particular needs will be negotiated.

### **Policy Hou 4 Housing Density**

**The Council will seek an appropriate density of development on each site having regard to:**

- a) its characteristics and those of the surrounding area**
- b) the need to create an attractive residential environment and safeguard living conditions within the development**
- c) the accessibility of the site to public transport and other relevant services**
- d) the need to encourage and support the provision of local facilities necessary to high quality urban living.**

**Higher densities will be appropriate within the City Centre and other areas where a good level of public transport accessibility exists or is to be provided. In established residential areas, proposals will not be permitted which would result in unacceptable damage to local character, environmental quality or residential amenity.**

214. The aim of this policy is to promote an appropriate density of development, taking account of site characteristics and location. There are many benefits of higher density development – it makes efficient use of urban land, helps maintain the vitality and viability of local services and encourages the effective provision of public transport. However higher densities are not always appropriate. Particular care will be taken in established residential areas to avoid inappropriate densities.

### **Policy Hou 5 Conversion to Housing**

**Planning permission will be granted for the change of use of existing buildings in non-residential use to housing, provided:**

- a) a satisfactory residential environment can be achieved**
- b) housing would be compatible with nearby uses**
- c) appropriate open space, amenity and car and cycle parking standards are met**
- d) the change of use is acceptable having regard to other policies in this plan including those that seek to safeguard or provide for important or vulnerable uses.**

215. A significant contribution to housing needs has been made over the years by the conversion of redundant commercial buildings to housing. This has included office buildings in the New Town which were originally houses, warehouses in Leith and vacant hospital and school buildings. The recycling of buildings achieves sustainability goals and provides the essential means by which the historic character of different localities can be maintained. It can help to create the high density, mixed use environments which are appropriate for central sites. It is an objective of the Plan to resist the conversion of empty shop units to residential use, and to safeguard these for shopping and small business use (see Policy Ret 9).

### **Policy Hou 6 Affordable Housing**

**Planning permission for residential development, including conversions, consisting of 12 or more units should include provision for affordable housing amounting to 25% of the total number of units proposed. For proposals of 20 or more dwellings, the provision should normally be on-site. Whenever practical, the affordable housing should be integrated with the market housing.**

216. Government policy states that where a shortage of affordable housing has been identified, this may be a material consideration for planning and should be addressed through local development plans.

217. Affordable housing is defined as housing that is available for rent or for sale to meet the needs of people who cannot afford to buy or rent the housing generally available on the open market. Affordable housing is important in ensuring that key workers can afford to live in the city as well as helping meet the needs of people on low incomes.

218. A key aim is that affordable housing should be integrated with market housing on the same site and should address the full range of housing need, including family

housing where appropriate. Provision on an alternative site may be acceptable where the housing proposal is for less than 20 units or if there are exceptional circumstances.

219. Further information on affordable housing requirements is provided in planning guidance. The details of provision, which will reflect housing need and individual site suitability, will be a matter for agreement between the developer and the Council.

#### **Policy Hou 7 Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas**

**Developments, including changes of use, which would have a materially detrimental effect on the living conditions of nearby residents will not be permitted.**

220. The intention of the policy is firstly, to preclude the introduction or intensification of non-residential uses incompatible with predominantly residential areas and secondly, to prevent any further deterioration in living conditions in more mixed use areas which nevertheless have important residential functions. This policy will be used to assess proposals for the conversion of a house or flat to a House in Multiple Occupation (i.e. for five or more people). Further advice is set out in Council Guidance

#### **Policy Hou 8 Student Accommodation**

**Planning permission will be granted for purpose-built student accommodation where:**

- a) **The location is appropriate in terms of access to public transport and university and college facilities; and**
- b) **The proposal will not result in an excessive concentration of student accommodation in any one locality**

221. It is preferable in principle that student needs are met as far as possible in purpose-built and managed schemes rather than the widespread conversion of family housing. Increasing the amount of purpose-built student accommodation assists the growth of the universities and the attractiveness of the city as a centre for Higher Education. Such housing can take place at relatively high densities and requires significantly less car parking and open space than family housing, although some provision may still be required.

222. Developments should be close to the universities and colleges and accessible by public transport. In assessing the degree of concentration of student accommodation, the Council will take into account the nature of the locality in terms of mix of land use and housing types, the existing and proposed number of students in the locality. Further advice is provided in Council guidance.

#### **Policy Hou 9 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

**The development of a site for caravans for gypsies, travellers and/or travelling showpeople will be permitted provided:**

- a) **it has been demonstrated that a site is needed in the location proposed**
- b) **the site would not detract from the character and appearance of the area**
- c) **the site would not detract from the amenity currently enjoyed by residents in the area**



**d) the site can be adequately screened and secured and provided with essential services**

**e) it has been demonstrated that the site will be properly managed.**

223. To support the provision of a site or sites in appropriate locations for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople to meet their needs and help avoid the illegal and unmanaged use of land for this purpose, or the overnight parking of vehicles on roadside verges.

#### **Policy Hou 10 Community Facilities**

**Planning permission for housing development will only be granted where there are associated proposals to provide any necessary health and other community facilities. Development involving the loss of valuable health or other community facilities will not be allowed, unless appropriate alternative provision is to be made.**

224. The intention of this policy is to ensure that new housing development goes hand in hand with the provision of a range of community facilities when this is practicable and reasonable, such as the development planned for regeneration areas. Facilities such as local doctor and dental surgeries, local shops, community halls and meeting rooms are necessary to foster community life. Equally, the Council will seek to retain facilities of proven value, if threatened by redevelopment proposals without prospect of replacement.

## **Section 6 : SHOPPING AND LEISURE**

225. This section focuses on the important role of town, local and other centres in providing shopping, entertainment, places to eat and drink and local services in accessible locations. Centres which provide a strong mix of uses and a focal point for local residents contribute to creating and maintaining sustainable communities.

### **Objectives**

- To sustain and enhance the city centre as the regional focus for shopping, entertainment, commercial leisure and tourism related activities and encourage appropriate development of the highest quality
- To maintain the existing and proposed broad distribution of centres throughout the city and sustain their vitality and viability
- To ensure that some basic convenience provision is made or retained within walking distance of all homes
- To improve the appearance, quality and attractiveness of all centres

### **NEW RETAIL DEVELOPMENT**

226. In line with national and strategic planning policy, Policies Ret 1 – Ret 5 apply a sequential approach to the identification of preferred locations for new retail development. They provide policy guidance to assist the assessment of proposals for retail development at different locations throughout the plan area - the City Centre Retail Core, town centres, commercial centres, local centres and out-of-centre locations (see Table 6 in Part 1).

227. For larger developments of 2,500 sq.m. or above, and occasionally for smaller proposals, applicants will be required to demonstrate, through a Retail Impact Assessment, that there will be no threat to the vitality and viability of the centres listed in Table 6 as indicated in the relevant policy. Town and local centres within adjoining Council areas will also be considered when assessing retail impact if they fall within the intended catchment area of a proposal.

### **City Centre Retail Core**

#### **Policy Ret 1 City Centre Retail Core**

**Planning permission for retail development in the city centre retail core will be granted having regard to the following considerations:**

- a) whether the proposal will provide high quality, commercially attractive units to a high standard of design that will strengthen the role of Edinburgh as a regional shopping centre, safeguard historic character and improve the appearance of the city centre**
- b) whether the proposal will reinforce the retail vitality of the shopping streets in the retail core**
- c) whether the proposal has paid special attention to upper floors if not to be used for retail purposes, and how these may be put to, or brought into beneficial use which will enhance city centre character**
- d) whether the proposal will help to create a safe and attractive pedestrian environment, safeguard historic character and improve the appearance of the city centre including the public realm.**

**Planning permission will be granted for retail development on sites which adjoin or can form an effective extension to the city centre retail core if it is clear that no suitable sites are available within the city centre retail core, and subject to considerations a) to d) above.**

228. This policy supports proposals for additional retailing floorspace in or adjacent to the city centre retail core. It recognises that the success of this regional shopping centre depends not just on the quantity and quality of shopping facilities but also the appearance of the shopping environment taking account of its historic character and ease of movement, by pedestrians in particular.

229. A number of non-statutory planning documents have been prepared to guide development proposals in the city centre retail core and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. These identify key issues which retail development proposals should address, for example encouraging a mix of uses on upper floors, promoting evening activity, providing flexible retail floorplates and enhancing public realm.

### **Town Centres**

#### **Policy Ret 2 Town Centres**

**Planning permission will be granted for retail development within a town centre, where it has been demonstrated that:**

- a) there will be no significant adverse effects on the vitality and viability of the city centre retail core or any other town centre**
- b) the proposal is for a development that will be integrated satisfactorily into the centre and will help to maintain a compact centre**
- c) the proposal is compatible, in terms of scale and type, with the character and function of the centre**
- d) the proposal will reinforce the retail vitality and improve the appearance, including public realm**
- e) the proposal will help to improve the accessibility of the centre for all transport modes.**

**Planning permission will be granted for retail development on sites which adjoin the boundary of a town centre or can form an effective extension to the centre, and if it is clear that no suitable sites are available within the town centre itself, and subject to considerations a) to e) above.**

230. This policy applies to the following eight town centres – Corstorphine, Gorgie/Dalry, Leith/Leith Walk, Morningside/Bruntsfield, Nicolson Street/Clerk Street, Portobello, Stockbridge and Tollcross. The boundaries of each centre is shown on the Proposals Map and will be kept under review. Boundary changes may be recommended through the preparation of supplementary guidance

231. This policy supports proposals for retail development in or adjacent to Edinburgh's eight town centres in recognition of their important role in providing shopping and services in locations well served by public transport. Development opportunities are seldom available within town centres, especially to meet the requirements of larger stores, and are more likely to arise on edge of town centre sites. Edge of centre development should benefit rather than compete with the town

centre. Such proposals will need to demonstrate how the development integrates with the existing centre in terms of appearance and pedestrian connections.

### **Commercial Centres**

#### **Policy Ret 3 Commercial Centres**

**Proposals for additional retail floorspace in a Commercial Centre (see Table 6 and Proposals Map) will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that:**

- a) the proposal will address a quantitative or qualitative deficiency within its catchment area, and will be restricted to a scale which makes good this deficiency**
- b) all potential town centre and edge of town centre options (including the city centre retail core) have been thoroughly assessed and can be discounted as unsuitable or unavailable**
- c) the proposal will not have significant adverse individual or cumulative impacts on any other town, local or commercial centre and, in particular, will not impact adversely on the strategy and objectives for enhancing the vitality and retail attractiveness of the city centre retail core**
- d) the scale, format and type of development proposed is compatible with the future role of the centre as defined in relevant planning consents and outlined in Table 7.**
- e) the proposal will assist in making the centre more accessible by public transport, walking and cycling, contribute to less car travel, and will improve the appearance and environment of the centre.**

232. Policy Ret 3 covers seven commercial centres in Edinburgh – Cameron Toll, Craighleith, Hermiston Gait, Meadowbank, Newcraighall/The Jewel (which includes Fort Kinnaird retail park and an Asda superstore) Ocean Terminal and The Gyle. The purpose of this policy is to indicate the circumstances in which additional retail floorspace in a commercial centre will be supported.

233. The plan supports and values the role of the commercial centres in providing shopping and leisure facilities. However, within a context of the economic downturn and anticipated decline in retail spending, there is not expected to be any significant gap in retail floorspace provision in the LDP period to justify expansion of any of the commercial centres.

234. The effect of this policy is to complement policies Ret 1 and Ret 2 by directing any new retail development to the city or town centres in the first instance. This approach will help support the role of the city centre and town centres and promote investor confidence in these locations.

235. Where there may be an opportunity for a centre to continue to evolve to meet the needs of the population it serves, this is indicated in Table 7 Commercial Centres.

### **Local Centres**

#### **Policy Ret 4 Local Centres**

**Planning permission for retail development in or on the edge of a local centre will be permitted provided the proposal:**

- a) can be satisfactorily integrated into the centre
- b) is compatible, in terms of scale and type, with the character and function of the centre
- c) makes a positive contribution to the shopping environment and appearance of the centre
- d) would not have a significant adverse impact on the city centre retail core or any town or local centre
- e) is easily accessible by public transport, foot and cycle.

**Proposals for non-retail development in a local centre which would have a detrimental impact on the function of the centre will not be permitted.**

236. This policy applies to the local centres listed in Table 6 in Part 1 Section 3 and in Appendix B. It supports new retailing development of an appropriate scale and type in local centres and protects local centres from development which would threaten their future existence or undermine their role. 'Edge of local centre' will only apply to sites physically adjoining the existing boundary of the centre. This policy also protects the network of existing local centres as these help contribute to the overall LDP objective relating to sustainable communities and quality of life.

### **Out-of-Centre Development**

237. New retail development should be in locations which can be easily accessed on foot, by cycle and by public transport as well as by car and preferably in close proximity to other local services and community facilities to allow linked trips. This helps explain why existing and proposed centres are the preferred locations for new retail development. Policy Ret 5 will be used to assess proposals for retail development in out-of-centre locations.

#### **Policy Ret 5 Out-of-Centre Development**

**Proposals for retail development in an out-of-centre location will only be permitted provided it has been demonstrated that:**

- a) the proposal will address a quantitative or qualitative deficiency or will meet the needs of an expanding residential or working population within its catchment area
- b) all potential sites, either within or on the edge of an identified centre (see Table 6), have been assessed and can be discounted as unsuitable or unavailable
- c) the proposal will not have a significant adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively with other developments, on the vitality and viability of any existing centre.
- d) the site is or can be made easily accessible by a choice of transport modes and will reduce the length and overall number of shopping trips made by car.

238. This policy recognises that in exceptional circumstances, there may be retail proposals that can justify an out of centre location, for example smaller units to meet the needs of a growing population or where a gap in provision can be demonstrated. Proposals for non-local provision, for example a free-standing retail warehouse which

would trade over a wide area and provide essentially for car-borne shopping, would not be acceptable in terms of this policy.

239. There are benefits in providing small scale, convenience stores (up to 250sq.m. gross floorspace) in locations easily accessible on foot or by cycle. These will complement the role of the identified centres and therefore for such proposals it is not necessary to demonstrate that there is no site suitable and available in or adjacent to an identified centre (criterion b) in Policy Ret 5). The other requirements of Policy Ret 5 do need to be satisfied. This will allow, for example, large scale housing proposals to include local shopping facilities to serve new residents. This will also help meet create more sustainable communities, one of the overall objectives of the plan.

### **ENTERTAINMENT AND LEISURE USES**

240. Policies Ret 6 and Ret 7 apply a sequential approach to the location of entertainment and leisure uses such as cinemas, theatres, restaurants, night clubs, ten pin bowling, bingo halls and soft play centres. These policies will also be applied to proposals for visitor attractions supporting Edinburgh's role as a major tourist destination and cultural centre of international importance.

241. The preferred locations for entertainment and leisure development are the City Centre (as shown on the Proposals Map), the eight nine town centres and as part of mixed use regeneration proposals at Leith Waterfront and Granton Waterfront.

#### **Policy Ret 6 Entertainment and Leisure Developments – Preferred Locations**

**Planning permission will be granted for high quality, well designed arts, leisure and entertainment facilities and visitor attractions in the City Centre, at Leith and Granton Waterfront and in a town centre, provided:**

- a) **the proposal can be integrated satisfactorily into its surroundings with attractive frontages to a high quality of design that safeguards existing character**
- b) **the proposal is compatible with surrounding uses and will not lead to a significant increase in noise, disturbance and on-street activity at unsocial hours to the detriment of living conditions for nearby residents**
- c) **the development will be easily accessible by public transport, foot and cycle.**

242. The purpose of this policy is to identify the preferred locations for entertainment and leisure development but to ensure that such proposals make a positive contribution in terms of the type of use and quality of design, are in accessible locations and do not introduce unacceptable noise and late night disturbance.

243. The City Centre has a mixed use character and provides a wide range of leisure uses, arts and cultural establishments and pubs and restaurants. Whilst recognising the importance of such uses to the local and national economy, the policy takes account of potential impact on the environment and local residents.

244. Entertainment and leisure uses will be a key component of the major regeneration proposals at Leith Waterfront and Granton Waterfront and are also appropriate in town centres, contributing to the diversity and vitality.

#### **Policy Ret 7 Entertainment and Leisure Developments – Other Locations**

**Planning permission will be granted for entertainment and leisure developments in other locations provided:**

- a) **all potential City Centre, or town centre options have been thoroughly assessed and can be discounted as unsuitable or unavailable**
- b) **the site is or will be made easily accessible by a choice of means of transport and not lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic locally**
- c) **the proposal can be integrated satisfactorily into its surroundings with attractive frontages to a high quality of design that safeguards existing character**
- d) **the proposal is compatible with surrounding uses and will not lead to a significant increase in noise, disturbance and on-street activity at unsocial hours to the detriment of living conditions for nearby residents.**

245. This policy sets out criteria for assessing proposals for entertainment and leisure developments in other locations, such as commercial centres, local centres and elsewhere in the urban area. Key considerations include accessibility by public transport, design quality and impact on the character of the area and local residents.

### **ALTERNATIVE USE OF SHOP UNITS**

#### **Policy Ret 8 Alternative Use of Shop Units in Defined Centres**

**In the City Centre Retail Core and town centres, change of use proposals which would undermine the retailing function of the centre will not be permitted. Detailed criteria for assessing proposals for the change of use of a shop unit to a non-shop use will be set out in supplementary guidance.**

**The change of use of a shop unit in a local centre to a non-shop use will be permitted provided:**

- a) **the change of use would not result in four or more consecutive non-shop uses and;**
- b) **the proposal is for an appropriate commercial, community or business use, which would complement the character of the centre and would not be detrimental to its vitality and viability.**

246. This plan aims to protect the important retailing function of defined centres but recognises the benefits of a wide range of complementary service, leisure and other community uses. The right mix of shopping and other uses will vary in the different centres and in the case of the city and town centres, in different parts of the centre. The policy applies to ground floor units only or basement/first floor units that are directly accessed from the pavement.

247. Within the City Centre Retail Core, a strong, high quality retail offer is a key aspect of sustaining and enhancing the city centre and policies are required to ensure that shopping continues to be the predominant use. However in order to achieve a diverse, thriving and welcoming city, a more flexible approach to the introduction of complementary uses that support the main shopping function and encourage use into the evening is proposed. Supplementary guidance will be prepared to guide the mix of uses in different parts of the City Centre Retail Core and set out criteria for assessing proposals for uses other than shops.



248. Previous local plans incorporated a standard approach to change of use applications in town centres based on identifying primary frontages where there should be a greater proportion of units in shop use. However, each town centre is different in terms of the current mix of uses and how well it is meeting the needs of those who live, work and shop in the surrounding area. In order to take account of these differences, this plan proposes a tailored approach for each town centre. Separate supplementary guidance will be produced to guide change of use applications in each of the nine town centres. The supplementary guidance may also recommend changes to the town centre boundaries to be included in the next Local Development Plan.

249. The policy aims to avoid areas of “dead frontage” and reduced pedestrian flow which would detract from the character and vitality of the centre by requiring that at least one unit in every four is in shop use. Beyond this requirement, the policy applies a flexible approach to change of use applications in local centres provided the use will be beneficial to the local community such as providing services, hot food or entertainment facilities. In local centres, former shop units may also be suitable for business use, providing a beneficial use for vacant properties and opportunities for small start up businesses and job creation close to where people live.

### **Policy Ret 9 Alternative Use of Shop Units in Other Locations**

**Outwith defined centres, planning applications for the change of use of a shop unit will be determined having regard to the following:**

- a) where the unit is located within a speciality shopping street (defined on the Proposals Map and in Appendix B), whether the proposal would be to the detriment of its special shopping character**
- b) where the unit is located within a predominantly commercial area, whether the proposal would be compatible with the character of the area**
- c) whether the proposal would result in the loss of premises suitable for small business use**
- d) whether there is a clear justification to retain the unit in shop use to meet local needs**
- e) where residential use is proposed, whether the development is acceptable in terms of external appearance and the standard of accommodation created.**

250. The purpose of this policy is to guide proposals for change of use involving shop units not located within defined centres.

251. Independent and specialist retailers may be found in secondary locations throughout the city. But their concentration in some streets in the Old Town and on the fringes of the City Centre has given these a distinctive shopping character and interest worthy of protection. The defined speciality shopping streets are Cockburn Street; High Street (parts) Lawnmarket and Canongate; Victoria Street and West Bow, Grassmarket; Jeffrey Street and St Mary’s Street; St Stephen Street, Stafford Street, William Street and Alva Street in the New Town. More detailed information on the frontages to which Policy Ret 9 applies is provided in Appendix B.

252. In parts of the city, mainly the City Centre and Leith, there are concentrations of commercial uses including retail, food and drink, and entertainment uses which, although not fulfilling the role of a local centre, do make a positive contribution to the vibrancy of the city. Proposals incompatible with the commercial character of such areas will be resisted.

253. Single convenience shops and parades of small shops play an important role in meeting neighbourhood shopping needs and creating a sense of community, particularly in areas not well served by the network of shopping centres. It may be necessary to resist the loss of shop units to ensure local needs, particularly for people without access to car, are met

254. The Council's Guidance for Business provides advice on relevant design and amenity considerations for the conversion of shop units to residential use.

#### **Policy Ret 10 Food and Drink Establishments**

**The change of use of a shop unit or other premises to a licensed or unlicensed restaurant, café, pub, or shop selling hot food for consumption off the premises (hot food take-away) will not be permitted:**

- a) if likely to lead to an unacceptable increase in noise, disturbance, on-street activity or anti-social behaviour to the detriment of living conditions for nearby residents or**
- b) in an area where there is considered to be an excessive concentration of such uses to the detriment of living conditions for nearby residents.**

255. The provision of food and drink establishments in areas where people live is a recognisable component of urban living. However, such uses can cause a number of problems for local residents. Particular care will be taken to prevent an excessive concentration of hot food shops, pubs and bars in areas of mixed but essentially residential character. The Council's Guidance for Businesses identifies sensitive areas in this regard namely Tollcross, Grassmarket, Nicolson/Clerk Street and Broughton Place/Picardy Place and their environs.

## **Section 7 - TRANSPORT**

256. The relationship between land uses and how people move between them is fundamental in promoting sustainable development. The policies in this section complement the Council's Local Transport Strategy.

### **Objectives**

- To minimise the distances people need to travel
- To promote and prioritise travel by sustainable means i.e. walking, cycling and by public transport.
- To minimise the detrimental effects of traffic and parking on communities and the environment
- To ensure that development does not prejudice the implementation of future road, public transport and cycle and footpath proposals.

## **TRANSPORT AND NEW DEVELOPMENT**

257. All planning applications involving the generation of person-trips should provide information on the demands that will be made on the road network and transport system. A comprehensive Transport Assessment must be submitted with planning applications for proposals generating a significant amount of travel or in particularly traffic sensitive locations. The aim of an assessment is to ensure maximum feasible sustainable transport access to a development. It should include a prediction of the number of trips likely to be made to the development and the modal split, together with details of measures to improve or maximise access by public transport, walking and cycling and minimise and deal with impacts of car journeys associated with the proposal. The Assessment should include a reference to traffic reduction and mode share targets set out in the Local Transport Strategy, the LDP Transport Appraisal and other relevant transport studies current at the time of application. Where appropriate, policy Del 1 will be used to secure developer contributions towards transport interventions necessary to mitigate the effects of development or meet sustainable travel targets.

### **Policy Tra 1 Location of Major Travel Generating Development**

**Planning permission for major development which would generate significant travel demand will be permitted on suitable sites in the City Centre. Where a non City Centre site is proposed, the suitability of a proposal will be assessed having regard to:**

- a) the accessibility of the site by modes other than the car**
- b) the contribution the proposal makes to Local Transport Strategy objectives and the effect on targets in respect of overall travel patterns and car use**
- c) impact of any travel demand generated by the new development on the existing road and public transport networks.**

**In general, applicants should demonstrate that the location proposed is suitable with regard to access by public transport, cycling and walking and that measures will be taken to mitigate any adverse effects on networks and bring accessibility by and use of non-car modes up to acceptable levels if necessary.**

258. The policy applies to major offices, retail, entertainment, sport and leisure uses and other non-residential developments which generate a large number of journeys by employees and other visitors. These developments should be accessible by a choice of means of transport which offer real alternatives to the car. For this reason, a location in the City Centre will normally be preferable. Major travel generating developments will also be encouraged to locate in the identified town centres and employment centres, provided that the scale and nature of the development is such that it can be reached conveniently by a majority of the population in its catchment area by regular and frequent public transport services or on foot.

259. Out-of-centre development will only be acceptable where it can clearly be demonstrated that the location is suitable, and that access by sustainable forms of transport and car parking provision and pricing mean that the development will be no more reliant on car use than a town centre location. This means that good public transport, walking and cycling accessibility will still need to be assured.

260. Applications should be accompanied by travel plans to demonstrate how development, particularly in out of centre locations, will meet the requirements of Policy Tra1. Travel plans should accord with Scottish Government guidance and will be monitored to assess their impact on reducing demand for car travel and maximising use of existing and new transport infrastructure. Travel plans may also be relevant when assessing residential applications in terms of Policy Hou 4 Housing Density or Policy Tra 2 Private Car Parking.

## **CAR AND CYCLE PARKING**

### **Policy Tra 2 Private Car Parking**

**Planning permission will be granted for development where proposed car parking provision complies with and does not exceed the parking levels set out in Council guidance. Lower provision will be pursued subject to consideration of the following factors:**

- a) whether, in the case of non-residential developments, the applicant has demonstrated through a travel plan that practical measures can be undertaken to significantly reduce the use of private cars to travel to and from the site**
- b) whether there will be any adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, particularly residential occupiers through on-street parking around the site and whether any adverse impacts can be mitigated through control of on-street parking**
- c) the accessibility of the site to public transport stops on routes well served by public transport, and to shops, schools and centres of employment by foot, cycle and public transport**
- d) the availability of existing off-street parking spaces that could adequately cater for the proposed development**
- e) whether the characteristics of the proposed use are such that car ownership and use by potential occupiers will be low, such as purpose-built sheltered or student housing and 'car free' or 'car reduced' housing developments and others providing car sharing arrangements**
- f) whether complementary measures can be put in place to make it more convenient for residents not to own a car, for example car sharing or pooling arrangements, including access to the city's car club scheme.**

261. The purpose of this policy is to ensure car parking provided as part of development proposals accords with the Council standards which are tailored to local circumstances, including location, public transport accessibility and economic needs, but generally fulfil the wider strategy of encouraging sustainable, non-car modes. The standards express the *maximum* amount of car parking that different types of development may provide.

262. The policy sets out the circumstances in which a lesser amount of car parking than the standards require may be appropriate to help reduce car use. This is only likely to be acceptable in locations where there are existing or planned on-street parking controls.

263. At least half the space saved by omitting or reducing car parking should be given over to landscape features and additional private open space (see Policy Hou 3), so that residents will have the amenity benefits of a car-free environment.

### **Policy Tra 3 Private Cycle Parking**

**Planning permission will be granted for development where proposed cycle parking and storage provision complies with the standards set out in Council guidance.**

264. The provision of adequate cycle parking and storage facilities is important in meeting the objective of the Local Transport Strategy to increase the proportion of journeys made by bicycle. The Council's parking standards set out the required levels of provision of cycle parking and storage facilities in housing developments and a range of non-residential developments.

### **Policy Tra 4 Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking**

**Where off –street car parking provision is required or considered to be acceptable, the following design considerations will be taken into account:**

- a) **surface car parks should not be located in front of buildings where the building would otherwise create an active frontage onto a public space or street, and main entrances to buildings should be located as close as practical to the main site entrance**
- b) **car parking should preferably be provided at basement level within a building and not at ground or street level where this would be at the expense of an active frontage onto a public street, public space or private open space**
- c) **the design of surface car parks should include structural planting to minimise visual impact**
- d) **the design of surface car parking or entrances to car parking in buildings should not compromise pedestrian safety and should assist their safe movement to and from parked cars, for example, by the provision of marked walkways.**
- e) **Space should be provided for small-scale community recycling facilities in the car parking area in appropriate development, such as large retail developments.**

**Cycle parking should be provided closer to building entrances than general car parking spaces and be designed in accordance with the standards set out in Council guidance.**

265. This policy sets out important design considerations for car and cycle parking provision including environmental quality, pedestrian safety and security. Poorly

located or designed car parking can detract from the visual appearance and vitality of the surrounding area. Car parking in front of supermarkets which widely separates entrances from main roads, is an added discouragement to public transport use and walking, and detracts from urban vitality and safety. A high standard of design for surface car parking will be sought, with landscaping to soften its visual impact, and in larger car parks the provision of marked walkways for ease of pedestrian movement and safety. New off-street car parking provides an opportunity to expand the city's network of small recycling points to complement larger community recycling centres. Provision of well located high quality cycle parking suitable to the type of development and to users is an essential component of the Council's efforts to encourage cycling.

### **Policy Tra 5 City Centre Public Parking**

**Planning permission will be granted for well-designed, short-stay, public off-street car parks at suitable locations in the City Centre to meet the needs of shoppers and leisure visitors, provided there will be no adverse effects for the historic environment.**

266. Additional purpose-built off-street car parking can be justified in the city centre, to meet the needs of shoppers and leisure visitors primarily, to boost the city centre's shopping functions and enable it to compete more effectively with other shopping centres. Off-street car parking provision is also to be preferred to the wide-spread use of streets in the city centre for parking; it is less visible and obtrusive and could enable pavements to be widened. The west and north-west edges of the city centre retail core have in particular been identified as areas where short- and medium-stay public off-street parking would be beneficial and reduce the amount of traffic circulating and seeking spaces to park. However, the location and design of built car parks in Edinburgh city centre's historic environment is challenging. New off street car parks should include provision for motorcycles and cycles.

### **Policy Tra 6 Park and Ride**

**Park and ride facilities will be permitted on sites closely related to public transport corridors and railway stations provided visual impacts can be mitigated through careful design and landscaping.**

267. Safe, convenient and secure park and ride facilities linked to efficient public transport services can help reduce congestion. Planning permission has been granted for an extension to the park and ride facilities at Hermiston. This policy sets out criteria which will be used to assess proposals for any additional new park and ride facilities. Where a green belt location can be justified to meet transport objectives, the Council will minimise any adverse effects on landscape setting through careful siting, design and landscaping.

## **TRANSPORT PROPOSALS AND SAFEGUARDS**

268. The LDP identifies a number of transport proposals and safeguards. These are shown on the Proposals Map with details set out in Table 9 in Part 1.

### **Policy Tra 7 Public Transport Proposals and Safeguards**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the implementation of the public transport proposals and safeguards listed in Table 9 and shown indicatively on the Proposals Map.**

269. To ensure that development proposals take account of committed and potential public transport proposals. These are required to reduce reliance on travel by private car and help meet climate change targets and sustainable development objectives.

### **Policy Tra 8 Cycle and Footpath Network**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would:**

- a) **prevent the implementation of proposed cycle paths/footpaths shown on the Proposals Map**
- b) **be detrimental to a path which forms part of the core paths network or prejudice the continuity of the off-road network generally**
- c) **obstruct or adversely affect a public right of way or other route with access rights unless satisfactory provision is made for its replacement**
- d) **prejudice the possible incorporation of an abandoned railway alignment into the off-road path network**

270. Encouragement of walking and cycling is at the heart of government and Council proposals to promote more sustainable travel, improve health and provide equally for people who for whatever reason do not own a car. Edinburgh has an extensive, highly attractive and, in some parts, relatively well connected off-road network based on abandoned railway alignments, paths along river banks and the canal towpath. Many of these are included in the Council's Core Paths Plan. In addition to existing well-established paths, the Core Paths Plan identifies opportunities for extensions and connections.

271. This policy ensures that development proposals do not obstruct or damage existing cycle paths and footpaths and other routes with access rights and do not prejudice the future implementation of potential additions or improvements to off-road routes across the city.

### **Policy Tra 9 New and Existing Roads**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the proposed new roads and road network improvements listed in Table 9 and shown indicatively on the Proposals Map.**

272. The Council does not generally support new road construction or road improvements aimed at increasing capacity on the road network. However in some cases roads proposals are necessary to mitigate the effects of development on the road network or to improve existing congestion levels. The details of planned new roads and improvements to the road network across the LDP area are set out in Table 9. This policy ensures that future development does not prejudice the implementation of these roads proposals.

### **Policy Tra 10 Rail Freight**

**Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the retention of viable freight transfer facilities at Seafield and Portobello.**

273. There are rail freight transfer facilities at a limited number of locations in Edinburgh: Powderhall, Portobello and in Leith Waterfront. The Powderhall facility is used only for road-to-rail waste transfer. If this use stops, the site is safeguarded for other potential waste management roles. The re-designation of Leith Docks for industrial purposes assumes that a rail-sea freight transfer capability will be retained.



Keeping a reduced general freight rail head to the east in Seafield will complement the safeguard for a waste management facility in that location (see Policy RS3). It is also prudent to retain the rail freight capability at Portobello.

### **Policy Tra 11 Edinburgh Airport Public Safety Zones**

**Development will not be permitted within the Airport Public Safety Zones, as defined on the Proposals Map. This includes new or replacement houses, mobile homes, caravan sites or other residential buildings. Depending on the circumstances of individual proposals, the following types of development may be permitted as an exception to this general policy:**

- 1. extensions and changes of use; or**
- 2. new or replacement development which would be associated with a low density of people living, working or congregating.**

**In assessing applications, the Council will take account of the detailed guidance and assessment criteria in [Circular 8/2002: Control of Development in Public Safety Zones](#).**

274. Public Safety Zones are identified at either end of Edinburgh Airport's main runway. In these zones, special development restrictions apply to control the number of people on the ground at risk of death or injury in the event of an aircraft accident on take-off or landing.

## **Section 8 - RESOURCES AND SERVICES**

275. The following policies relate to development proposals for the use of natural resources or for provision of certain services. Policies protecting natural resources are in section 2 – Caring for the Environment. The policy requiring carbon reduction measures and space for recycling in new development is in section 1 – Design Principles.

### Objectives

- To support appropriate energy generation and waste management development to help meet national targets
- To support the provision of other necessary resources and services: mineral extraction, water and drainage and telecommunications.

## **SUSTAINABLE ENERGY**

### **Policy RS 1 Sustainable Energy**

**Planning permission will be granted for development of low and zero carbon energy schemes such as small-scale wind turbine generators, solar panels and combined heat and power/district heating/energy from waste plants and biomass/woodfuel energy systems provided the proposals:**

- a) do not cause significant harm to the local environment, including natural heritage interests and the character and appearance of listed buildings and conservation areas**
- b) will not unacceptably affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers by reason of, for example, noise emission or visual dominance.**

276. This policy is intended to support developments of appropriately sited and designed freestanding wind turbines. Wind turbine proposals will be assessed for their cumulative effect on the landscape and biodiversity, taking account of other turbines approved or proposed in the surrounding area. Given the importance of protecting the landscape setting of the city, it is unlikely that wind turbines located in the green belt will accord with policy RS1.

277. Proposals to fit micro-generation equipment onto existing buildings will be assessed using the above policy and non-statutory guidance for householders.

278. Where development for energy from waste or biomass is proposed, the Council expects the opportunity for local reuse of heat energy to be explored. Where potential uses for such heat are firmly identified, the necessary connections should either be implemented or safeguarded. Such proposals will be assessed for their impact on air quality using Policy **Env 22**.

## **WASTE**

### **Policy RS 2 Safeguarding of Existing Waste Management Facilities**

**Development in the area immediately surrounding an existing or safeguarded waste management facility (as identified on the Proposals Map) will only be allowed if it is demonstrated that there will be no adverse implications for the approved waste handling operations.**

**Policy RS 3 Provision of New Waste Management Facilities**

**Planning permission for new waste management facilities will be granted:**

- a) on the existing sites safeguarded through Policy RS 2
- b) on land designated 'Business and Industry' on the Proposals Map
- c) on other suitable sites within the urban area provided there will be no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or the environment
- d) on operational or former quarries including those identified through Policy RS 5, provided the waste management operation would not sterilise the identified mineral extraction potential.

**Planning permission will be granted at Seafield (designated EW 1d on the Proposals Map) for a waste management facility incorporating thermal treatment with energy recovery. Other development proposals at Seafield will only be permitted if they do not adversely affect this waste management option.**

**Policy RS 4 Waste Disposal Sites**

**Planning permission for new landfill or land raise sites will not be granted. An exception may be made where it is demonstrated that there will be significant environmental benefits and no dis-benefits and the proposal will address an identified shortfall in landfill capacity established at the national or regional level.**

279. Policy RS 2 continues the safeguarding of the existing three Community Recycling Centres (Craigmillar, Seafield, Sighthill) and Powderhall Waste Transfer Station. It also safeguards an existing waste management site at Braehead Quarry, off Craigs Road, where there is sufficient separation from the new housing proposed in this Plan. The policy also applies to development proposals in the immediate vicinity of the safeguarded sites and is intended to ensure that such development does not introduce conflict between uses, for example in terms of noise or air quality.

280. Policy RS 3 supports the principle of new facilities at those sites. Modern waste management facilities are highly controlled and can be similar in impact to general or light industrial processes. Many waste management facilities would be appropriate in locations designated for industrial or storage and distribution uses. Accordingly, Policy RS 3 continues to support new facilities in industrial areas and introduces the scope for low impact waste management uses on suitable sites elsewhere in the urban area. These may include a fourth community recycling centre.

281. Land at Seafield (identified as EW 1d) has unique locational advantages: it is sufficiently remote from housing areas; it has the benefit of rail access; and it has an outlet in nearby regeneration and potentially industrial uses for energy recovered after thermal treatment. Accordingly, its potential as a location for energy from waste and combined heat and power uses should be retained in any development proposals.

282. Policy RS 3 identifies quarries as opportunities to locate new waste management facilities which comply with the minerals policy below. This could be done by establishing such facilities on a temporary basis or by siting and designing them in a way which does not sterilise the mineral resource or significantly constrain quarrying operations.

283. This Plan does not identify opportunities for the disposal of residual municipal waste or other forms of waste to landfill sites. It similarly opposes (through Policy RS 4) land raise operations unless there will be demonstrable benefits to the appearance of the environment and no harmful impacts and the need for additional relevant landfill capacity in the Plan area has been established at the national or regional level.

## **MINERALS**

### **Policy RS 5 Minerals**

**Planning permission will be granted for development to extract minerals from the quarries identified on the Proposals Map: Hillwood, Bonnington Mains and Ravelrig. Development which would prevent or significantly constrain the potential to extract minerals from these sites will not be allowed.**

284. It is important to protect economically viable mineral deposits from sterilisation by permanent development. The only mineral resource within the area likely to be economically viable in the Plan period is hard rock. There are three operational quarries in the LDP area - Hillwood (dormant), Bonnington Mains and Ravelrig. The above policy is intended to protect that resource, and to ensure that new development does not introduce conflict which would prejudice mineral operations.

285. The Plan area also includes deposits of coal in the west and south east and small areas of peat in the south west. Proposals for their extraction will be assessed for their environmental and traffic impact using other policies in this Plan. An additional consideration, when assessing proposals affecting peat, is its role as a carbon sink.

## **WATER SUPPLY AND DRAINAGE**

### **Policy RS 6 Water and Drainage**

**Planning permission will not be granted where there is an inadequate water supply or sewerage available to meet the demands of the development and necessary improvements cannot be provided.**

286. Scottish Water has replaced the main storage and treatment facilities in Edinburgh, at Fairmilehead and Alnwickhill, with a new facility at Glencorse in Midlothian. Further, smaller scale, enhancements of the water supply and sewerage network may be needed to serve new development. For larger developments this will be identified and delivered as described in the next section below on delivery.

## **TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

### **Policy RS 7 Telecommunications**

**Planning permission will be granted for telecommunications development provided:**


- a) the visual impact of the proposed development has been minimised through careful siting, design and, where appropriate, landscaping**
- b) it has been demonstrated that all practicable options and alternative sites have been considered, including the possibility of using existing masts, structures and buildings and/or site sharing**
- c) the proposal would not harm the built or natural heritage of the city.**

287. The provision of new telecommunications infrastructure is essential to economic competitiveness. The telecommunications industry must be enabled to expand and diversify, but this must be undertaken sensitively and imaginatively, and with minimum environmental impact. Telecommunications equipment such as antennas, mobile phone masts and base stations can have a significant visual impact in both urban and rural areas. Telecommunications operators are therefore required to demonstrate that all practicable options to minimise impact have been explored, and the best solution identified.

288. There will be a limited number of locations, including city landmarks such as Arthur's Seat and Salisbury Craigs, where the impact of an installation cannot be satisfactorily minimised, and where it will therefore be unacceptable in principle. In other locations, individual proposals may be acceptable but where there is a concentration of these uses, consideration will be given to the cumulative visual impact. Conditions will be imposed on any consent, requiring the removal of any mast or apparatus and the reinstatement of a site to its former condition when it becomes redundant.

289. Edinburgh is one of ten UK cities to receive early delivery of high speed broadband and large areas of wireless connectivity in public areas. The latter will require installation of new equipment, some of which may require planning permission or conservation area / listed building consent. These will be assessed using the above policy if appropriate and a separate non-statutory guideline on telecommunications.

## APPENDIX A CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARIES



There are currently 49 Conservation Areas

Abbeyhill Colonies	Balerno	Barnton Avenue
Blacket	Colinton	Coltbridge & Wester Coates
Corstorphine	Craiglockhart Hills	Craigmillar Park
Cramond	Currie	Dalmeny
Dalry Colonies	Dean	Duddingston
Gilmerton	Grange	Hawthornbank(North Fort St) Colonies
Hermiston	Inverleith	Juniper Green
Kirkliston	Leith	Lochend (Restalrig Park) Colonies
Marchmont, Meadows & Bruntsfield	Merchiston & Greenhill	Morningside
Morton Mains	New Town	Newhaven
Old Town	Pilrig	Plewlands
Portobello	Queensferry	Ratho
Rosebank Colonies	Shandon	Shaw's Place (Pilrig) Colonies

Slateford (Flowers) Colonies	South Side	Stockbridge Colonies
Swanston	Thistle Foundation Village	Trinity
Victoria Park	Waverley Park	West End
West Murrayfield		

## APPENDIX B – SHOPPING CENTRES

The extent of the City Centre Retail Core, town centres, local centres and speciality streets are shown on the Proposals Map. This is appendix lists the properties included within the boundaries of these shopping areas to assist in the use of the policies in Part 2 Section 6 Shopping and Leisure

### City Centre Retail Core

1-3 Alva Street 4-33 Castle St 14-16, 24 Elder Street 6a-36 Frederick Street 33a-111a George Street 2-56 Hanover Street 2-4 Hope Street 5-37 Leith Street 1-27 Multrees Walk 34a North Castle Street 10-147 Princes Street 23-46 Queensferry Street 2-204 Rose Street 31, 65-69, 87-89, 101-103 Rose Street North Lane 71, 101, 127-129 Rose Street Lane South 7-99 Shandwick Place 1-13 South Charlotte Street 8-20 South St Andrew Street 1-2, 8 St Andrew Square 1-111 St James Centre 1-19 Waterloo Place 3 Waverley Bridge 16, 28-50 West Register Street	12 Calton Road 7 Charlotte Lane 1 Elder Street Lane 3a-31 Frederick Street 30-108 George Street 3-55 Hanover Street 27 James Craig Walk 2 Melville Street 18 North Bridge 1a-3 Princes Street 1-21 Queensferry Street 12-13 Randolph Place 3-167 Rose Street 36-44, 52, 70-78, 90 Rose Street North Lane 120-122, 146-150 Rose Street Lane South 2-56 Shandwick Place 3-19 South St Andrew Street 7-21 South St David Street 30-42 St Andrew Square 3 Thistle Street South West Lane 2-14 Waterloo Place 1-9 Waverley Steps 1, 5-9, 13-19 West Register Street
---	---

### Town Centres



<b>Bruntsfield / Morningside</b>	2 Bruntsfield Avenue 103-219 Bruntsfield Place 7-23 Church Hill Place 2 Colinton Road 42 Forbes Road 1A Maxwell Street 1 Millar Crescent 33-95 Morningside Road, 4-216 Morningside Road 3 -5, 2 Viewforth	78-226 Bruntsfield Place 1 Cannan Lane 6-16 Church Hill Place 1 Falcon Road West 90 Lemington Terrace 1-3 Merchiston Place 145-265 Morningside Road 302-426 Morningside Road
----------------------------------	--	---

<b>Corstorphine</b>	5-9 Clermiston Road 1-17 Glasgow Road 2-4 Manse Road 16-30 Meadow Place Road 109-309 St John's Road	5-5A Featherhall Avenue 1-4 Gylemuir Road 1-12 Ormiston Terrace 38-160 St John's Road 3 Station Road
---------------------	---	--

<b>Gorgie/Dalry</b>	2- 8 Alexander Drive 6 – 8 Caledonian Road 15 -191 Dalry Road 87 – 345 Gorgie Road 99 Gorgie Park Road 1-3 Wardlaw Street 4 Wardlaw Street 1 Westfield Road 39 Westfield Road	4 Caledonian Place  18 -128 Dalry Road 92 – 306 Gorgie Road 340 -390 Gorgie Road 3,4 Orwell Place 8 Orwell Terrace
---------------------	---	--

<b>Leith &amp; Leith Walk</b>	1-31 Albert Place 3-5 Bangour Road 107-117 Brunswick Street 170-174 Constitution Street 1-10 Croall Place 5-7 Dalmeny Street 1-17 Duke Street 1-201 Great Junction Street 9-41 Haddington Place 2 Henderson Street  2-4 Leith Walk 1-381 Leith Walk 6 Middlefield 10 Montgomery Street 3 Pirrie Street	3 Balfour Street 1-10 Brunswick Place 88-96 Brunswick Street 2-5 Crighton Place  6 Dalmeny Street 2-22 Duke Street 1-75 Elm Row 2-174 Great Junction Street  1-5 Henderson Street 4 Jane Street  68-378 Leith Walk 4 Manderston Street 1 Montgomery Street 2-42 Newkirkgate
-------------------------------	---	---

--	--	--

<b>Nicolson Street / Clerk Street</b>	1 Chambers Street 5-85 Clerk Street 18 Hope Park Terrace 5-45 Newington Road 2-88 Newington Road 2-140 Nicolson Street 1-24 St Patrick Square 1-67 South Bridge 2-98 South Clerk Street 6-8 Salisbury Place 19-20 West Preston Street	2-66 Clerk Street 9 Hunter Square  59-115 Newington Road  1-129 Nicolson Street 1-9 St Patrick Street 78-108 South Bridge 1-75 South Clerk Street 21, 44 West Crosscauseway
---------------------------------------	---	--

<b>Portobello</b>	4-10 Bath Street 49-51 Pipe Street 62-332 Portobello High Street	3-19 Brighton Place 79-205 Portobello High Street
-------------------	--	--

<b>Stockbridge</b>	2 -10 Baker's Place 1-21 Comely Bank Road 1-6 Glanville Place 6-62 Hamilton Place 11-20 North West Circus Place 1-77 Raeburn Place 2&3 St Stephen Place 2-78 St Stephen Street	5-7 Baker's Place 2-36 Deanhaugh Street 8 Gloucester Street 9-11 Mary's Place 34-36 North West Circus Place 2-110 Raeburn Place 7-63 St Stephen Street
--------------------	---	--

<b>Tollcross</b>	1-11 Earl Grey Street 73 Fountainbridge 2 Gillespie Crescent 1-69 Home Street, 105-141 Lauriston Place 1-43 Leven Street 3, 4 Lochrin Place 125-165 Lothian Road	2-48 Earl Grey Street 48-50 East Fountainbridge 1-10 Gillespie Place 2-66 Home Street 4 -52 Lochrin Buildings 2-44 Leven Street 118-144 Lothian Road
------------------	---	--

### Local Centres

<b>Ashley Terrace</b>	30 - 36 Ashley Terrace	37 - 50 Ashley Terrace
<b>Balgreen Road</b>	472 - 480 Gorgie Road	191 - 229 Balgreen Road
<b>Blackhall</b>	5 - 1 Craigmillar Place 16 Marischal Place	1 Craigmillar Terrace 232 - 248 Queensferry Road
<b>Boswall Parkway</b>	2 - 14 Wardieburn Drive	31 - 53 Boswall Parkway
<b>Broughton Street</b>	10 - 40 Broughton Street 42 - 76 Broughton Street 2 Picardy Place 1 Forth Street 2a Broughton Place 1 - 9 East London Street	1 - 7 Barony Street 42 - 54 London Street 19 - 45 Broughton Street 49 - 87 Broughton Street 91 - 115 Broughton Street
<b>Bryce Road, Currie</b>	120 - 124 Lanark Road West	56, 60 - 62 Bryce Road
<b>Chesser</b>	536 - 560 Gorgie Road	1 Chesser Avenue
<b>Chesser Avenue</b>	1 - 9 Hutchison Terrace	1 - 11 Newmarket Road
<b>Colinton</b>	7 - 23 Bridge Road	10 - 64 Bridge Road
<b>Comiston Road</b>	2 - 34 Comiston Road 1 - 19 Comiston Road 6 - 22 Morningside Drive	36 - 42 Comiston Road 1 - 23 Morningside Drive
<b>Corslet Place, Currie</b>	13 - 17 Bryce Road	1 - 11 Corslet Place
<b>Craiglockhart</b>	2 - 4 Craiglockhart Road North	118 - 142 Colinton Road
<b>Craigmillar</b>	1 - 2 Craigmillar Castle Road 1 - 13 Niddrie Mains Road 196 - 200 Peffermill Road	3 - 9 Craigmillar Castle Road 2 - 106 Niddrie Mains Road 161 Duddingston Road West
<b>Dalkeith Road</b>	152 - 218 Dalkeith Road	
<b>Davidsons Mains</b>	36 - 38 Cramond Road South 8 - 14 Main Street 15 - 51 Main Street	51 - 55 Quality Street 44 - 80 Main Street 61 - 89 Main Street
<b>Drylaw</b>	645 - 683 Ferry Road 20 - 26 & 28 - 40 Easter Drylaw Place	
<b>Drumbrae</b>	24 - 42 Duart Crescent	
<b>Dundas Street</b>	122 - 160 Dundas Street	3-23 Henderson Row
<b>Dundee Street</b>	137 - 183 Dundee Street	
<b>East Craigs</b>	1 - 4 Bughtlin Market	
<b>Easter Road</b>	1 - 107 Easter Road 1 Maryfield - 10 Earliston Place (London Road) 3 - 28 East Norton Place (London Road) 1 - 21 Cadzow Place (London Road)	4 - 162 Easter Road
<b>Ferry Road (East)</b>	1 - 53 Ferry Road	28 - 44 Ferry Road

<b>Ferry Road (West)</b>	2 - 12 North Junction Street 109 - 147 Ferry Road 120 - 142 (excluding 122) Ferry Road 144 - 162 Ferry Road	86 - 90 Coburg Street 27 - 28 Summerside Place
<b>Forrest Road</b>	1 - 6 Greyfriars Place 4 - 32 Forrest Road	1 - 61 Forrest Road 1 - 22 Teviot Place
<b>Gilmerton</b>	1 - 13 Drum Street 8 - 38 Drum Street	27 - 55 Drum Street 2 Ferniehill Road
<b>Goldenacre</b>	1 Inverleith Gardens 1 - 2 Bowhill Terrace 1 Goldenacre Terrace	58 - 66 Inverleith Row 1 - 27 Montagu Terrace
<b>Gracemount</b>	1 - 21 Gracemount Drive 62 Captains Road	2 Gracemount Drive
<b>Hillhouse Rd/Telford Rd Jocks Lodge</b>	2 - 14 Telford Road 12 - 34 Hillhouse Road 1 - 5 Wolseley Place 1 - 18 Willowbrae Road	1 - 9 Telford Road 2 - 4 Strachan Road 1 - 7 Wolseley Terrace 23a - 29 Jocks Lodge
<b>Juniper Green</b>	574 - 606 Lanark Road 534 - 546d Lanark Road	553 - 573 Lanark Road 529 - 539 Lanark Road
<b>Liberton Brae Main Street, Balerno Main Street, Kirkliston</b>	129 - 149 Liberton Brae 6 - 48 Main Street 22 - 28, 66, 74 - 86 Main Street 1 - 5 Station Road	15 - 29 Main Street 27 - 35 Main Street
<b>Marchmont North</b>	39 - 43 Warrender Park Road 26 - 34 Warrender Park Road 48 - 60 Warrender Park Road 27a - 35 Marchmont Road 22 - 30 Marchmont Crescent 15 - 30 Argyle Place	2 - 8 Warrender Park Road 22 - 36 Marchmont Road 23 - 29 Marchmont Crescent 26 - 28 Roseneath Place 5 - 17 Roseneath Street
<b>Marchmont South</b>	94 - 110 Marchmont Road 123 - 129 Marchmont Road 2 - 4 Spottiswoode Road 20 - 21 Strathearn Road	126 - 148 Marchmont Road 1 - 5 Spottiswoode Road 92 - 104 Marchmont Crescent 2 - 10 Beaufort Road
<b>Milton Road West Moredun Park Road</b>	2 - 10 Milton Road West 70 - 92 Moredun Park Road	96 - 98 Duddingston Park 101 - 117 Moredun Park Road
<b>Muirhouse / Pennywell Oxgangs Broadway Parkhead</b>	39 - 47 Pennywell Road 1 - 15 Pennywell Court 1 - 18 Oxgangs Broadway 283 - 291 Calder Road 8 - 10 Parkhead Gardens	49 - 63 Pennywell Road 2 - 16 Pennywell Court 299 - 345 Calder Road
<b>Pentland View Court, Currie Piershill</b>	1 - 9 Pentland View Court 4 - 42 Piersfield Terrace Northfield Broadway	161 - 177 Piersfield Terrace 88 - 100 Northfield Broadway
<b>Polwarth Gardens Queensferry (Centre)</b>	1 - 7 Polwarth Gardens 2 - 14 Polwarth Crescent 1 - 52, High Street, South Queensferry (odd and even) 2 - 6 Hopetoun Road (even)	2 - 18 Polwarth Gardens 38 - 44 Merchiston Avenue 23 - 45 Hopetoun Road (odd) 5 & 7 Mid Terrace 1 Old Post Office Close (now

	15 & 19 West Terrace 12 & 14A West Terrace	part of Orocco Pier Hotel)
<b>Ratcliffe Terrace</b>	44 - 78 Ratcliffe Terrace 27 - 63 Ratcliffe Terrace	2 Fountainhall Road 1 Grange Loan
<b>Restalrig Road</b>	133 - 165 Restalrig Road	
<b>Rodney Street</b>	1 - 25 Rodney Street	2 - 54 Rodney Street
<b>Roseburn Terrace</b>	1 - 59 Roseburn Terrace	2 - 28 Roseburn Terrace
<b>Saughton Road North</b>	73 - 89 Saughton Road North	A - H 100 Saughton Road North
<b>Scotstoun Grove, Queensferry</b>	1 - 7, 9 Scotstoun Grove	
<b>Sighthill</b>	483 - 501 Calder Road	
<b>Stenhouse Cross</b>	1 - 12 Stenhouse Cross	
<b>Viewforth</b>	1 - 12 St Peters Buildings	119 - 139 Gilmore Place
<b>Walter Scott Avenue</b>	62 - 104 Walter Scott Avenue	
<b>Waterfront Broadway</b>	3 Waterfront Broadway	
<b>West Maitland Street</b>	1 - 14 West Maitland Street 1 - 3 Grosvenor Street	5 - 32 West Maitland Street
<b>Western Corner</b>	1 - 7 Western Corner 127 - 31 Corstorphine Road	113 - 125 Corstorphine Road 50 - 84 Corstorphine Road
<b>Whitehouse Road</b>	185 - 199 Whitehouse Road	
<b>Wester Hailes</b>	1 & 2 Westside Plaza 3 - 34 & 36 Wester Hailes Centre (odd and even)	
<b>Proposed new Local Centres:</b>	Fountainbridge Western Harbour	Granton Waterfront Brunstane

### Speciality Shopping Streets

<b>Cockburn Street</b>	11 - 71 Cockburn Street	2 - 54 Cockburn Street
<b>Grassmarket</b>	1 - 9 Grassmarket 8 - 98 Grassmarket 1 - 13 Cowgatehead	15 - 29 Grassmarket 65 - 89 Grassmarket
<b>High Street/ Lawnmarket/ Canongate</b>	94 - 112 Canongate 154 - 172 Canongate 246 - 278 Canongate 1 - 137 High Street 124 - 180 High Street 351 - 381 High Street 322 - 346 Lawnmarket	97 - 145 Canongate 175 - 223 Canongate 259 - 299 Canongate 2 - 60 High Street 205 - 219 High Street 435 - 521 Lawnmarket
<b>Jeffery Street/ St Mary's Street</b>	1 - 37 Jeffery Street 2 - 68 St Mary's Street	2 - 16 Jeffery Street
<b>Victoria Street/ West Bow</b>	1 - 9 Victoria Street 80 - 118 West Bow	8 - 46 Victoria Street 87 - 105 West Bow
<b>William Street/</b>	3 - 31 William Street	33 - 51 William Street

**Stafford Street/  
Alva Street**

2 - 26 William Street  
14 - 18 Stafford Street  
34 - 36 Alva Street

28 - 38 William Street  
11 - 15 Stafford Street

## **APPENDIX C GLOSSARY**

### **ACTIVE FRONTAGE**

Ground floor building frontage designed to allow people to see and walk inside and out.

### **AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

Housing that is for sale or rent, to meet the identified needs of people who cannot afford to buy or rent housing generally available on the open market.

### **AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREAS**

Designated parts of the city where the Council considers that air quality objectives are unlikely to be achieved

### **BIODIVERSITY**

The variety of life on earth, both plant and animal species, commonplace and rare, and the habitats in which they are found.

### **BIODIVERSITY DUTY**

A duty placed upon every public sector body and office-holder to further the conservation of biodiversity in line with the Scottish Biodiversity Strategy. [Introduced by the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004]

### **BROWNFIELD**

Land which has been previously developed. The term includes derelict land and land occupied by redundant buildings.

### **BULKY GOODS**

Goods of such a size that they could not normally be transported by customers traveling by foot, cycle or bus and therefore need to be carried away by car or delivered to customers, and which require large areas to display them.

### **BUSINESS USE**

Class 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Scotland) Order 1997 which includes general office, light industry or research and development which can be carried out without detriment to the amenity of any residential area.

### **COMMERCIAL CENTRES**

Centres of strategic importance which have a more specific focus on shopping or shopping/leisure uses and do not have the diverse mix of uses found in town centres.

### **COMMUNITY**

The term community includes individuals and groups, and can be based on location (for example people who live in, work in or use an area) or common interest (for example businesses, sports or heritage groups)

### **CONSERVATION AREA**

An area designated under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as being of special architectural or historic interest, the character and interest of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.

### **CORE PATHS**

Under the terms of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003, the Council has prepared a plan for a system of 'core paths' to give people reasonable access throughout their area for walking, cycling, horse riding and to inland water.



**COUNCIL GUIDANCE**

Guidance (other than that which is supplementary guidance), prepared, consulted on and approved by the Council on a range of planning matters. Council guidance will be a material consideration in determining planning applications.

**COUNTRYSIDE**

References to the “Countryside” (with a capital letter) relate specifically to the “Countryside Policy Area” shown on the Proposals Map. References to “countryside” relate to open land in the rural area and may include both “green belt” and “Countryside Policy Area”

**COUNTRYSIDE RECREATION**

Passive or active outdoor recreational pursuits or land uses. This may involve very limited buildings, which do not, of themselves, disrupt the peace and tranquility of the countryside (or neighbouring urban area) or threaten the character and amenity of the landscape and its enjoyment by others.

**DENSITY**

The floorspace or number of dwellings in a development divided by its land area.

**DEVELOPMENT BRIEF**

A document approved by the Council providing guidance on how a specific site of significant size or sensitivity should be developed in line with the relevant planning and design policies. It will usually contain some indicative vision of future development form.

**EFFECTIVE HOUSING LAND SUPPLY**

Land identified for housing which is free or expected to be free of development constraints in the period up to 2024 and will therefore be available for the construction of housing.

**EMPLOYMENT USE**

Generally businesses, general industry or storage and distribution uses, each defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)(Scotland) Order 1997.

**EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION**

A treaty which promotes the protection, management and planning of European landscapes and organises European co-operation on landscape issues.

**GREEN BELT**

Land defined in adopted local plans or local development plans which protects and enhances the landscape setting and identity of Edinburgh and protects and gives access to open space around the city and smaller settlements.

**GREENFIELD**

Land which has not previously been developed, or fully-restored formerly derelict land which has been brought back into active or beneficial use for agriculture, forestry, environmental purposes, or outdoor recreation.

**GREEN NETWORK**

The linking together of natural, semi-natural and man-made open spaces to create an interconnected network, that provides recreational opportunities, improves accessibility and enhances biodiversity and the character of the landscape and townscape.

**GREENSPACE**

Any vegetated land or structure, water or geological feature in the urban area including playing fields, grassed areas, trees, woodlands and paths

**HOUSING IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO)**

The term 'house in multiple occupancy' in relation to houses, means accommodation which is the only or principal residence of more than five unrelated people. This approach also applies, in general, to flatted accommodation, although in smaller properties, proposals involving more than four unrelated people living together may be considered to constitute a HMO.

**HOUSING LAND AUDIT**

Assessment of housing land across The City of Edinburgh Council, East Lothian, Midlothian and West Lothian as at 31 March each year. It is undertaken jointly by the four Councils in consultation with housing providers.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

Physical networks which serve development such as roads, paths, street lighting, supplies of water, gas, electricity and waste water drainage and services for occupants of developments such as public transport measures, schools and healthcare.

**LIFE SCIENCES**

The scientific study of living things – plants, animals and humans

**LISTED BUILDING**

A building identified by Historic Scotland as being of special architectural or historical interest as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. Categorized A, B, C(s) to reflect their relative importance.

**LOCAL NATURE RESERVES**

Area of nature conservation interest with value for education and informal enjoyment designated by a local authority under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act (1949) as amended.

**LOCAL NATURE CONSERVATION SITES**

Sites considered by the Council to be of local importance for wildlife or for their geological or geomorphological interest, usually following consultation with local voluntary nature conservation organisations, and therefore worthy of a measure of protection in this local plan.

**LOCAL CENTRE**

For the purposes of this Plan a local centre is a shopping centre, usually of 10 units or greater, serving a local retail function. The local centres are listed in Table 6. In some instances, centres of less than 10 units have been included in order to provide a local centre within 15 minutes walk of residents where possible.

**LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY**

Document prepared by the Council setting out its transport objectives and an implementation programme.

**LOW AND ZERO CARBON TECHNOLOGY**

Equipment provided on-site or integrated into buildings and which use solely renewable sources, resulting in zero carbon dioxide emissions, or which include use

of fossil fuels but with significantly lower carbon dioxide emissions overall, which may include combined heat and power (CHP) and/or a range of other methods.

### **MAJOR OFFICE DEVELOPMENT**

Proposals for office development exceeding 1,000 sq.m. gross floorspace, and those proposals of less than 1,000 sq.m., which could be linked to existing or proposed developments on adjacent sites, to create combined developments which together exceed 1,000 sq.m..

### **MASTER PLAN**

A detailed document that explains how a site or sites will be developed, usually prepared by or on behalf of the landowner, including a representation of the three-dimensional form of proposals and an implementation programme.

### **MATERIAL CONSIDERATION**

Any consideration relevant to the use and development of land taken into account when determining a planning application.

### **MODE SHARE TARGET**

The percentage of journeys made by different types of transport.

### **NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK (NPF)**

NPF is the Scottish Government's statutory strategy for Scotland's long term spatial development.

### **NATIONAL RENEWABLES INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (N-RIP)**

A document prepared by Scottish Enterprise and Highlands and Islands Enterprise to assist the development of a globally competitive off-shore renewables industry in Scotland through the creation of infrastructure to support large scale manufacturing, assembly, deployment and operations, and maintenance of offshore renewable energy devices.

### **NATURA 2000**

Sites selected by the European Commission for designation as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) under the Habitats Directive or classified as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) under the Wild Birds Directive are referred to collectively in the Regulations as European sites. The network of sites across the European Community is known as Natura 2000.

### **NON-SHOP USES**

Defined as uses not covered by Class 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Scotland) Order 1997.

### **OPEN SPACE**

Includes 'greenspace' (see definition) and 'civic space' consisting of squares, market places and other paved or hard landscaped areas with a civic function.

### **PLACEMAKING**

This is the process of creating better places, places that people enjoy being in. It is achieved through developers, public sector agencies and local communities working together.

### **PLANNING ADVICE NOTES (PAN)**

A series of documents, produced by the Scottish Government, to provide advice and information on technical planning matters.

**PLANNING CONDITIONS**

Conditions attached to a planning permission that are enforced through planning legislation.

**PUBLIC REALM**

The parts of the city (whether publicly or privately owned) that are available for everyone to see and use without charge 24 hours a day, including streets, squares and parks.

**PUBLIC TRANSPORT NODE**

A point of interchange on the public transport network.

**RENEWABLE ENERGY**

Natural energy from sources which will never run out such as sunlight, wind, rain, tides, waves and geothermal heat.

**SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENTS**

Section 1 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979 requires the Secretary of State for Scotland to maintain a schedule of monuments of national importance and to publish from time to time a list of such monuments (referred to as Scheduled Monuments). This responsibility passed to Scottish Ministers on 1 July 1999.

**SCOTLAND'S LANDSCAPE CHARTER**

A voluntary charter which encourages action from all sectors of society to fulfil its vision that, within a generation, we can be proud of all our landscapes.

**SCOTTISH GEODIVERSITY CHARTER**

A voluntary charter which encourages signatories, including the City of Edinburgh Council, to raise awareness of geodiversity and integrate it into policy and decision-making.

**SCOTTISH PLANNING POLICY (SPP)**

SPP is the statement of the Scottish Government's policy on nationally important land use matters.

**SHOP UNIT**

Premises accessed directly from the street and designed primarily for shop use.

**SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST (SSSI)**

Areas of land or water that are of special interest by reason of their flora, fauna or geological or physiographical features. Designated by SNH under the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and in accordance with specific guidelines to protect the special interest of the site from damage or deterioration.

**SOUTH-EAST WEDGE**

The South-East Wedge refers to the area to the south of the existing built-up areas of Craigmillar and Niddrie, east of Little France, and north and east of Danderhall. It includes parts of the City of Edinburgh and Midlothian Council areas.

**SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS**

An area designated by a local authority in development plans as being of special landscape character requiring special protection against inappropriate forms of development.

#### **SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA (SPA)**

An area of international importance for rare, threatened or migratory species of birds. Proposed developments must be considered against the risk to the ecological integrity of the site under the terms of EU Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds (commonly known as the Birds Directive).

#### **STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

In Scotland's four city regions, Strategic Development Plans provide a long term vision, a spatial strategy and strategic policies and proposals, setting clear parameters for Local Development Plans.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE**

Guidance prepared, consulted on and adopted by the Planning Authority to deal with further information or detail in respect of particular LDP issues. Supplementary guidance must be expressly identified in the LDP and be submitted to Scottish Ministers. Once adopted, supplementary guidance forms part of the development plan.

#### **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

Development which aims to minimise the impact of human activity on the environment as a whole, whilst supporting economic and social progress.

#### **SUSTAINABLE URBAN DRAINAGE**

A comprehensive approach to surface water management which aims through a combination of design measures to minimise the quantity and improve the quality of water before it is discharged from a development site so as to help prevent flooding and pollution.

#### **TOWN CENTRE**

Centres that provide a diverse and sustainable mix of activities and land uses which create an identity that signals the function and wider role.

#### **TOWNSCAPE**

The urban equivalent of landscape; for example, the appearance of streets.

#### **TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT**

Transport Assessment concerns person trips, not car trips. It is a comprehensive assessment that should enable all the potential transport impacts of a proposed development or redevelopment to be fully understood. The objective should be to encourage sustainable travel in relation to the transport mode hierarchy. The assessment should be presented in clear language so that lay people can understand the implications.

#### **TRAVEL PLAN**

Tool for an organisation to manage its transport needs to encourage safe, healthy and sustainable travel options. It is site based, reflecting the different needs and problems of different locations. The principal objective of a plan is typically to minimise car use associated with a development.

#### **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (TPO)**

Made by a local authority under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 to protect trees of importance for amenity.

**URBAN AREA**

The built up parts of the Council area i.e. the city and smaller settlements. The urban area is shown on the Proposals Map as those parts of the Council area not covered by green belt or countryside policy area designations.

**URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK**

Urban design frameworks show how planning and design policies should be implemented, and what principles should be followed by developers and their designers. They may be used to co-ordinate more detailed master plans and are likely to be prepared for any area where the likelihood of significant change calls for co-ordinated action.

**VITALITY AND VIABILITY (OF TOWN CENTRES)**

Vitality is a measure of how lively and busy a town centre is. Viability is a measure of its capacity to attract ongoing investment, for maintenance, improvement and adaptation to changing needs.

**WASTE/WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Includes any substance that constitutes a scrap material or an effluent or other unwanted surplus substance arising from the application of any process; and any substance or article that requires to be disposed of as being broken, worn out, contaminated or otherwise spoiled (but does not include explosives).

**WINDFALL**

A site which becomes available for development during the plan period which was not anticipated when the plan was being prepared

**WORLD HERITAGE SITE**

A cultural or natural site considered by UNESCO World Heritage Committee to be of 'outstanding universal value' and therefore one that needs to be preserved as part of the world heritage of humankind. The historic core of Edinburgh, essentially the Old and New Town, was inscribed in 1995.

Planning Committee

12 June 2014

**Appendix 2 Changes to Local Development Plan (LDP)**

**The Second Proposed Plan includes the following changes from the first Proposed Plan published in May 2013. Minor editing changes are not listed.**

**\* Refers to paragraph number in the Second Proposed Plan (paragraph number in first Proposed Plan if different)**

**Introduction**

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Para 8	Insert “and its Supplementary Guidance on Housing Land” after SDP	To be consistent with the approved SDP.
Text Box	Amend text and chart to update SDP context and LDP process	To take account of changes in the SDP since the Proposed Plan prepared and provide updated information on the LDP process

**Part 1 Section 1 - Aims and Strategy**

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Para 11	Shorten Aim 2 on housing and Aim 3 on transport	More concise wording
Para 11	Add “healthier” to Aim 5	In recognition of the role that planning can play in helping to meet health objectives.
Figure 1	Replace Spatial Strategy Summary Map with revised version	To show the additional housing proposals included in the Second Proposed Plan and some other minor changes in interests of accuracy and clarity.
Paras 14 - 16 (para 14)	Delete para 14 and replace with the following three paragraphs; 14. Edinburgh is a successful and growing city. The LDP strategy directs future growth to four Strategic Development Areas – major redevelopment opportunities in the <b>City Centre</b> , continuing regeneration at <b>Edinburgh Waterfront</b> , urban expansion with new tram and rail infrastructure at <b>West Edinburgh</b> and housing and business development on a range of sites in <b>South East Edinburgh</b> . In addition to new greenfield housing allocations in West Edinburgh and South East Edinburgh Strategic Development Areas, new sites have also been identified at Queensferry, Currie	To explain the spatial strategy of the Second Proposed Plan.



	<p>and Balerno.</p> <p>15. The plan continues to promote the reuse of previously developed land and relies on windfall sites to contribute to meet the city's housing requirement. Potential large scale regeneration opportunities are shown on Figure 1. These are supported by the LDP's policies and some have masterplans or development briefs to guide their development. Prior to identifying additional greenfield housing sites, consideration has been given to potential new brownfield opportunities within the existing urban area. The LDP maintains a green belt around Edinburgh whilst ensuring the strategic growth requirements of the SDP can be accommodated. Key elements of the Green Belt controlling the outward growth of the city are identified on Figure 1.</p> <p>16. The LDP strategy directs new housing to sites which best meet a range of assessment criteria including landscape impact, green belt boundaries, accessibility to public transport and infrastructure capacity. One of the new housing sites (at Brunstane) will result in further coalescence between Edinburgh and Musselburgh. Whilst development resulting in the coalescence of settlements is not normally supported, it is justified in this instance because this site compared favourably to other possible options in the housing site assessment - see Volume 2 of the Revised Environmental Report.</p>	
--	---	--

**Part 1 Section 2 - A Plan to Protect and Enhance the Environment**

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Para 28 (para 26)	Add the following sentence "An ongoing review of conservation areas will consider amendments to boundaries, opportunities for enhancement, and the designation of new conservation areas."	To explain that changes affecting conservation areas may be made during the plan period.
Para 35 (para 33)	Delete bullet point 2 and replace with: sites at Queensferry, Currie and Balerno also	Further changes to the green belt are required to meet

	to meet SDP strategic housing requirements	SDP housing requirements. Major housing development on green belt sites is no longer limited to West and South East Edinburgh.
Para 43 (para 41)	<p>Replace “water quality” with “ecological quality” in first sentence.</p> <p>Add new third sentence and amend start of following sentence: “The Council, with others, has a responsibility to reduce overall flood risk. It has completed...”</p> <p>Delete “indicative” before “flood map” in 2<sup>nd</sup> last sentence.</p>	<p>To reflect the full scope of the River Basin Management Plan.</p> <p>To reflect the Council’s responsibilities under the relevant flood risk management legislation.</p> <p>SEPA has recently published new flood maps for Scotland.</p>
Para 52 (para 50)	Delete first sentence and replace with: “Development on greenfield housing sites provides opportunities to extend existing green corridors into the wider countryside.”	There are now new green network opportunities beyond West and South East Edinburgh
Para 54 (para 52)	Replace “10” with “11”.	An additional greenspace proposal has been included.
Figure 5	Show indicatively GS11 proposal at Balerno and amend key and shading .	To include reference to new greenspace proposal and to make clearer.
Table 1	<p>Add the following proposal:</p> <p><b>Reference:</b> GS11  <b>Name :</b> Newmills Park  <b>Proposal:</b> New linear park</p> <p>Proposal to create a new linear park in conjunction with housing development on adjacent site (Proposal HSG 37). It should be landscaped and maintained to meet the Council's large greenspace standard.</p>	The Second Proposed Plan includes a new greenspace proposal at Balerno.

### Part 1 Section 3 - A Plan to provide Jobs, Homes, Services

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Table 2 Purpose Column	<p>Edinburgh Bioquarter – amend text to read “The Edinburgh BioQuarter (EBQ) aims to become a top 10 global centre of excellence for life sciences offering opportunities for academic, commercial and clinical research and development with health care, teaching facilities and appropriate support services and facilities focused on the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary.”</p> <p>Riccarton – add reference to National</p>	<p>To reflect wording in supplementary guidance.</p> <p>To reflect recent decision to locate this national facility at</p>

Appendix 2 – Changes to LDP

	<p>Performance Centre for Sport.</p> <p>Royal Highland Centre – some minor changes to description of uses.</p>	<p>Riccarton.</p> <p>To provide consistency with approved Master Plan.</p>
Para 62 -65 (paras 60 - 63)	Delete and replace with new text on how the LDP meets its housing requirement.	The approved SDP and its Supplementary Guidance have significantly increased the amount of housing land to be allocated in the LDP.
Figure 7	Delete and replace with new Figure 7	To help illustrate how the LDP is meeting its housing requirement.
Para 67 (para 65)	Delete and replace with new text summarising the housing proposals included in the Second Proposed Plan.	The Second Proposed Plan includes a number of additional housing sites.
Table 3	<p>Amend site capacities to reflect figures from 2013 Housing Land Audit</p> <p>Proposal HSG 11 – add reference to other uses</p>	<p>To provide updated information in relation to the existing housing proposals.</p> <p>To provide a more accurate description of proposals for this site.</p>
Table 4	<p>Amend site capacities to reflect figures from 2013 Housing Land Audit</p> <p>Add new proposals</p> <p>HSG28 Ellen's Glen, HSG 29 Brunstane, HSG32 Builyleon Road, HSG33 South Scotstoun, HSG34 Dalmeny, HSG36 Currehill Road and HSG37 Newmills Road.</p> <p>HSG28 Riccarton Mains Road is now HSG35 Riccarton Mains Road</p> <p>HSG29 Curriemuirend is now HSG31 Curriemuirend</p>	<p>Additional housing sites must be identified to meet the requirements of the SDP and its Supplementary Guidance. These have been identified through further assessment work which has also resulted in some minor changes to some sites included in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>Two HSG reference numbers have been changed to accommodate the new sites.</p>
New para 72	<p>Insert new paragraph on health facilities</p> <p>“Anticipated population growth in Edinburgh and the housing proposals identified in Tables 3 and 4 will have implications for the provision of primary care and other community health services. The Council and NHS Lothian will work in partnership to identify actions to adjust existing health care facilities and services to meet the future needs of Edinburgh’s population. This could mean services being provided in a different way or the provision of new facilities.”</p>	<p>In response to representations expressing concern about the impact of development on the capacity of health facilities.</p>
Table 5	Amend to include two additional school proposals – one at Brunstane and one at Queensferry.	The revised LDP Education appraisal has identified the need for two new schools in conjunction with additional housing proposals.

Figure 8	Amend to show additional proposed new local centre at Brustane	New local centre required as part of a new housing proposal.
Table 6	Add additional centre “Brunstane”	New local centre required as part of a new housing proposal.
Para 75 (para 72)	Delete 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence and replace with “Growth in consumer spending has slowed and although the outlook is less bleak than predicted a few years ago, increases in spending over the next 5 years are likely to be limited.	Predictions for retail spending have changed in response to improving economic conditions.
Para 77 (para 74)	Delete para 74 and replace with “Policies will continue to direct new development to existing centres, with town centres being given priority over commercial centres. There is not expected to be sufficient growth in retail spending over the next five years to support further expansion of commercial centres (over and above that which already has planning permission), whilst also sustaining the existing network of town and local centres. Despite recent economic improvements and some increase in retail spending, the view of retail analysts is that the rate of spending growth will be well below that experienced in recent decades and largely offset by factors such as more efficient use of sales space and the continued increase in internet shopping. Justification for any net increase in retail provision in Edinburgh is expected to come mainly from population growth. However, there may also be opportunities to improve the quality of shopping and leisure facilities, including changes to layout of the centre and unit sizes. Table 7 takes account of these considerations and provides information on each of the commercial centres, including its characteristics, current expansion proposals and anticipated future role.”	Predictions for retail spending have changed in response to improving economic conditions
Table 7	Newcraighall/The Jewel Amend text to add reference to proposed cinema and revise wording in relation to public transport and retail floorspace	To provide a more accurate description of this centre.
Table 8	Add new shopping proposal S5 - a new local centre at Brunstane.	New local centre required as part of a new housing proposal.
Figure 9	Insert new Figure 9 Transport Overview Map	This should have been included in the published version of the original Proposed Plan.

**Part 1 Section 4 - A Plan that can Deliver**

No changes

**Part 1 Section 5 - A Plan for All Parts of the City**

<b>Reference*</b>	<b>Changes</b>	<b>Reason for Changes</b>
<b>City Centre</b>		
Para 104 (Para 101)	Delete “considering its impact on local residents” and replace with “making it an attractive place to live”	To recognise the residential role of the city centre.
Para 106 (para 103)	Amend wording to remove reference to planned improvements to Waverley and Haymarket stations and include anticipated redevelopment opportunities at Haymarket, West Port/King’s Stables and Dewar Place. Insert sentence to explain the information shown on Figure 12.	The station improvements are now complete. To highlight major redevelopment opportunities in the city centre  To provide clarification.
Figure 12	Amend to show St James Quarter as part of City Centre Retail Core, include Dewar Place and reduce extent of Haymarket “bubble”.	To correct a drafting error, highlight Dewar Place as an additional redevelopment opportunity and remove the Haymarket Station area as redevelopment is complete.
Proposal CC2	Amend Development Principles diagram to extend commercial-led mixed use shading across Jeffrey Street Arches and West Cranston Street. Minor amendments to text.	To make consistent with extent of the proposal on Figure 12 and Proposals Map and reflect the recently approved application.
<b>Edinburgh Waterfront</b>		
Proposal EW2c	Amend Development Principles diagram to reflect recent permission and realign the footpath.  Amend reference to Forth Ports Ltd.	To provide the current position regarding development intentions for this site.  To use the correct name of the organisation.
<b>West Edinburgh</b>		
Figure 14	Amend West Edinburgh Overview Map to include RBS Gogarburn.	In recognition of its status as a special economic area.
Maybury and Cammo Site Brief	Delete “Later phases of development in the western part of the site are not anticipated to come forward until after 2025.” from 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point	The whole site can come forward in the period up to 2024.
Maybury and Cammo Site Brief	Additional bullet point for Maybury site: “The entirety of Craigs Road should be widened on the southern edge to facilitate all vehicle movements.”	To ensure appropriate access to the site
Maybury and Cammo Site	Additional bullet point for Cammo site “Opportunity to change the character of	To ensure future proposals for the site fully address

Brief	Maybury Road, through street design to enable and improve path connections across Maybury Road and create residential frontage with reduced speed limit.”	issues relating to the existing main road and opportunities it provides.
Edinburgh Park/South Gyle	On Development Principles Diagram, amend first point in key to read “housing-led mixed use redevelopment”	To clarify the intentions for this part of the site.
<b>South East Edinburgh</b>		
Para 117 (para 114)	Amend to include reference to housing proposals at Ellen’s Glen Road, Moredunvale and Brunstane.	To update text to cover all new housing proposals in South East Edinburgh.
Figure 15	Amend South East Edinburgh Overview Map to include extend of Brunstane housing proposal.	To update map to cover all new housing proposals in South East Edinburgh.
Moredunvale	Move to South East Edinburgh section and amend Diagram	To show the proposals more clearly.
Newcraighall Site Brief	Change name to “Newcraighall and Brunstane Site Brief” Amend description to include Brunstane proposals. Insert revised map which includes Brunstane site Inset Brunstane Development Principles	To include essential development principles for the new housing site at Brunstane.
Newcraighall Site Brief	Insert the following clause in the 4 <sup>th</sup> development principle for HSG27 Newcraighall East “the extending grassland habitat with the opportunity for connections outwith the Council area.”	To provide more detailed advice on the potential green network opportunity relating to development on this site.
New Site Briefs	Add new site brief for Ellen’s Glen Road	To set out essential development principles for this new housing site
Edinburgh Bioquarter Development Principles	Amend 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence of bullet point 2 to read :  Supporting uses are appropriate to promote place making and provide local services and evening and weekend activity.	To better describe the other uses appropriate in the Bioquarter.
<b>Elsewhere Across the LDP Area</b>		
Paras 119 - 120 (Paras 115 – 116)	Delete and replace with revised text summarising what the LDP’s strategy, policies and proposals mean for other parts of Edinburgh.	In order to ensure consistency with the SDP, the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Proposed Plan promotes major change in parts of the city not located in a Strategic Development Area.
Curriemuirend	Amend Diagram.	To show the proposals more clearly.
New Site Briefs	Add new site briefs for Queensferry, and Currie & Balerno.	To set out essential development principles for new housing sites

Part 2 Policies

<b>Reference*</b>	<b>Changes</b>	<b>Reason for Changes</b>
New Para 124	Insert the following as an additional paragraph in introduction to section 2 “Policies are often expressed positively, in terms of what kinds of development will be permitted or encouraged. Where a policy states that certain types of development will be permitted, it should also be understood that failure to meet the Council’s expectations and aspirations may provide grounds for refusal of planning permission.”	To explain how the Council will uses the policies in the LDP.

**Part 2 Section 1 - Delivering the Strategy**

<b>Reference*</b>	<b>Changes</b>	<b>Reason for Changes</b>
Policies DtS 1 – DtS 5	Change to policies Del 1 – Del 5	Easier reference
Policy Del 3 (Policy DtS 3)	Add sentence at end of policy. “Housing as part of mixed use development will be encouraged on appropriate sites to help meet housing need and create strong, sustainable communities. “	To promote housing on suitable sites in the city centre.

**Part 2 Section 2 – Design Principles for New Development**

<b>Reference*</b>	<b>Changes</b>	<b>Reason for Changes</b>
Policy Des 5	Add noise to criterion a)	To recognise the potential impact of noise on amenity.
Policy Des 6	Amend criterion b) ii) to replace “where runoff will be drained by common sewers” with “on sites where measures on the ground are not practical” In last supporting paragraph Replace “minimise” with “avoid” before ‘pollution effects’ in 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence. delete 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence and replace with “Where ground SUDS cannot be provided for practical reasons, then building design measures to manage heavy rainfall such as green roofs should be provided.” “Add the word “nearly” before “zero carbon	To clarify the circumstances in which green roofs will be expected  To reflect government policy.



	homes” in 2 <sup>nd</sup> supporting paragraph.	
Policy Des 7	In criterion b) replace integrated with “connected to other networks”	To accord with government policy, on the advice of Scottish Natural Heritage.
Policy Des 9	In criterion c) include reference to multi-functional green networks	To accord with government policy, on the advice of Scottish Natural Heritage.
Policy Des 10	Change criterion c) to include reference to water quality	To reflect scope of River Basin Management Plan.

### Part 2 Section 3 – Caring for the Environment

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Policy Env 11	Amend wording to read “Planning permission will not be granted for development which would have a significant adverse impact on the special character or qualities of the Special Landscape Areas shown on the Proposals Map.”	In response to concerns that previous wording may allow poor quality development.
Policy Env 13	Reword supporting text in relation to Habitats Regulations Appraisals.	To more accurately reflect the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.

### Part 2 Section 4 – Employment and Economic Development

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Policy Emp 3	Remove word “directly”	Word not required
Policy Emp 5	Remove word “directly”	Word not required
Para 200 (para 129)	Last sentence should read “one hectare” not “2 hectares”	To correct inconsistency with threshold in policy Emp 9.

### Part 2 Section 5 – Housing and Community Facilities

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Policy Hou 1	Delete last sentence.	No longer applicable because of Policy 7 in approved SDP.

### Part 2 Section 6 – Shopping and Leisure

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes

Appendix 2 – Changes to LDP

Policy Ret 5	Delete criteria a) and replace with  'the proposal will address a quantitative or qualitative deficiency or will meet the needs of an expanding residential or working population within its catchment area'	To bring wording in line with Scottish Planning Policy and to recognise that out of centre development may serve a catchment beyond the local area.
--------------	--	---

**Part 2 Section 7 - Transport**

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Policy Tra 1	Add new sentence at end of last paragraph in supporting text: Travel plans may also be relevant when assessing residential applications in terms of Policy Hou 4 Housing Density or Policy Tra 2 Private Car Parking.	To indicate when a travel plan may be used to determine housing proposals
Policy Tra 8	Amend bullet point c to read  "obstruct or adversely affect a public right of way or other route with access rights unless satisfactory provision is made for its replacement".  Amend supporting text to include reference to other routes with access rights	To bring the policy wording in line with Scottish Planning Policy.

Part 2 Section 8 – Resources and Services

No Changes

**APPENDICES**

Reference*	Changes	Reason for Changes
Appendix A	Add Pilrig Colonies Conservation Area to the map.  Include a list of Conservation Areas	To correct omission on map.  For ease of use.
Appendix B	Gorgie Town Centre Add 340-390 Gorgie Road to frontage and change 92-300 Gorgie Road to 92-306 Gorgie Road.  Marchmont North Local Centre Exclude 36-46 Warrender Park Road and 1-3 Roseneath Street.  East Craigs Local Centre Amend to 1-4 Bughtlin Market	To reflect changes identified through preparation of supplementary guidance.  The extent of the local centre has been reviewed and residential frontages removed.  Reflect extent of replacement centre.

	Add “Brunstane” to list of proposed New Local Centres	To be consistent with Proposal S5.
--	---	------------------------------------

## PROPOSALS MAP

Reference	Changes	Reason for Changes
Green Belt	Amend green belt boundaries to accommodate new housing proposals at Queensferry, Dalmeny, and Currie.	To meet Edinburgh’s housing requirement.
Green Belt	Amend boundary to take 39 Turnhouse Road and Airwest site at Turnhouse out of the green belt.	To create a clearly defined green belt boundary consistent with Scottish Planning Policy
Green Belt	Amend boundary to take into account the new Forth Road Bridge	To create a clearly defined green belt boundary consistent with Scottish Planning Policy
Countryside Area Policy	Amend boundary to take into account the new Forth Road Bridge	To follow the revised Green Belt boundary defined by the new Forth Road Bridge.
Special Landscape Areas	Amend boundary of Edmonstone Special Landscape Area to exclude land at Edinburgh Bioquarter.	The Bioquarter Supplementary Guidance is a more appropriate mechanism to balance development and the protection of local landscape qualities on this site.
Local Nature Conservation Site	Amend Boundary of the Local Nature Conservation Site at bavelaw, Balerno  Add two new Local Nature Conservation Sites at Ratho and Harlaw	The site was reassessed in response to a representation  These should have been included in the published version of the original Proposed Plan.
Area of Importance for Flood Management	Update areas of importance for flood management	To take account of SEPA’s new flood maps
Open Space	Amend open space designation adjacent to Murrayfield Stadium.	To omit the hardstanding area.
Open Space	Remove open space designation at Hillpark Avenue.	Development for housing has commenced.

Appendix 2 – Changes to LDP

Open Space	Remove open space designations at Ellen's Glen Road	To accommodate new housing proposal.
Proposal GS6	Amend boundaries of IBG Open Space	To bring in line with West Edinburgh Landscape Framework.
Greenspace Proposal	Add new greenspace proposal at Newmills, Balerno	To indicate new proposed linear park
Cycleway safeguard	Amended the positioning of the cycleway safeguard south of Burdiehouse housing site (HSG 22)	More viable, safer route as agreed with Transport.
Housing Proposal	Add new proposals HSG28 Ellen's Glen, HSG 29 Brunstane, HSG32 Builyeon Road, HSG33 South Scotstoun, HSG34 Dalmeny, HSG36 Currehill Road and HSG37 Newmills Road.  HSG28 Riccarton Mains Road is now HSG35 Riccarton Mains Road HSG29 Curriemuirend is now HSG31 Curriemuirend	To meet Edinburgh's housing requirement.
School Proposal	Add two new school proposals SCH9 and SCH10.	To show indicative location of additional school proposals
Special Economic Area	Amend boundary between Emp 4 Edinburgh Airport and Emp 5 Royal Highland Centre at Fairview Mill.	Fairview Mill is not within the boundaries of the Airport Master Plan 2011. It should therefore lie within Emp 5.
Commercial Centre	Extend the boundary of the Craigleith Commercial Centre to include the petrol filling station and play area.	To reflect the extent of the centre.
Local Centre	Exclude 36-46 Warrender Park and 1-3 Roseneath Street from Marchmont North Local Centre	These frontages are residential.
Local Centre	Amend boundary of East Craigs Centre	To reflect boundary of new centre
Tram Safeguard	Add the tram halt safeguard in centre of the IBG	To correct an omission

LDP Second Proposed Plan

Appendix 3 – Schedules of Representations

<b>Issue 1: Introduction, Aims and Strategy</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.1</u></a>
<b>Issue 2: Green Belt and Special Landscape Areas</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.13</u></a>
<b>Issue 3: Other Environmental Issues</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.28</u></a>
<b>Issue 4: Economic Development and Shopping &amp; Leisure</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.57</u></a>
<b>Issue 5: Housing and Community Facilities</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.70</u></a>
<b>Issue 6: Existing Housing Proposals</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.86</u></a>
<b>Issue 7: New greenfield housing proposals in West Edinburgh</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.106</u></a>
<b>Issue 8: New greenfield housing in South East Edinburgh 1</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.149</u></a>
<b>Issue 9: New greenfield housing in South East Edinburgh 2</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.215</u></a>
<b>Issue 10: Other new greenfield housing proposals</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.248</u></a>
<b>Issue 11: Housing Regeneration Proposals</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.259</u></a>
<b>Issue 12: Suggested housing sites outwith urban area - West &amp; South East</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.326</u></a>
<b>Issue 13: Suggested housing sites outwith urban area - Queensferry Kirkliston</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.332</u></a>
<b>Issue 14: Suggested housing sites outwith urban area Ratho Currie Balerno</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.353</u></a>
<b>Issue 15: Other suggested development sites outwith urban area</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.361</u></a>
<b>Issue 16: Suggested housing sites within urban area</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.409</u></a>
<b>Issue 17: Transport and Resources</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.415</u></a>
<b>Issue 18: Strategic Development Areas - other matters</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.435</u></a>
<b>Issue 19: Policies DtS 1 + DtS2</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.458</u></a>
<b>Issue 20: Design and Environment policies</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.464</u></a>
<b>Issue 21: Employment, Housing and Shopping policies</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.497</u></a>
<b>Issue 22: Transport and Resources policies</b>	<a href="#"><u>page.516</u></a>

### Issue 1 Introduction, Aims and Strategy

Representations grouped under Issue 1 were submitted by one individual and 25 organisations (including three Community Councils and one Community Group). There were six responses indicating support for the Introduction, Aims and Strategy section of the plan and four submitting comments. The other representations all seek changes to the plan.

The majority of representations on this issue come from landowners/developers promoting additional growth and are accompanied by representations relating to additional development opportunities. They raise concerns that the Proposed LDP is not visionary and is inconsistent with Scottish Planning Policy and the now approved Strategic Development Plan.

**The purpose of the summary tables is to provide an indication of the number and nature of representations submitted. All representations along with any supporting documents can be viewed at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan). These representations have informed the preparation of the Second Proposed Plan. Each summary table includes sections explaining how the Council has had regard to the representations received on this issue.**

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Supports Plan</b>				
58	Scottish Water			Supports content of plan and have no amendments to request at this time.
1746	Cramond & Harthill Estate	Halliday Fraser Munro		The five aims listed within the plan are supported and will guide development to sustainable locations. Support is given in particular to development at Cammo. Supports the provision of an additional green network.
2169	Henderson Global Investors	GVA		Supports the aims and strategy. The redevelopment of the St James centre can play a significant part in the economic growth of the city.
2172	RSBP Scotland			Support aim 4 "to look after and improve our environment for future generations in a changing climate".
2255	Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS)	GVA		Support aims and strategy. Their contribution to the city, regional and national economy is consistent with aim of supporting growth of city economy. Strategic location of key

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				employment locations is helping to ensure easy access to jobs and services by sustainable transport means. Out with SDAs strategic assets in certain cases can make a contribution to ensure accordance with SDP spatial strategy.
2256	The EDI Group Ltd	GVA		Support the aims of the LDP. They reflect a positive vision for Edinburgh as a growing and sustainable capital city.
<b>Comments</b>				
1745	Currie Community Council			Need for further consultation period where no further development sites can be added.
2071	Old Town Community Council			Concerned that the sustainability of communities in the Old Town is being undermined by planning policies.
1960	Scottish Property Federation			Concerned that the Proposed LDP has been written on the basis of the Proposed SDP.
1707	A J C Clark			Comments on Aims 1, 3 and 4 regarding use of inner city brownfield sites, increasing densities and extending transport routes.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>The text in the introduction has been updated to reflect the current position regarding the Strategic Development Plan and its Supplementary Guidance. Additional sites are required to meet the increased strategic housing requirements.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
1707	A J C Clark		Changes requested in relation to annotation, map size and key, missing web link, information included in appendices	Changes needed in interests of clarity and accuracy.
2183	Liberton & District Community		Revise Figure 1 to add a definitive boundary for South East SDA.	Consider it important to clearly define the boundary to avoid disputes. Consider the suggested boundary is clearly

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
	Council		Boundary should be delineated along the line of the A701 with a deviation to include the Alnwickhill Waste Treatment Works.	definable on an ordnance map base and would provide protection from development to land to the west. Inclusion of Alnwickhill acknowledges outline planning permission and the contribution of the site to providing a generous housing land supply.
2240	Save Stockbridge		Define meaning of Aim 1 so that it cannot be interpreted to mean that any development proposal amounts to growth in the city economy.	Displacement of economic activity cannot amount to economic growth and cannot be used to justify planning permission.
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object on the grounds that the LDP does not meet the development needs of the city in full. It is necessary to release further Green Belt for development for example at South Queensferry.
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	While SDAs are identified in the SDP, the SDP is deficient and more land will need to be identified. This should include land at South Queensferry.
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object to all references to NPF2 and SPP as both documents are under review. The LDP should be revised to take proposed changes into account. Considers that the LDP fails to meet requirements of draft SPP. It adopts a do minimum approach.
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object to Figure 1 on the grounds that it does not identify South Queensferry as a strategic development area. Consider South Queensferry to be a clear and logical location for strategic growth given its location on the motorway and rail network. It is supported by SESplan as a growth area.
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to statement in paragraph 5 that the LDP cannot make development happen. Considers that in a plan-led system the LDP directs or restricts further growth.



Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to paragraph 8 and table on page 4 on grounds that the LDP is not consistent with the SDP as it is subject to significant modification.
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to paragraph 93 on the grounds that the plan is not visionary as its housing land requirements are deficient.
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to Aims of the plan set out in paragraph 11 as they conflict with additional housing requirements set out in SESplan. The LDP actively restricts development to a scale and in locations that have been deemed insufficient by the Scottish Government. LDP will not meet aim 5 as it does not meet the development needs of the city in full.
1740	Mrs N Bowlby	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object to paragraph 56 on the grounds that economic opportunities across the city are carried forward from historic Local Plans and considers that these should be deleted and new land identified in sustainable locations such as South Queensferry for development associated with major transport linkages such as the New Forth Crossing.
1742	CALA Management Ltd	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to paragraph 11 on the grounds that that aims conflict with the additional housing land requirements to be set out for the purposes of SESplan. The LDP actively restricts development to a scale and in locations that have been deemed insufficient by the Scottish Government. There is no alternative strategy in place to accommodate either an increase in housing land requirements from the SDP or a failure in delivery of sites within the SDAs.
1742	CALA Management Ltd	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to paragraph 8 and the table on page 4 on grounds that the LDP is not consistent with the SDP as it is subject to significant modifications. LDP allocations are insufficient to meet SDP requirements when these are finally determined.
1742	CALA Management Ltd	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to statement in paragraph 5 that the LDP cannot make development happen. Considers that in a plan-led

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				system the LDP directs or restricts further growth.
1742	CALA Management Ltd	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Concerned over inclusion of additional housing land in the core development areas established in ELSP. There has been only limited progress and Council must provide a range and choice of sites in line with SPP. Suggest Balerno as a sustainable location that would benefit from growth.
1742	CALA Management Ltd	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to paragraph 11 on the grounds that that aims conflict with the additional housing land requirements to be set out for the purposes of SESplan. The LDP actively restricts development to a scale and in locations that have been deemed insufficient by the Scottish Government. There is no alternative strategy in place to accommodate either an increase in housing land requirements from the SDP or a failure in delivery of sites within the SDAs. Land at Glenbrook Road Balerno should be identified for residential development.
1742	CALA Management Ltd	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Concerned over inclusion of additional housing land in the core development areas established in ELSP. There has been only limited progress and Council must provide a range and choice of sites in line with SDP. Suggest Currie as a sustainable location that would benefit from growth.
1744	CALA Management Ltd	Ryden	Acceptance that the proposed plan is not consistent with the SDP.	Objects to paragraph 8 and table on page 4 on grounds that housing land allocations are insufficient to meet SDP requirements.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Modify paragraph 14 to define and explain the concept of a strategic development area.	Considers that an explanation of the significance of SDAs, their origin in the SDP and the need for the LDP to conform to the SDP is required.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Change aim 1 to read "support the growth of the city economy, without endangering its cultural and natural heritage assets".	Considers that the balance between requirements of growth and the environment must be reflected in all aims. Statements must be consistent with each other.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			<p>Change aim 2 to read "carefully monitor the number of houses to be provided by Edinburgh and adjust this, up or down, as firm evidence indicates. And also improve the quality of new homes being built".</p> <p>Change aim 4 to read "protect and improve our environment for future generations in a changing climate"</p> <p>Modify paragraph 14 to define and explain the concept of a strategic development area.</p>	
1855	NHS Lothian		Request healthcare provision is given due regard.	Disappointed there is no mention of health in the aims or vision. Adding as an aim would allow for decisions to incorporate health as a direct consideration rather than unplanned consequences of other decisions.
2174	Homes For Scotland		Changes to housing land allocations following approval of SDP with additional supplementary guidance on housing land.	Purpose of LDP is unclear. Do not understand why an LDP has been published without the SDP context in place. Objects on grounds that LDP does not support Edinburgh's capital city/economic role. It is not a plan for the growth of the city region. Provision of housing is inadequate, deliberately constrains the amount of housing close to Edinburgh and fails to deal with range and choice of housing.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to statement in paragraph 5 that the LDP cannot make development happen. Considers that in a plan-led system the LDP directs or restricts further growth.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object to Figure 1 as it does not identify Kirkliston or South Queensferry as strategic development areas. Concerned that the identification of only four strategic sites within West Edinburgh can provide an adequate range and choice of housing sites. Suggest a number of smaller sites should be

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				identified to maintain a 5 year housing land supply.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to paragraph 8 and the table on page 4 on grounds that LDP is not consistent with the SDP therefore proposed allocations are premature and insufficient.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect representation.	Objects to paragraph 93 on the grounds that the plan is not visionary as its housing land requirements are deficient.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect representation.	Objects to paragraph 58-68 and Tables 3 and 4 on the grounds that the LDP is not consistent with the SDP. The LDP is premature and relies on base land supply that has little prospect of delivering numbers expected in the LDP. Land at Kirkliston and Queensferry should be allocated for strategic development.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object to all references to NPF2 and SPP as both documents are under review. The LDP should be revised to take proposed changes into account. Considers that the LDP fails to meet requirements of draft SPP. It adopts a do minimum approach and is based on a flawed SDP. The LDP does not achieve the aim of draft SPP to actively manage the housing land supply.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	While SDAs are identified in the SDP, the SDP is deficient and more land will need to be identified. This should include land at Kirkliston and South Queensferry.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to Aims of the plan set out in paragraph 11 as they conflict with additional housing requirements set out in SESplan. The LDP actively restricts development to a scale and in locations that have been deemed insufficient by the Scottish Government. LDP will not meet aim 5 as it does not meet the needs of the city in full.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Representation is lodged at paragraph 13 as the LDP does not meet the development needs of the city in full. It is

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
	Estates			necessary to release further Green Belt land for development, for example at South Queensferry and Kirkliston.
2182	Land Options East	Derek Scott Planning	Despite requirements the LDP is not consistent with the Strategic Development Plan.	Objects on the grounds that the LDP is not consistent with the SDP as significant changes are in process of being made.
2198	Mrs N Bowlby's 1992 Trust	PPCA	Plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to paragraph 8 and the table on page 4 on the grounds that the LDP is not consistent with the SDP therefore proposed allocations are premature and insufficient.
2198	Mrs N Bowlby's 1992 Trust	PPCA	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	While SDAs are identified in the SDP, the SDP is deficient and more land will need to be identified. This should include land at South Queensferry.
2198	Mrs N Bowlby's 1992 Trust	PPCA	Plan should be changed to reflect representation.	Objects to Aims of the plan set out in paragraph 11 as they conflict with additional housing requirements set out in SESplan. The LDP actively restricts development to a scale and in locations that have been deemed insufficient by the Scottish Government. LDP will not meet aim 5 as it does not meet the needs of the city in full.
2198	Mrs N Bowlby's 1992 Trust	PPCA	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to all references to NPF2 and SPP as both documents are under review. The LDP should be revised to take proposed changes into account. Considers that the LDP fails to meet requirements of draft SPP. It adopts a do minimum approach and is based on a flawed SDP. The LDP does not achieve the aim of draft SPP to actively manage the housing land supply.
2198	Mrs N Bowlby's 1992 Trust	PPCA	Plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to paragraph 93 on the grounds that the plan is not visionary as its housing land requirements are deficient.
2198	Mrs N Bowlby's 1992 Trust	PPCA	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to statement in paragraph 5 that the LDP cannot make development happen. Considers that in a plan-led system the LDP directs or restricts further growth.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
2198	Mrs N Bowlby's 1992 Trust	PPCA	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object to Figure 1 on the grounds that it does not identify South Queensferry as a strategic development area. Consider South Queensferry to be a clear and logical location for strategic growth given its location on the motorway and rail network. It is supported by SESplan as a growth area.
2213	Paton & Muir	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Expresses concern about the definition of West Edinburgh as it does not include strategic settlements such as Ratho. Contends that there is too much reliance on land north of the A8 and land to the south must be taken into consideration.
2213	Paton & Muir	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object to all references to NPF2 and SPP as both documents are under review. The LDP should be revised to take proposed changes into account. Considers that the LDP fails to meet requirements of draft SPP. It adopts a do minimum approach and is based on a flawed SDP. The LDP does not achieve the aim of draft SPP to actively manage the housing land supply.
2213	Paton & Muir	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to Aims of the plan set out in paragraph 11 as they conflict with additional housing requirements set out in SESplan. The LDP actively restricts development to a scale and in locations that have been deemed insufficient by the Scottish Government. LDP will not meet aim 5 as it does not meet the needs of the city in full.
2213	Paton & Muir	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	While SDAs are identified in the SDP, the SDP is deficient and more land will need to be identified. This should include land at Ratho.
2213	Paton & Muir	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Object to Figure 1 as it does not identify land at Ratho to the south of the A8 as a strategic development area. Believe the land is a clear and logical location for strategic growth.
2213	Paton & Muir	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to statement in paragraph 5 that the LDP cannot make development happen. Considers that in a plan-led

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				system the LDP directs or restricts further growth.
2213	Paton & Muir	PPCA Ltd	The plan should be changed to reflect the representation.	Objects to para 58-68 and Tables 3 and 4 on the grounds that the LDP is not consistent with the SDP. The LDP is premature and relies on base land supply that has little prospect of delivering numbers expected in the LDP. Object to loading of additional housing development in previously identified Core Development Areas which have only delivered limited completions and are heavily reliant on major infrastructure. Range and choice of sites needs to be provided. Ratho presents an opportunity.
2225	Catchelraw Trust	Strutt & Parker	Changes set out in other representations.	Do not believe plan achieves aims particularly to increase the number and improve the quality of new homes. Identified level of development does not deliver even a minimum of 5 years supply. Green belt should be drawn to allow a generous supply.
2231	Rosebery Estates Partnership	Strutt & Parker	Changes set out in other representations.	Do not believe plan achieves aims particularly to increase the number and improve the quality of new homes. Identified level of development does not deliver even a minimum of 5 years supply. Green belt should be drawn to allow a generous supply.
2231	Rosebery Estates Partnership	Strutt & Parker	Include the word "Proposed" in front of the word "SDP" and reflect this change throughout plan to reflect current status of the plan.	Objects to paragraph 8 on grounds that the LDP is consistent with the proposed SDP which may require modification.
2231	Rosebery Estates Partnership	Strutt & Parker	Amend paragraph 10 to read "In addition, the Council will continue to review and update its non-statutory guidelines, development briefs and frameworks and where referenced against a specific policy in this plan, it will take the	Considers that some non-statutory guidelines are out of date. The opportunity to review, update and elevate some of them to Supplementary Guidance should not be missed. If a specific document is to be used in support of a policy then it should be referenced against that policy in the plan.



Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			status of Supplementary Guidance".	
2241	Scottish Canals		Figure 1 should include Wester Hailes/Calders as a large area of regeneration focused on the canal.	Believe that the area should be highlighted as a key regeneration priority for the city and form part of the long-term spatial strategy for Edinburgh.
2255	Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS)	GVA	Amend Figure 1 and Figure 14 to correctly identify boundaries of West Edinburgh SDA as set out in SDP. Annotate Figure 14 to include safeguarded RHS showground. Add Appendix 4 of RBS Representation Report to Section 5 - West Edinburgh.	Considers that diagrams fail to correctly identify the boundaries of the West Edinburgh SDA as set out in the SDP. The LDP should more appropriately reflect this spatial context and contribution of RBS to aims and strategy. Figure 14 should identify the Gogar Park opportunity as shown in the RBS representation report and to accord with the proposals map it should be annotated to include the safeguarded relocation of the Royal Highland Showground. Section 5 should include development principles for the Gogar Park Site.
2260	Taylor Wimpey	Strutt & Parker	Include the word "Proposed" in front of the word "SDP" and reflect this change throughout plan to reflect current status of the document.	Objects to paragraph 8 on grounds that the LDP is consistent with the proposed SDP which may require modification.
2260	Taylor Wimpey	Strutt & Parker	Set out in other representations.	Do not believe plan achieves aims particularly to increase the number and improve the quality of new homes. Identified level of development does not deliver even a minimum of 5 years supply. Green belt should be drawn to allow a generous supply.
2260	Taylor Wimpey	Strutt & Parker	Amend paragraph 10 to "In addition, the Council will continue to review and update its non-statutory guidelines, development briefs and frameworks and where	Considers some non-statutory guidelines are out of date. The opportunity to review, update and elevate some of them to Supplementary Guidance should not be missed. If a specific document is to be used in support of a policy then it should be referenced against that policy in the plan.



Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			referenced against a specific policy in this plan, it will take the status of Supplementary Guidance".	
<p><b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b></p> <p><b>Changes made to the Introduction and Aims and Strategy section in relation to the increased housing requirements on the SDP and its Supplementary Guidance should address the many representations on this matter. (2225, 2231, 2260, 2182, 2174, 1744)</b></p> <p><b>Amendments have been made to text and diagrams in response to comments made including Figure 5 and Development Principles key on page 53 (1707)</b></p> <p><b>Changes have been made to Figure 1 and Figure 14 in response to RBS Gogarburn (2255). The Key on Figure 1 has been amended to clarify that the areas of red are major new development. RBS Gogarburn is now shown on Figure 14.</b></p> <p><b>Figure 1 now identifies housing opportunities at Queensferry, Currie and Balerno to meet the increased housing requirements – although these are not in Strategic Development Areas (1740)(1742)(2177)(2198) and also an additional regeneration area at Wester Hailes (2241). New housing opportunities are not shown at Kirkliston and Ratho for the reasons set out in the Environmental Report - Second Revision (2177, 2213)</b></p> <p><b>The word “healthier” has been added to Aim 5. Specific reference to healthcare has also been added in Part 1 Section 3. (1855)</b></p> <p><b>No other changes have been made in response to these representations for the reasons set out below:-</b></p> <p><b>There is no need to change Aim 1 because para 11 makes it clear that the LDP will balance the aims (1750)(2240)</b></p> <p><b>The extent of the South East and West SDAs are shown indicatively in the Main Issues Report and Environmental Report. The exact boundaries can be viewed on the actual GIS maps used in the LDP project documents at <a href="http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan">www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan</a>. (2183)</b></p> <p><b>The wording of para 5 regarding making development happen is correct. No change needed (1740)(1742)(2177)(2198)(2213)</b></p> <p><b>The Council’s intentions regarding the preparation of statutory Supplementary Guidance are set out in para 9.(2231)(2260)</b></p>				

## Issue 2 Green Belt and Special Landscape Areas

Issue 2 covers representations relating to Green Belt and Special landscape Areas set out in Part 1 of the Proposed LDP. The representations are summarised in two tables, one on Green Belt and one on Special Landscape Areas.

**The purpose of the summary tables is to provide an indication of the number and nature of representations submitted. All representations along with any supporting documents can be viewed at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan). These representations have informed the preparation of the Second Proposed Plan. Each summary table includes sections explaining how the Council has had regard to the representations received on this issue.**

### Green Belt

79 individuals and organisations submitted representations about green belt matters, including three Community Councils and two Community Groups. 49 of these supported green belt designation as set out in the Proposed LDP. Specific reference was made to the retention of land within the green belt at Balerno, Currie, Juniper Green, Brunstane and Edmonstone.

Most of the remaining representations are promoting changes in the green belt boundaries to accommodate development proposals. Others are objecting to the Plan because some housing proposals involve development on land currently in the green belt.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b>Supports Plan</b>				
1151	Balerno Community Council			Support green belt policy and retention of green belt boundary around Balerno.
2180	Juniper Green Community Council			Supports green belt policy. Existing green belt areas should be left intact. It is essential that the existing green buffers are retained and where possible, strengthened.
537	Edinburgh South West Communities Forum			Supports the green belt.
3	Owen	Ensor		Supports the protection of the green belt in Balerno as it maintains identity and prevents urban sprawl. Comments that housing would endanger the countryside and wildlife.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
7	William F	Wallace		Supports green belt at Balerno and no further housing development on grounds that infrastructure would be stretched. Makes reference to development in other areas being contrary to the protection of green belt.
16	Mike	Martin		Supports the protection of the green belt around Balerno as it maintains identity, promotes local food production, prevents flooding and is used for recreational purposes.
17	Anne	Menelaws		Supports retention of the green belt and the protection of the landscape, environment and associated wildlife in this area.
18	Gary	Menelaws		Supports retention of the green belt and the protection of the wildlife in the area.
24	Pauline	McKenzie		Supports the retention of the green belt as it improves the ambience of the city.
38	Malcolm G	Fergusson		Supports green belt and opposes development which would remove agricultural land and green space.
41	Gavin T	Johnson		Concerned about housing development at Cockburn Crescent, Balerno. The green belt must be protected.
118	Patrick	Green		Supports the boundaries of the green belt as proposed in the plan. Specifically to Balerno, Juniper Green and Currie limiting further residential development is essential in preventing further strain on the existing infrastructure and services.
118	Patrick	Green		Supports the green belt policy and designation of the areas shown in the Spatial Summary Map as green belt or green space.
162	Patrcia	Gow		Supports green belt designation and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt.
260	Devin S	Scobie		Supports the protection of the green belt around Balerno. Concerned about the capacity of existing infrastructure and services, should development take place.
305	F L	Henderson		Supports the protection of the cities green belt with particular

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				reference to Balerno. Welcomes pledges to build on brownfield sites in preference to Greenfield.
408	Walter	Gow		Supports green belt protection around Balerno and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt.
520	Viola	MacPhail		Supports green belt designation at Glenbrook Road, Balerno. Removal would be detrimental and development would impact on traffic. Brownfield sites should be developed before any green belt land is lost to development.
522	Gareth	Gettinby		Supports green belt around Balerno and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt. Suggests other areas should be explored before Balerno is considered.
628	Gordon	Laing		Support retention of Muir Wood Field, Currie, as green belt on grounds that it prevents coalescence and contributes to the green network.
961	Iain	Proudfoot		Support retention of Muir Wood Field, Currie within the green belt. Would welcome identification of the area as open space.
1161	Rosie	Veitch		Supports green belt protection. Is against development in Balerno as it will alter the character of the area. Brownfield sites should be developed first.
1164	Hazel	Corry		Supports green belt around Cockburn Crescent, Balerno. Brownfield sites should be built on first as to protect the environment. Development in the area would affect the countryside character of the area and put additional pressure on existing services and infrastructure.
1223	Alistair	Weir F.R.I.C.S		Supports green belt around Balerno. No justification for developing Glenbrook Road.
1225	Rosanna	Veitch		Supports the green belt around Cockburn Crescent, Balerno. Objects to any building on the green belt. Brownfield land should be developed first.
1355	Lynn	Mann		Supports green belt designation to retain environmental

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				integrity. Refers to Balerno and the impact development would have on amenity and drainage.
1507	Kenneth	Dickson		Supports green belt policy and the focus on developing brownfield sites. Support protection of green belt at Cockburn Crescent, Glenbrook Road and Harlaw Gait, Balerno. Comments on the impact on traffic if development took place.
1530	Hannah Margaret	Ensor		Supports the green belt policy and designation, particularly in regard to green belt south of Cockburn Crescent, Balerno. Acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt.
1531	John	Ensor		Supports the designation of green belt as shown on the Proposal Map. Supports the green belt policy and the criteria outlined within this policy. Acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt.
1547	Iain	Fiddes		Supports the green belt protection outlined in the LDP.
1605	Richard M	Henderson		Supports green belt policy and in particular absence of proposals in Balerno. Brownfield sites should be developed first and development only on sites where the infrastructure and community can absorb it without adverse effect. Development on agricultural land should be avoided.
1615	Mairi Harkness	Roy Cunningham		Support green belt particularly around Balerno and specifically Glenbrook Road. Development of the area would impact substantially on the character of the area as well as local infrastructure.
1676	Geraldine	Jones		Supports green belt policy and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt.
1707	A J C	Clark		Land at Muirwood Field and north west of 469 Lanark Road West, Balerno should remain in the Green Belt because they contribute to the amenity of their areas.
1712	James	Loftus		Supports the safeguarding of the green belt as per the proposed plan. Development should be focused towards brownfield sites.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				Acknowledges the impact development will have on the city and neighbourhoods if green belt isn't preserved.
1713	Fiona	Loftus		Supports the protection of the green belt. Refers to health benefits presented by access to open space and the impact development would have on wildlife, traffic and pollution if it were to take place.
1714	Angela	Loftus		Supports the safeguarding of the green belt as per the proposed plan. Development should be focused towards brownfield sites. Acknowledges impact development would have on the green belt should it proceed.
1762	Maureen	McCulloch		Supports green belt designation and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt. Expresses concern at any development of Cockburn Crescent. Development should be focused towards brownfield sites.
1851	Alexander John	Mowatt		Supports green belt protection at Cockburn Crescent, Balerno. Expresses concern about the impact on infrastructure should any development go ahead.
2003	Alison	Taylor		Supports green belt designation and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt.
2022	Ken	Taylor		Supports green belt policy and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt as well as the importance of protecting access to the rural landscape within the city.
2030	Keith	Taylor		Supports the countryside being given the same status as green belt.
2051	James	Young		Supports green belt designation and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt. Development should be focused towards brownfield sites and any large scale development on green belt land should be vigorously opposed.
2223	T	Proudfoot		Brunstane Farmland should remain as green belt. It should be retained as farmland or recreational/wildlife ground and treated

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				accordingly.
2269	Steven	Still		Supports green belt policy and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt in terms of its recreational, environmental, agricultural and employment importance.
2270	Catriona	Still		Supports green belt policy and acknowledges the benefits of protecting the green belt in terms of its recreational, environmental, agricultural and employment importance.
232	Balerno Parish Church			Support green belt principles and absence of proposals for housing in Balerno. Believe that development should first be carried out on brownfield sites and agricultural land in Balerno should continue to be used for that purpose.
1409	SASA			Support retention of Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA) occupied fields within the green belt.
1532	ESS Ecology			Supports green belt protection. Development should be focused towards brownfield site.
2192	Midlothian Council			Supports the intention to retain the Edmonstone ridge in the green belt.
<b>Comments</b>				
1707	A J C	Clark		Agree that the green belt plays an important role in directing planned growth and supporting regeneration (page 7, para 13). Considers the proposals for GS 10 to be pretty insignificant. HSG 29 should be provided with enhanced facilities as well as being included as a greenspace since money has already been spent on planting trees.
42	Catherine M	Johnson		Preservation of green belt is vital.

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

**Many of these representations provide general support for green belt policy and the boundaries shown in the first Proposed Plan. Others relate to specific sites and locations. The Second Proposed Plan continues to provide a green belt around Edinburgh as required by the Strategic Development Plan. However it is necessary to take further land out of the green belt at Queensferry and Currie in order to meet strategic housing requirements. More detailed information on why these housing sites have been identified is**

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b>set out in Volume 2 of the Environmental Report - Second Revision.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
537	Edinburgh South West Communities Forum		Existing green belt areas to be retained and strengthened.	Development on the Pentland slopes in the green belt would represent a significant intrusion into the area. Requests that existing green belt areas are retained intact and that existing green buffers are retained and where possible strengthened. Peripheral green belt provides an important function protecting higher quality green belt and preventing coalescence. Raises concerns over planning by appeal with regard to housing developments.
4	Jillian	Glen	Delete "some areas have been taken out of the green belt" on page 12.	Objects on grounds that removing parts of green belt in west Edinburgh contradicts aims of plan and stated purpose of the green belt.
5	Robert	Glen	Delete "some areas have been taken out of the green belt" on page 12.	Objects on grounds that removing parts of green belt in west Edinburgh contradicts aims of plan and stated purpose of the green belt.
45	Roy	Lugton	Do not proceed with development of green belt.	Green belt is of huge importance and adds to the amenity of the area. Proceeding with proposals will exacerbate traffic problems particularly around Kaimes Crossroads.
161	David	Thomson	Scrap proposed plan.	Further erosion of green areas will restrict opportunities for recreation. Many flats have been constructed in Juniper Green in recent years.
182	John	Williamson	Whole plan rejected.	Opposes development on green belt. Access to Frogston Road already busy and could not cope with additional traffic.
183	Mary	Williamson	No development on green belt land.	Opposes any building on the green belt. Transport links are inadequate.
196	James	Bisset	No development on green belt land resulting in loss of agricultural land.	Objects on grounds that the plan is a large scale incursion into the green belt with no mitigating circumstances.
257	Gertrude	Bisset	No development in the green belt should be allowed.	Objects to development in the south and west of the city on the grounds that green belt will be swallowed up.



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
258	Liberton Association		Include a period of protection during which no further reductions in green belt will be permitted following establishment of new boundary.	Objects to reference to green belt boundaries being largely unchanged. To give meaning to robust boundaries a period of protection is required.
312	Oliver	Craig	Retain green belt in south Edinburgh and elsewhere.	Green belt should be retained and development should be focused towards brownfield sites.
783	Eric	Clarke	No breach of the green belt. Capacity of local traffic routes.	N/A
1163	Andrew	Veitch	No loss of green belt to development.	Objects on grounds that plan allows building on green fields. Brownfield sites should be used first. Proposals would endanger an environmentally sensitive area and construction would distress animals. Development of green field will put greater stress on services which would not be necessary if brownfield sites used first.
1575	Philip Anthony	Grant	No green belt land to be used for housing or other building.	Objects on the grounds that the green belt is a vital green space which prevents urban sprawl, providing space for exercise, food growing, wildlife and trees. More homes should be built on brownfield land.
1794	Sheila	MacLeod	Remove 39 Turnhouse Road from green belt.	Site is surrounded by industry as well as airport uses, the gas plant and road. There may also now be housing within the vicinity.
1907	Mr R Purves	Holder Planning	Green belt boundary should be amended to remove the residential area of West Mill Road, Colinton from green belt.	Object to inclusion of the residential area in the green belt on grounds that it is inappropriate to include predominantly urban areas.
2029	Steven Scott	Taylor	No building on green field locations.	Brownfield sites and underused buildings should be developed before greenfield sites to make good use of urban space and avoid derelict and redundant undeveloped buildings.
2040	Martin White	Rick Finc Associates	Amend green belt to exclude land at 469 Lanark Road West. Greater flexibility in policy Des 9 to include land	Objects on grounds that Policy Des 9 is being applied in restrictive manner. Green belt release would be consistent with policy Env10 and SDP policies 11, 12 and 13. No proper

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			within private garden and removal of open space, LNCS and SLA designation.	consideration of green belt boundary and existing boundaries not robust or defensible. LDP does not promote the opportunity to enhance the appearance of the green belt or increase countryside access and interpretation of guidance is not consistent with SPP. Also the LDP is inconsistent in the use of the designation.
2152	Edith	Gray	Priority given to brownfield and existing agreed developments.	Objects to areas removed from green belt to meet housing requirement. Each area should be debated as and when development needed. Green belt should only be reduced when brownfield and existing agreed developments are at full capacity.
1631	Caledonian Trust Plc.	Holder Planning	Inner boundary of green belt amended to remove land at Brunstane House.	Land should be included within the urban area of the city. Do not consider existing boundary to be strongly defensible and believe the character of area to be more urban than rural.
1710	Mr & Mrs Love	Montagu Evans	Review green belt boundary in vicinity of Johns Burn, Balerno to allow for the development of a dwelling.	Consider that boundary proposed would be more defensible and allow for organic growth of Balerno.
1750	The Cockburn Association		New paragraph added. "The LDP recognises that pressure on the green belt from development is likely to continue. As the green belt also makes a significant contribution to the proposed National Development of Green Networks (NPF3), it is important to provide stronger safeguards for the most valued areas of the green belt. The selection of areas is based on the Edinburgh Green Belt Review of 2008 and is set out in Policy Env10.	The importance of the Edinburgh green belt review is not mentioned. The status of document and use to inform policies and proposals needs to be clarified.
1993	Spire Healthcare Ltd	Turley Associates	Remove Murrayfield Hospital from the green belt.	Murrayfield and its grounds should be removed from the green belt allocation set out within the proposed plan. Approach taken

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				at Corstorphine Hospital and ERI set precedent and Murrayfield should be considered equally.
2174	Homes For Scotland		Substantial changes to green belt boundaries will be needed given the scale of housing development needed.	Supports the principles of green belts but boundaries will need to be redrawn given scale of additional housing needed and have to be done so with the principles of green belts in mind; i.e. to direct the long term spatial pattern of growth needed to meet needs and demands.
2199	Murray Estates	Holder Planning	Remove an area of derelict farm buildings within Hermiston from the green belt.	Objects to inclusion of land on the basis that the site is visually and physically part of the village. Sensitive development would significantly enhance the village character.
2235	The Royal Zoological Society of Scotland (RZSS)	GVA	Remove housing allocation HSG 7 from the green belt	Objects to the green belt 'over-wash' on this allocation as the site does not meet any green belt objectives. Recognition of importance of creating high quality development in a mature landscape setting and looks to achieve this by designation as a Special Landscape Area.
2245	SEEDco	Holder Planning	Remove Todhills building group from green belt and identify as a settlement in the LDP. The green belt boundary should be redrawn accordingly.	Should be removed from the green belt because it is a developed site and does not meet green belt criteria set out in SPP. It is appropriate for inclusion in the urban area because of its character and location next to Shawfair Business Park.
2255	Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS)	GVA Grimley Ltd	Remove RBS Headquarters at Gogarbank from the green belt.	Object to inclusion within the green belt on basis that it does not accord with SPP and green belt exclusions are not consistent across the plan area. Scale of existing and consented development make it clear that site is a major business use. Character and location make it appropriate to remove from green belt. Change to neighbouring land at IBG means green belt designation is no longer appropriate. Clear and defensible boundaries could be drawn.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
2300	IM Properties (Development) Ltd	Turley Associates	Change the boundary of the proposed green belt designation at Turnhouse Road to follow the railway line and allocate the Air West site for business and industry.	Land at Airwest should be removed from the green belt and allocated for business and industry to reflect the extant planning permission and to provide a robust, defensible green belt boundary.

#### **How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

**A number of representations object to the first Proposed Plan because it proposes development on land currently in the green belt. The plan provides a green belt around Edinburgh as required by the Strategic Development Plan (SDP). However, it must also ensure that the strategic growth requirements of the SDP can be accommodated. One of the purposes of the green belt is to direct planned growth to the most appropriate locations. Green belt sites have been identified to help meet strategic housing requirements. More detailed information on why the housing sites have been identified is set out in Volume 2 of the Environmental Report - Second Revision.**

**Some changes have been made to the green belt in the Second Proposed Plan taking account of relevant representations and other considerations.**

**Additional green belt land has been identified for housing to meet SDP requirements (2174)**

**Land at 39 Turnhouse Road and at Airwest, Turnhouse Road are removed from the green belt to create a more appropriate, clearly defined green belt boundary. (1794)(2300)**

**Land at Brunstane House is removed from the green belt because greenfield land to the east is identified as a housing site. (1631)**

**Other representations requesting the removal of land from the green belt have been fully considered but no changes have been made for the following reasons**

**469 Lanark Road West – Lanark Road West forms a strong, clearly identifiable green belt boundary at this location. There is no justification to amend the boundary to remove this individual property. It would result in a weak boundary. (2040)**

**Johns Burn, Balerno – The existing green belt boundary is strong and clearly identifiable. It is not appropriate to amend this to create a weaker boundary in order to support the development of a house. (1710)**

**Murrayfield Hospital – This site is part of the green belt at Corstorphine Hill and contributes to the landscape setting of the city. Its removal from the green belt would undermine green belt objectives in this location. (1993)**

**Hermiston Village – The plan proposes to take the village itself out of the green belt in accordance with national policy. This representation also seeks the removal from the green belt of adjacent farm buildings. These are rural in character and include temporary structures. Their removal from the green belt and inclusion in the urban area would be detrimental to the landscape setting of the city. (2199)**

**HSG7 at the Zoo – This matter was considered through the Edinburgh City Local Plan Inquiry. Given the particular characteristics of**

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				<p>this housing site, the Reporters recommended the site be identified as a housing proposal but retained in the green belt. There has been no change in circumstances to justify a change in approach. (2235)</p> <p>Todhills – the site itself does not meet green belt objectives. However, it is part of a wider area that does, with the A7, provide a strong clearly identifiable boundary. Removing the site from the green belt would create a weaker boundary. (2245)</p> <p>RBS at Gogarburn - the principle of taking the RBS Gogarburn site out of the green belt is supported by Scottish Planning Policy. However the A8 currently provides a strong clearly identifiable green belt boundary. If this site is taken out of the green belt in isolation from other land to the south of the A8, it is not possible to create a suitable green belt boundary. The plan therefore proposes to retain RBS Gogarburn in the green belt but apply Policy Emp 7 in recognition of its special economic importance. (2255)</p> <p>Some representations request changes/additions to LDP text on green belts (1750). These are not considered necessary or appropriate.</p>

### Special Landscape Areas

There were 13 representations on Special Landscape Areas (SLA) with three supporting the plan as written. Ten representations are seeking a change in SLA boundaries linked to the development potential of particular sites.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b>Supports plan</b>				
119	Craigeith/Blackhall Community Council			Supports designation of Corstorphine Hill as a Special Landscape Area (SLA). Pleased that the SLA includes both the former Ravelston Quarry and the designed landscape north of Craigcrook Castle.
2269	Steven Still			Supports the proposal that the Special Landscape Areas remain unchanged. Specifically in relation to land around Glenbrook Road and A70.
2270	Catriona Still			Supports the proposal that the Special Landscape Areas remain unchanged. Specifically in relation to land around Glenbrook Road and A70.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>The support for the Special Landscape Areas at Corstorphine Hill and Balerno is noted.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
1744	CALA Management Ltd	Ryden	Remove land at Craigcrook Road from the protection of Policy Env 11 - Special Landscape Areas.	Suggest that the proposal would ensure the character and appearance of the area was not adversely effected by the new development with the key landscape features being fully respected.
1904	Edinburgh Napier University	Jones Lang LaSalle	Object to extension of a Candidate Special Landscape Area Craiglockhart to cover the entire extent of the University's ownership at Craiglockhart.	Objects to extension of cSLA at Craiglockhart on the grounds that it is not justified and sufficient protection is provided by assessing impact of development on the setting of a listed building.
1993	Spire Healthcare Ltd	Turley Associates	Remove land at Murrayfield Hospital from SLA.	Object to inclusion on the basis that the character varies from the wider SLA and it would be more appropriate to consider it in the context of the built environment around Corstorphine Hill.
2142	Edinburgh BioQuarter Partners	Scott Hobbs Planning Ltd	Clear reference on status and where information on Statements of Importance is contained. Review of Local Landscape Designations should form part of the LDP. Boundary of Edmonstone SLA is incorrect. BioQuarter site should be excluded from SLA to which it relates.	Objects on the grounds that the status of Review of Local Landscape Designations report is uncertain, boundary of local landscape area is incorrect, there is no justification for inclusion of BioQuarter within SLA, and there is inconsistency with other economic development proposals. SLA designation and special economic area designation of the BioQuarter are incompatible.
2182	Land Options East	Derek Scott Planning	Buildings to the south of Liberton Drive should be removed from the green belt and Special Landscape Area and included within the urban area.	These buildings are urban in appearance, making little contribution to the objectives of green belt designation and detract from the SLA.
2194	Miller Homes	Geddes Consulting	Amendment to the Proposals Map to remove Goodtrees Farm, Balerno from the proposed Pentlands Special	The LDP Proposed Plan should review the proposed SLA boundary to ensure that its proposed development strategy delivers a generous land

Ref No.	Name	Consultant	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			Landscape Area and include it within the Urban Area.	supply. It is proposed as part of the need to allocate further greenfield land that the site as Goodtrees Farm is removed from the proposed SLA area in order to accommodate additional growth at Balerno. This modification would not affect the overall character and appearance of the proposed Pentland Hills SLA.
2195	Miller Homes Ltd	Holder Planning	Remove the SLA designation from the suggested Winton Gardens housing site.	Believes the removal of the SLA designation is justified because the development will not impact on the essential character of the SLA. States that the site is not continuous with the main landscape sweep that makes the SLA unique, does not provide recreational opportunities, has limited intervisibility with the rest of the SLA and does not provide value to the other essential characteristics of the SLA.
2243	Scottish Enterprise		Clear reference on status and where information on Statements of Importance is contained. Review of Local Landscape Designations should form part of the LDP. Boundary of Edmonstone SLA is incorrect. BioQuarter site should be excluded from SLA to which it relates.	Objects on the grounds that the status of Review of Local Landscape Designations report is uncertain, boundary of local landscape area is incorrect, there is no justification for inclusion of BioQuarter within SLA, and there is inconsistency with other economic development proposals. SLA designation and special economic area designation of the BioQuarter are incompatible.
2285	Mr & Mrs Philip and Barratt David Wilson Homes	Clarendon Planning & Development	cSLA09 - Pentlands should be amended to exclude the two fields between Cockburn Crescent and the established tree boundary to the south.	Suggests the Statement of Importance for cSLA09 does not provide sufficient justification to include these fields. Suggests the proposed woodland along the south boundary would mitigate against potential visual intrusion as well as creating a long-lasting screen to Balerno's urban fringe. Claims the completed development would enhance the views from the Pentlands.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
2295	Braehead Partnership & Gladman Developments	Gladman Developments	Amend the boundary of the Cammo Special Landscape Area to exclude land to the east of Cammo Walk.	This site does not form part of the Cammo Designed Landscape and is not physically or visually connected to the farmland fringe at Craigiehall Temple. Consider this land should be included in the Cammo housing allocation (HSG20).

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

**The boundary of the Edmonstone SLA has been amended to exclude land at Edinburgh BioQuarter. The BioQuarter Supplementary Guidance is a more appropriate mechanism to balance development and the protection of local landscape qualities on this site.(2142, 2243)**

**No other changes have been made to SLA boundaries. All representations have been fully considered taking account of the location, landscape quality and setting of the site in question. In all cases, their inclusion within the SLA boundary is justified.(1774, 1904, 1993, 2182, 2194, 2195, 2285, 2295)**



### Issue 3 Other Environmental Issues

Issue 3 covers representations relating to Part 1 Section 2 (A Plan to Protect and Enhance the Environment) of the Proposed LDP, except Green Belt and Special Landscape Areas which are covered in Issue 2.

The representations under Issue 3 are set out in three tables.

1. Biodiversity designation at Craighouse
2. Other biodiversity issues
3. All other environmental issues

**The purpose of the summary tables is to provide an indication of the number and nature of representations submitted. All representations along with any supporting documents can be viewed at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan). These representations have informed the preparation of the Second Proposed Plan. Each summary table includes sections explaining how the Council has had regard to the representations received on this issue.**

#### Biodiversity Designation at Craighouse

A total of 112 individuals and organisations submitted representations on Craighouse Campus, almost all relating to the boundaries of the Local Nature Conservation site (LNCS), which is the Craiglockhart Hills Local Biodiversity Site (LBS). Of these representations, three were submitted by Community Groups.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
1563	Friends of Inverleith Park		The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1926	Friends of Craighouse		The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2155	Friends of Craighouse Grounds and Woods		Gravelled area to right of entrance to Craighouse should be designated as open space	Area is a piece of recolonised woodland and scrubland and is rich in biodiversity and should be designated as open space
322	Martin	Little	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to reduction in size of Local Nature Conservation site on grounds of biodiversity.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
536	Nicol	Watt	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction in the size of the Local Nature Conservation Site at Craighouse on the grounds of biodiversity
1018	Hazel	Little	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1170	Diana	Cairns	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	No justification for change as areas deleted have not changed in terms of wildlife & biodiversity.
1209	Kim	Angus	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1211	Stewart	Anderson	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1287	Catherine	Bisset	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
1288	Willie	Black	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1289	Richard	Blair	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include the entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site.
1304	Gillian	Brodie	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1305	Rebecca	Brooks	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1429	Ian	Brown	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1434	Linda	Burns	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1444	Graham	Cameron	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1470	Norman	Dalgleish	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1471	Allison	Dalrymple	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1472	Peter	Darbyshire	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1473	Sophia	Darbyshire	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1480	Rosy	Barnes	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity. LNCS should change into Local Biodiversity Site designation.
1487	Jacqueline	Constable	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1513	Marjory	Dodd	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1517	Tony	Dougan	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1520	Andrew	Drummond	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1533	Kousha	Etessami	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1558	Anne-Marie	Fraser	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1570	Caroline	Gardner	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1584	Sabine	Guendel	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1599	Lousie	Hampton	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site.
1601	Gill	Hamilton	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1602	Dougie	Hamilton	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1610	Fiona	Hartree	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1618	Helen	Hood	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1619	Margaret	Holligan	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1641	Andrew K	Zealley	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1647	Peter	Hutchison	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1651	Barry	Hughes	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1652	Alison	Hughes	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1654	Elsbeth	Dodd	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1655	Allan	Jones	Keep designation of site as it is	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
1677	Jenni	Jones	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1692	Jeremy	Leathart	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1694	Alison	Lawson	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1702	Maire	Kilgallon	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1711	Honor	Loudon	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1716	Ruaridh	Little	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1717	Charles	MacKenzie	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1719	Ruth	Macadam	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be extended to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
1722	Lucila	Machado	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1724	Fiona and Sheila	Mackay	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1732	Mary	Macmaster	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1757	M W	Marwick	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1769	Juliet	McCann	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
1776	Peter	Maxwell	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1778	Jane	McLaren	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1792	Anni	McLeod	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1793	Mike	McLean	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1796	Joanna	McPake	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1810	Paul	Burgess	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1817	Helen	Mitchell	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1825	Sarah	Moffat	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1826	Robert	Moffat	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1839	David	Morris	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1842	Sandra	Morris	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1848	Ben	Murray	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1853	Andrew Scott	Neil	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1860	Mr & Mrs	O’Gorman	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1874	Stephen	Pells	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1902	Sandra	Quickert	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1910	Anna	Raper	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1911	Benjamin	Raper	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
1932	Sandra	Riddell	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1947	Robert	Saunders	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1951	Diarmid	Scott	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1961	James	Scully	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1965	Georgina	Sigouin	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1968	Mike	Sinclair	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
1970	Andrew	Smith	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of loss of biodiversity, and recreation al space.
2023	Liz	Taylor	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2033	Iain	Twaddle	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site.
2035	Kathy	Tunnah	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2037	Elena & Andrew	Thomson	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
2043	Marek	Wilkojc	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2044	Ruth	Wilkojc	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2052	Michael	Wilson	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2055	Amy	Woodhouse	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2059	Simon & Kate	Yates	The designation of whole of site as a Special Landscape Area and Local Nature Conservation site	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2097	Donald	Bisset	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2099	Ailsa	Brigham	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2100	Tana	Collins	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2105	Robert	Corrie	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site.
2112	Maureen	Loebel	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
2115	David and Laura	Maguire	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site.
2122	Sigrid	Nielsen	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site.
2123	Julie	Odell	Keep Craighouse Campus as green space	Objects to any development because of loss of greenspace and impact on wildlife
2124	Alex	Schweitzer-Thompson	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2125	Caroline	Smith	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2126	Euan	Smith	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2127	Peter & Mary	Snow	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2130	Alan	Dickson	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity.
2134	Juliet	Wilson	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
2135	Richard	Cameron	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity
2136	Barbara & David	Watts	The boundary of the existing Local Nature	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site.
2168	Stephen	Hawkins	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object on the grounds that the area provides amenity value to the community
2200	Ian	Murray MP	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2228	Jo	Young	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds that nothing has physically changed on the site
2287	Timothy	Doggett	The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Objects to the changes in the boundary of the biodiversity designation with no text to explain why.
2288	Nigel	Hambly	The Local Nature Conservation site should be extended to encompass the entire Craighouse site.	There is no justification for a reduction in the LNCS designation as the biodiversity of the site has not been depleted in any way. Information provided on the biodiversity value of the site including reference to bats and roe deer.
2303	Nick	Honhold	Amend biodiversity designation at Craighouse to reinstate previous boundaries.	No justification to change the extent of the designation. It goes against principle of preserving biodiversity.
1542	Scottish Storytelling Centre		The boundary of the existing Local Nature Conservation Site should be reinstated to include entire estate at Craighouse	Object to the reduction of the Local Nature Conservation site on the grounds of biodiversity. LNCS should change into Local Biodiversity Site designation

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

**The Council has considered these representations, which has included seeking advice from its partners as follows. The part of the Local Nature Conservation Site referred to in the above representations has been reassessed using additional species data extracted from a 2012 ABI Wildlife Consultancy report with permission from Edinburgh Napier University. The information was assessed by The Wildlife Information Centre and verified by experts. The assessment was then considered by the Local Biodiversity Sites Steering Group, on which relevant specialist organisations are represented. The Council and the Group consider that the evidence**

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>does not justify the boundary change sought by the representations.</b>				

### Other Biodiversity Issues

There were five representations on other biodiversity matters. One is from Balerno Community Council in support of the plan. The other representations seek changes to boundaries of biodiversity designations and suggest minor wording changes.

Ref No.	Organisation	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b>Supports plan</b>				
1151	Balerno Community Council			Support changes to the Local Nature Conservation Sites, in particular those along Balerno, Water of Leith walkway
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representation</u></b>				
<b>This supporting representation is noted.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
2249	Ken Shade		Remove extension of LNCS where it is extended to cover private access road, and area of farm fields to south of Easter Bavelaw Farm	Changes are unnecessary, inconsistent, and many require future alterations/buildings. Original survey contains number of inaccuracies
1458	James RS Brownright	Gill Wall	Realign the boundary of the Burdiehouse Burn Valley Park Local Nature Reserve	The boundary should be altered to reflect the approved LNR boundary
2165	Hallam Land Management Ltd	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure (E&I) UK Ltd	The Local Nature Conservation site allocation in the north east corner of the Burdiehouse housing proposal (HSG 22) should be deleted and follow the north east boundary of the site	The boundary should be altered in line with the Edinburgh City Local Plan 2010
2172	RSBP Scotland		Generally supportive, but suggesting minor changes to; aims, biodiversity, woodland cover, flood risk management, green network, Maybury and Cammo site brief.	Changes to text suggested to improve clarity and improve biodiversity.

Ref No.	Organisation	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</b>				
The heading in part 1 Section 2 has been changed to “Biodiversity” (2172)				
The LNCS at Balerno has been reassessed and some changes made – the slope has been removed from the site and the quarry on Hare Hill included. These changes affect land in Edinburgh and Midlothian. However there is no justification for the other suggested changes (2249).				
No other changes have been made.				
The Burdiehouse Burn LNR is part of the wider Niddrie Burn Complex Local Nature Conservation Site. The areas outwit the LNR meet the criteria for inclusion in the LNCS designation (1458)				
The habitat in the north east corner of the Burdiehouse site is consistent with the neighbouring habitat and it is therefore appropriate to include it in the LNCS (2165)				
The minor changes suggested by RSPB are not justified, either because they are too detailed for inclusion in the LDP or are not necessary. The suggested changes to para 33 and 34 are not supported because enhancing biodiversity is not a purpose of the green belt. The comments regarding the Maybury and Cammo Site Brief are more applicable at the master planning stage. (2172)				

### All Other Environmental Issues

34 individuals and organisations submitted representations on other environmental issues, including nine Community Councils and two Community Groups. Some organisations such as The Cockburn Association and Scottish Environmental Protection Agency submitted a number of representations on this section of the LDP.

The 16 representations which support the plan as written cover a range of issues such as open space, green networks, conservation areas and green space proposals.

The main changes being sought relate to suggested additional greenspace proposals, deletion of some existing greenspace proposal and open space designations and reference to flood risk assessments for housing proposals.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Supports Plan</b>				
2071	Old Town Community Council			Supports all provisions within this section and hopes to see them given more weight in planning decisions.
2180	Juniper Green			Support for proposals in Paragraph 38 concerning the importance

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
	Community Council			of trees and woodland in urban and rural settings. Keen to see the creation of further woodlands in the area north of the Pentland Hills and the continued use of existing woodland e.g. The Millennium Woodland at Curriemuirend Park
2190	Marchmont & Sciennes Community Council			Supports the retention of Conservation Area status for 'Marchmont, Meadows and Bruntsfield' in line with the historic nature of the properties and urban environment in this area
2226	Portobello Community Council			Supports page 9, para 15 and 16. Suggests that a survey for average travel to work times should be undertaken for those living in the City vis a vis those living outwith it.
2268	Stockbridge and Inverleith Community Council (SICC)			Support the designation of open space as playing fields at Edinburgh Academicals. Retail and commercial use on the site is not wanted on the site.
628	Gordon	Laing		Supports GS10 for open space and presumably additional sporting facilities
2101	Mark	Lazarowicz		Supports Proposal GS8 Inverleith Depot.
14	Forestry Commission Scotland			Strongly supports the aims of the Strategy and how the Council is looking to enhance green networks in Edinburgh, the inclusion of the reference to the Edinburgh Forestry and Woodland Strategy and green network elements to be incorporated into planned development. Welcomes specific green network proposals being included in the spatial analysis and tables. Originally submitted representation voicing concerns over lack of green network policy but since discussion with Council officers, reassured that adequate consideration has been given to green network elements in policies and proposals. This representation supersedes that of 14 May 2013.
1750	The Cockburn Association			Supports first sentence of Paragraph 41

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1750	The Cockburn Association			Support for GS1, GS2, GS3, GS4, GS5, GS8 and GS10
2244	West Blasket Association (WBA)			Support in general for the Plan but concerned about the recent appeal decision to grant planning permission for housing on the Edmonstone Estate. Strong support for the green belt. This decision eats into the limited green belt and could act as a precedent for future application which would undermine Policy Env 10. These concerns are shared by Grange Prestonfield Community Community Council. Support for references to the Green Network from Paragraph 46 onwards and the reference in Paragraph 51 to the Open Space Strategy which is reflected throughout the Proposals Map. We therefore strongly support Policy Env 18 and would object to proposals in these areas of open space.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency			Supports the reference in Paragraph 86 to the development plan facilitating a wide range of 'low and zero carbon energy generation' Supports the detail of Paragraph 88 which outlines the main types of waste management installation that will be required in the LDP area. Supports the inclusion of Figure 10 'Waste Management Safeguards' Welcomes commitment in Paragraph 91 that states '...this plan supports existing and new waste management facilities'.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency			Supports the reference in Paragraph 46 to the Central Scotland Green Network (CSGN). States the CSGN is key in successfully implementing River Basin Management Plans, sustainable flood risk management and climate change adaptation. Also supports the content of Paragraph 48 regarding the importance of surface water drainage systems in contributing to the CSGN. Support is given to the approach of ensuring developers



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				positively contribute to the green network through managing surface water drainage.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency			<p>Supports greenspace proposal GS7 to divert the Gogar Burn as shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Welcomes SEPA's inclusion as an 'owner' of the project in the Proposed Action Plan and would welcome further engagement as the proposal develops.</p> <p>The new route of the burn may run adjacent to sites HSG 19 and SCH 6 as identified on the Proposals Map. Flooding from any future diversion of the Gogar Burn will need to be considered in relation to this site. SEPA would welcome the adoption of a strategic approach to flooding in this area which could consider the re-alignment of Gogar Burn and avoid ad-hoc development that may limit future opportunities to resolve flooding issues.</p>
2274	Scottish Natural Heritage			<p>Generally supportive of the plan as written but requests minor modifications.</p> <p>Paragraph 39 discusses the Council's biodiversity duty and local heritage designations but does not refer to national or international designations.</p> <p>Commends integrative approach taken with green networks and welcomes the clear identification of greenspace proposals in the plan. Wishes to emphasise the following - 'Subject to individual site constraints, all of these areas (GS1 to GS10) should be multi-functional, offering as many of the elements discussed under paragraph 48 as can reasonably be achieved'.</p> <p>Suggests links could be achievable at other sites notably proposal GS6 which could be achieved by considering the relationship of GS6 to HSG 19 and Edinburgh Park/South Gyle. The Proposed LDP discusses the removal of green belt around institutions and businesses. Previously commented in the MIR, the removal of these large areas reduces the green belt's ability to contribute to the settlement strategy.</p>

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
2274	Scottish Natural Heritage			Generally supportive of the plan as written but requests minor modifications. Welcomes the 5 aims of the LDP and that they are interlinked. Pleased to see an emphasis on retaining and enhancing Edinburgh's built and natural assets and these being an integral part of the strategy. The wording could be altered in this paragraph to remove 'where possible' as this wording is not aligned to Scottish Government's Environment National Outcome and is at odds with the Edinburgh Design Guidance. Figure 1 does not show the proposed removal of major business and other uses from the green belt. Recommends these potentially substantial changes to the green belt are shown.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>The supporting representations are noted</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
351	New Town & Broughton Community Council		The Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan and its Action Plan should be given more weight	The sentence "The Management Plan informs a separate Action Plan and may be a material consideration for decisions on planning matters" should be changed to "The Management Plan informs a separate Action Plan and will be a material consideration for decisions on planning matters"
351	New Town & Broughton Community Council		The LDP should identify areas of public open space deficiency	Believes Canonmills/Silvermills to be the second most deficient area for public open space in the city centre after Gorgie/Dalry. Shortfalls should be identified and planned for by surveying potential sites and seeking ownership through compulsory purchase.
1745	Currie Community Council		Muir Wood Field designated as open space.	Designation would provide separation between Juniper Green and Currie and reflect the RWELP.
1745	Currie Community Council		Suggests it would be appropriate to include the area between Currie and Juniper Green Conservation Areas excluding the Kinleith Mill	Blinkbonny is a separate hamlet with its own history, identity, appearance and character. Housing is less dense than adjacent Conservation Areas and it forms a break between the built up area of Lanark Road and the Pentland Hills

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			site in one of the Conservation Areas	
1747	Cramond & Barnton Community Council		An open space proposal should be added at Mauseley Hill and Cammo Water Tower and land adjacent	If the Cammo housing site (HSG19) is included in the LDP then land around Cammo Tower, adjacent to Cammo Estate and leading to Mauseley Hill should be managed as an area for recreation, habitat conservation and landscape management.
2150	Friends of Cammo		Addition of Mauseley Hill, Cammo Water Tower and adjacent land to 'Table 1. Greenspace Proposals'	<p>Mauseley Hill, Cammo Water Tower and adjacent land should be included in 'Table 1. Greenspace Proposals' because they are important scenic and cultural features, complement the landscape character and wildlife habitats of the Cammo Estate and are used informally for recreation but are not managed for recreation or landscape or habitat conservation.</p> <p>Positive greenspace management is required for land including, and adjacent to Mauseley Hill and Cammo Water Tower to safeguard and enhance the landscape, cultural heritage, biodiversity and recreation values of the area. to complement the conservation and recreational values of the Cammo Estate and River Almond Walkway and to enhance the potential contributions of this area to the green belt and provide amenity and recreational benefits if LDP proposals for housing at Cammo go ahead</p>
1240	Pam	Barnes	Inverleith Park - GS8 on the Proposals Map - should be permanently seen as greenspace	Wants to ensure that Inverleith Park is returned to open space in the LDP
1568	Robert & Jessica	Gibson	<p>Development in the South East Wedge Parkland should not go ahead.</p> <p>*Note: These comments are regarding a Pre-application Notice (13/00298/PAN) and the site is not</p>	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of wildlife and biodiversity, lack of infrastructure, air quality and impact on local amenities.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			an allocation in the Proposed LDP	
1707	A J C	Clark	Requests that greenspace proposals are included for the Muir Wood Field and Curriemuirend Park and Riccarton Mains Road Triangle.	Considers that none of these areas should be taken out of the green belt/open space. There was a commitment by the Council to reinstate proposals to provide playing fields at Muirwood Field in 1980.
1707	A J C	Clark	Identify Blinkbonny Village in Currie (except Kinleith Mill site) as a Conservation Area	It retains much of its character from when it was a mill village.
2101	Mark	Lazarowicz	Pocket parks and green routes in Leith should be included	To develop proposals from the local community.
2297	Alasdair	Rankin	The Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan and its Action Plan should be given more weight	The sentence "The Management Plan informs a separate Action Plan and may be a material consideration for decisions on planning matters" should be changed to "The Management Plan informs a separate Action Plan and will be a material consideration for decisions on planning matters"
1658	John Swan & Sons plc	CBRE Ltd	Deletion of the 'open space' designation of land between Chesser Avenue and New Market Road, and the site re-allocated for 'mixed use' development.	Suggests the allocation of land between Chesser Avenue and New Market Road as mixed use as it forms a natural extension to the existing local centre at Corn Exchange, the site is private open space, there would be public transport benefits and the development would add to the viability, variety and vitality of the local centre.
2297	Alasdair	Rankin	The LDP should identify areas of public open space deficiency	The Community Council believes Canonmills/Silvermills to be the second most deficient area for public open space in the city centre after Gorgie/Dalry. Shortfalls should be identified and planned for by surveying potential sites and seeking ownership through compulsory purchase.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Insert 'in certain areas...' after 'development' in Line 3 of Paragraph 37	The second sentence in this paragraph is misleading and implies development will not have a negative impact on landscape. It is beneficial to note that Stage 2 of the Edinburgh Green Belt Review found limited scope for further development in areas of

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				low landscape quality without incurring further damage.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Changes to the last sentence of Paragraph 27 - '...proposals without harming the overall character of the inventory site'	it is not made clear whether the last sentence of Paragraph 27 is protecting or developing inventory sites. Greater weight should be given to their protection.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Changes to 3rd and 4th bullet points in Paragraph 16	The 3rd bullet point needs some qualification to be consistent with Policy RS1. Regarding the 4th bullet point, the phrase 'no adverse impact' is too weak a qualification and is open to generous interpretation.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Alter paragraph 41 to build upon the first sentence which should direct statements in the rest of the paragraph	In terms of 'stringent protection' of the water environment, Paragraph 41 makes no mention of well designed afforestation of water catchments of the main rivers that have potential to cause significant flooding, development not being permitted in areas of important flood management and/or areas that there is a medium to high risk of flooding and criteria for building design to minimise flood damage and risk to humans applied to all development that is of risk to flooding.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Support in principle for greenspace proposals GS6 and GS9 but minor changes needed	For GS6 there is support in principle for extensive greenspace in the IBG. Location, size, shapes (preferably naturalistic rather than geometric) and the linkages of these spaces requires careful design in masterplan production. Support in principle for proposal GS9 but the proposed space is too small and does not reflect the convex shapes of the landforms in this area. This should be adjusted in the masterplan.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Minor changes to Paragraph 38	In line 3 after 'benefits' insert 'as well as carbon sequestration'. In line 7 after 'links' insert a new sentence reading 'The LDP seeks to implement this important strategy through site briefs, development principles and masterplans for development'.
1943	Scottish Rugby	Jones Lang LaSalle	Amendment to 'Open Space' designation on the Proposals Map.	Part of the Scottish Rugby Union (SRU) landholding is allocated as open space which encompasses the back pitch area. The area of open space represented on the proposals map is not correct as

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				the area covers the whole of the area from the Water of Leith to the western extent of the stadium. This area is private land and is used for wider Scottish Rugby operations. It is inappropriate to define this area as open space in terms of how open space is described in the LDP. Due to uncertainty surrounding the timescale of the Water of Leith flood prevention scheme and completion of the tram works, it is premature to outline any specific development requirements the SRU may pursue. Opportunities to be considered are largely outlined in the Main Issues Report representation.
1993	Spire Healthcare Ltd	Turley Associates	Remove the open space designation across the areas of lawn at Murrayfield House	Objects to lawn around Murrayfield House being designated as open space as the site is already protected due to Murrayfield House being a Category A Listed building. It is considered that the open space has extremely limited influence on the surrounding neighbourhood. These reasons provide justification for the removal of this designation.
2142	Edinburgh BioQuarter Partners	Scott Hobbs Planning Ltd	An urban parkland approach should be adopted in relation to the South East Wedge Parkland. Reference GS4 should be therefore amended.	Reference GS4 - 'The land around Craigmillar / Greendykes retained in the green belt will be landscaped to provide multi-functional parkland, woodland and country parks linking with parallel developments in Midlothian' should have the word 'country' removed from it to reflect the masterplan and Proposed Supplementary Guidance where there will be 'a higher density, more urban form of development previously planned' (Development Principle 1 of the Draft SG).
2164	George Nicolson (Decorators) Ltd	Montagu Evans LLP	Remove green space proposal GS3: Leith Links Seaward Extension	Objection on the grounds that there is no demand for greenspace in this area presently. It is understood from the current ECLP programme that adjacent proposal EW1c could take up to 30 years to be completed. The LDP should not be prescriptive in allocating this area of greenspace and that green or open space proposals should be provided when development comes forward. No objection to LDP aspiration to extend GS3 across Leith Links to Salamander Place and connect with the cycle/footpath on the

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				coast as long as it is not detrimental to the use of current business/industrial units on the site
2179	John Lewis	CBRE Ltd	Remove open space designation from area hatched in blue at Bonnington	An open space designation is not appropriate as much of the site is used for car parking.
2182	Land Options East	Derek Scott Planning	Change definition of greenspace	Proposed definition is over inclusive and combined with the open space definition provides a confusing definition for the latter. From the end of the definition add 'that contribute to the amenity of their surroundings and the City, provide for the recreational needs of residents and visitors, or an integral part of the city's landscape and townscape character and its biodiversity
2189	Mactaggart and Mickel	Holder Planning	Remove the open space designation at Hillpark Avenue	Planning permission for residential development has been granted for Mactaggart & Mickel on the Hillpark Avenue site. Therefore the open space designation should be removed and the site included in the urban area.
2203	New Ingliston Limited		Reduce the areas of open space in the proposals map in West Edinburgh to match the areas shown in the West Edinburgh Landscape Framework	Green space proposals area on proposals map are considerably larger and out of position with those shown in the West Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework. The areas should be maintained as shown in the WESDF.
2217	Peter Scott Planning Services		Addition of Mauseley Hill, Cammo Water Tower and adjacent land to 'Table 1. Greenspace Proposals'.	<p>Mauseley Hill, Cammo Water Tower and adjacent land should be included in 'Table 1. Greenspace Proposals' because they are important scenic and cultural features, complement the landscape character and wildlife habitats of the Cammo Estate and are used informally for recreation but are not managed for recreation or landscape or habitat conservation.</p> <p>Positive greenspace management is required for land including, and adjacent to Mauseley Hill and Cammo Water Tower to safeguard and enhance the landscape, cultural heritage, biodiversity and recreation values of the area, to complement the</p>

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				conservation and recreational values of the Cammo Estate and River Almond Walkway and to enhance the potential contributions of this area to the green belt and provide amenity and recreational benefits if LDP proposals for housing at Cammo go ahead
2222	West Craigs Ltd	GVA	Insert new bullet point in Paragraph 48	Insert 'Where CEC has failed to make provision for connectivity between key landholdings for green corridors via extant planning consents (e.g. Gogar rail station), it will ensure that all parties who benefit from such connectivity will contribute (including CEC), not just immediately adjacent land owners, and CEC will adopt any railway bridge structures offered to them as part of such connectivity'. Due account should be taken of the ability to deliver recreational green space on land currently owned by West Craigs Ltd adjoining new proposed housing at West Craigs, so meeting the relevant green space / recreational policies
2222	West Craigs Ltd	GVA	Add text to Paragraph 52	Add 'Any greenspace aspirations must be balanced by the requirement for the related development to be economically viable. For example the IBG Open Space is not necessary along all of the A8 corridor when the tram line acts as a physical screening along with the built environment e.g. Boundary walls
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Requests that the Development Principles relating to Housing Proposal IBG (Policy Emp 6) include some reference to the requirement for a flood risk assessment to be carried out to inform the design and layout of the finalised scheme.	The proposed site is located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. SEPA are aware of proposals to realign the Gogar Burn but a route is not finalised. We are also aware of recent changes to install the tram link to the Airport across the site which may mean our Indicative Flood Map is not representative of current conditions. A flood risk assessment would therefore need to be carried out to consider the existing risk of flooding (including works for the new tram line) and the on-going proposal to realign the Gogar Burn (GS7). Culverts and bridges also need to be considered. Expansion at this location may be constrained if mitigation cannot



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				be provided meaning future development may rely on works outside the site boundary. Other sites e.g. Maybury (HSG 19), Edinburgh Airport (Emp 4) and RBS HQ Gogarburn (Emp 6) may rely on land within this development to enable the Gogar Burn realignment. Consideration should be given to using a standard hydraulic model.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Amend the text relating to housing proposal HSG 17 to include: 'The finalised site capacity, design and layout should be informed by a flood risk assessment'	The proposed site is located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. SEPA is aware that a number of flood risk assessments have been carried out regarding the Niddrie Burn Restoration Project. However, if this consent were to lapse or not be implemented, any future applications would have to consider flood risk and as such an up-to-date flood risk assessment may be required.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Amend the text relating to housing proposal HSG 5 to include: 'The finalised site capacity, design and layout should be informed by a flood risk assessment'	The proposed site is located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. Part of the site, therefore, may not be suitable for development. Aware that SEPA commented on a Processing Agreement in January 2010 where we indicated that there was no risk of flooding to the site. This advice is now to be amended and it is suggested a flood risk assessment be submitted in support with any future application which examines the origin and risk from the small watercourse in the north-west of the site.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Amend the text relating to housing proposal HSG 4 to include: 'The finalised site capacity, design and layout should be informed by a flood risk assessment'	The proposed site is located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. Part of the site, therefore, may not be suitable for development. A flood risk assessment was undertaken in 2007 but this was high level with no specific modelling. This assessment indicated CEC advised on flood design levels close to the existing site levels but further information should be submitted.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection		Requests that the Development Principles for the business and residential development at	This site is located in a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. A flood risk assessment should be required which assesses the risk from the Gogar Burn and informs what parts of

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
	Agency		Edinburgh/South Gyle (Policy DtS 5) include some reference for a flood risk assessment to be carried so to inform the design and layout of the finalised scheme. Consideration should be given to whether there are any culverted watercourses within the site and pluvial flooding should be considered	the site are capable of development.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Amend the text relating to housing proposal HSG 26 to include: 'The finalised site capacity, design and layout should be informed by a flood risk assessment'	The proposed site is located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. The supporting Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) also recognises in the mitigation measures outlined in Appendix 3 that the site may be at risk from flooding. We are aware that a flood risk assessment has been carried out to support the planning application. However, if this consent were to lapse or not be implemented, any future applications would have to consider flood risk and as such an up-to-date flood risk assessment and mitigation measures may be required.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Amend the text relating to housing proposal HSG 27 to include: 'The finalised site capacity, design and layout should be informed by a flood risk assessment'.	The proposed site is located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. The supporting Strategic Environmental Assessment also recognises in the mitigation measures outlined in Appendix 3 that the site may be at risk from flooding. Aware that a flood risk assessment has been carried out to support the planning application. However, if this consent were to lapse or not be implemented, any future applications would have to consider flood risk and as such an up-to-date flood risk assessment and mitigation measures may be required.
2247	Scottish Environment		Requests that the Development Principles relating to Housing	The proposed site is located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. The northern perimeter of the site lies

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
	Protection Agency		Proposal HSG 30 include some reference to the requirement for a flood risk assessment to be carried out to inform the design and layout of the finalised scheme. The assessment would need to consider any bridges adjacent and downstream of the site and any work downstream at Greendykes.	within the Areas of Importance for Flood Control and a Fluvial Flood Risk Area as per the GIS files provided by the Council to SEPA during a previous consultation. As such a flood risk assessment will be required to assess the risk from the Niddrie Burn.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Additional supporting text should be included in Paragraph 57 which states: 'While many of these areas have had masterplans approved by the Council, planning applications coming forward may need to be updated to reflect current responsibilities under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act. Individual applications in these areas may therefore have to be supported by flood risk assessments'.	The Special Economic Areas outlined in Table 2 of the Proposed Plan are all located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. As such, parts of these sites may not be suitable for development. While we recognise that many of the site layouts have already been established through approved masterplans, these may not have been informed by current flood risk requirements outlined in Scottish Planning Policy and the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Amend the text relating to housing proposal HSG 18 to include: 'The finalised site capacity, design and layout should be informed by a flood risk assessment'	The proposed site is located adjacent to a functional flood plain or an area of known flood risk. Notes that the Strategic Environmental Assessment recognises this allocation does take in some land at fluvial flood risk however 'flood management solutions have already been identified for these'. SEPA is aware that a number of flood risk assessments have been carried out in this area regarding the Niddrie Burn Restoration Project. However, if this consent was to lapse or not be implemented, any future applications would have to consider flood risk and as such an up-to-date flood risk assessment and

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				mitigation measures may be required.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Amend the first sentence of Paragraph 41	Replace the term 'water quality' with 'ecological quality' which takes into account the biological quality elements of the water environment, not just whether it is polluted or not as implied by the term 'water quality'.
2255	Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS)	GVA Grimley Ltd	The Proposals Map should be amended to designate the Eyre Place gap site as 'white land' as opposed to its current designation as open space.	RBS is currently proposing a mixed-use re-development of this site e.g. Residential, office, retail care home, food and drink uses. Suggests an Open Space Audit be carried out now and not in 2014 in order to inform the preparation of the LDP and the value of open space designation at Eyre Place be re-assessed. The value of this 'open space' is not considered significant and it is expected that policies in the LDP will secure the delivery of replacement open space to compensate for the removal of the designation.
2271	sportscotland		The heading 'Countryside recreation' should be replaced with the term 'Outdoor Recreation' in the glossary and have the following definition: 'Passive or active recreational pursuits dependent on or derived from the use of the natural environment for their practice. Such activities require a range of buildings, structures and facilities from paths to slipways, changing to equipment storage and climbing walls to dry ski slopes'. Request that the definition of a green network extends outwith the urban area into the wider countryside.	While countryside recreation can have requirements for limited buildings, equally it can have requirements for medium and large scale buildings which impact on the definition. The definition needs to be clear on what is countryside recreation indicating the type of development proposals which might be associated with such a use. The term 'outdoor recreation' is now used. On a point of detail and to ensure consistency in the definition of green networks it is important for the glossary to make clear green networks extend outwith the urban area and into the wider countryside.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>Technical amendments have been made to the Proposals Map to remove open space designations from areas where planning permission had been granted and development has either commenced (2189) or has been completed (1943).</b>				
<b>The extent of Proposal GS6 shown on the Proposals Map has been amended to ensure consistency (2203). However proposed parkland along the A8 remains (2222)</b>				
<b>No other changes have been made.</b>				
<b>The Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan and Action Plan will not be a material consideration for all applications (351, 2297)</b>				
<b>Muirwood Field is covered by green belt designation. There is no justification to identify it as an open space proposal as well, and Planning Advice Note 65 does not include agricultural land within the definition of open space used for the open space audit and LDP. (1745)</b>				
<b>Open space deficiency is identified through the Council's Open Space Strategy (351, 2297)</b>				
<b>There is no justification to amend the Currie or Juniper Green Conservation Areas (1745, 1707)</b>				
<b>There is no current proposal for open space improvements at Mauseley Hill and Cammo Water Tower and no justification to require such a proposal in conjunction with housing proposal HSG20.(1747, 2150, 2217)</b>				
<b>The wording of Proposal GS8 explains the current position and future intentions for Inverleith Depot (1240)</b>				
<b>There are no committed proposals for the suggested new green space at Currie (1707)</b>				
<b>The open spaces shown in the LDP were identified through the Council's open space audit in consultation with local communities. (2101)</b>				
<b>The minor text changes requested by the Cockburn Association are not necessary or justified (1750)</b>				
<b>The reference in GS4 is to country paths not country parks. (2142)</b>				
<b>Proposal GS3 is the continuation of an existing local plan proposal (2164)</b>				
<b>The open space designation at Bonnington Road Lane (2179) is to be retained to ensure that any proposal involving loss of this open space also delivers appropriate new open space provision or improvements to existing open spaces.</b>				
<b>No changes have been made where open space still meets the definition of greenspace in Planning Advice Note 65 (1658, 1993 and 2255).</b>				
<b>The definitions of open space and greenspace are in line with Government policy (2182)</b>				
<b>Para 48 refers to green network opportunities across the plan – it is not appropriate to include a very specific reference to a particular land owner (2222)</b>				
<b>The need for a flood risk assessment is referred to in the supporting text for Policy Env21 Flood Protection – there is no need to repeat this for individual housing proposals (2247).</b>				
<b>The use of the term countryside recreation and its definition are considered appropriate in the context of this plan. The definition of green network doesn't refer to the urban area. (2271)</b>				

#### Issue 4 Economic Development and Shopping/Leisure

Issue 4 covers representations on economic development and shopping/leisure matters included in Part 1 Section 3 of the Proposed LDP. These representations are summarised in two tables.

**The purpose of the summary tables is to provide an indication of the number and nature of representations submitted. All representations along with any supporting documents can be viewed at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan). These representations have informed the preparation of the Second Proposed Plan. Each summary table includes sections explaining how the Council has had regard to the representations received on this issue.**

#### Economic Development

There were representations from 13 different organisations on economic development, including five representations supporting the plan in relation to Edinburgh Airport, Riccarton Campus and the BioQuarter. Representations seeking changes to the plan were mainly focused on the identification of additional employment opportunities and also included some suggested wording changes in relation to the BioQuarter and Gogarburn.

Ref No.	Organisation	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b>Supports Plan</b>				
1960	Scottish Property Federation			Welcomes the proposal to protect existing business and industry locations. Stresses importance of protecting Grade A office space in the city centre.
2140	Edinburgh Airport			Supports the safeguarding of the second runway and the retention of greenbelt policy within the second runway safeguard.
2140	Edinburgh Airport			Supports the wording of Policy Emp 4 Edinburgh Airport. The identification of Special Employment Areas highlights the unique contribution and opportunities associated with various land-uses around the urban edge.
2171	Heriot-Watt University	Muir Smith Evans		Welcomes the proposed removal of the campus from the greenbelt and the proposed identification of the

Ref No.	Organisation	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				Riccarton University Campus and Business Park as a Special Economic Area.
2274	Scottish Natural Heritage			Welcome development principles set out for the BioQuarter, particularly the need to respect the site's sensitive location within the wider landscape setting of the city.
<b>Comments</b>				
1941	Royal Yachting Association Scotland			Edinburgh could capitalise on its seaside location by improving recreational boating and encouraging marine tourism and events.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>One change is proposed relating to the above representation. In Table 2, the text for Riccarton in the Purpose Column now makes reference to the National Performance Centre for Sport (2171). Proposals relating to recreational boating and marine tourism can be assessed using relevant policies (1941)</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
1612	Harsco Infrastructure Services Ltd	Jones Lang LaSalle	Extension of policy Dts5 to include Bankhead Drive, and/or Relaxation of policy EMP8 to provide a wider mix of uses, and/or Widening of the corridor of the primary pedestrian / cycle route / movement corridor to incorporate sites that sit adjacent to it.	Suggests the inclusion of the site at Bankhead Drive as it is adjacent to the wider pedestrian/cycle and public transport initiatives and the site has the potential to contribute to the wider vision and initiatives promoted within the LDP and those listed for Area 1 on p54 in the LDP. Bankhead Drive provides an opportunity to form a gateway into the site.
1703	Amber Real Estate	Turley Associates	Requests changes to the	Suggests the designation of the Fairview Mill site for

Ref No.	Organisation	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			Edinburgh Airport boundary to comply with the BA masterplan and the designation of Fairview Mill site as employment uses with an accompanying policy that supports economic development of the site.	employment uses. Suggests an associated new policy to enable the development of the site for economic purposes.
1750	The Cockburn Association		There is reference to 'sustainable' - 'sustainable economic growth'. The glossary should be expanded to define all references to 'sustainable'.	The LDP makes extensive use of 'sustainable' but in various different forms e.g. Sustainable travel. Clarification is needed within the glossary as to whether all references to 'sustainable' derive from 'sustainable development' or whether there are different meanings for each 'sustainable' reference/issue.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Include reference to tree planting in the BioQuarter Development Principles.	Suggests tree planting on the upper slopes to provide a setting for buildings.
2142	Edinburgh BioQuarter Partners	Scott Hobbs Planning Ltd	Suggests the addition of text to the supporting text of policy Emp 2.	Suggests an additional sentence being added to the supporting text as follows: "The Supplementary Guidance and the Development Principles were informed by the EBQ Masterplan which the council supports as non-statutory guidance for the Edinburgh BioQuarter".
2142	Edinburgh BioQuarter Partners	Scott Hobbs Planning Ltd	Believes the purpose of the EBQ should be amended in Table 2.	Suggests the purpose of the EBQ should be revised to read "The main purpose of the BioQuarter is to become a top 10 global centre of excellence for life sciences offering opportunities for academic, commercial and clinical research and development with health care, teaching facilities and appropriate support services and facilities focused on the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary". This will then create consistency with the background section



Ref No.	Organisation	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				of the draft Supplementary Guidance.
2177	Hopetoun Estates Trust / Aithrie Estates	PPCA Ltd	Representation is lodged at paragraph 56 of the Local Development Plan.	New land should be identified in sustainable locations, such as Kirkliston and South Queensferry for development associated with major transport linkages such as the New Forth Crossing.
2213	Muir and Paton	PPCA Ltd	Representation is lodged at paragraph 56 of the Local Development Plan.	New land in sustainable locations such as Ratho should be identified for economic development given its association with major transport linkages such as the Tram.
2255	Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS)	GVA Grimley Ltd	Suggests amendments to the wording in Policy Emp 7 and Table 2.	Suggests the rewording of Policy Emp7 to read "Office and ancillary development will be supported within the boundary shown on the Proposals Map provided proposals are compatible with the existing function of the site, and accords with other relevant local development plan policies".  Suggests the reference to 'single user office development' in table 2 is removed and replaced with 'office development'.
2255	Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS)	GVA Grimley Ltd	The plan should recognise opportunities for new mixed uses at St Andrews Square to the rear of the banking premises.	Suggests that the site might offer an opportunity for mixed uses at St Andrew Square and an opportunity to link the line to the St James Quarter redevelopment to the east and should be recognised in the Plan.

Ref No.	Organisation	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
2262	Swanston Farms Ltd	GVA	Swanston Adventure Centre should be acknowledged within the LDP as a new landmark destination and tourist attraction at a key gateway location.	Suggests that Swanston Adventure Centre is recognised under the heading "Elsewhere Across the LDP Area". Suggests the major development here would enhance the green belt, promote development opportunities, protect the environment and provide regeneration opportunities to the site.

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

In Table 2, the text for the BioQuarter in the Purpose Column has been amended. (2142). The other representations relating to the BioQuarter (2142, 1750) raise matters which are addressed through the Supplementary Guidance.

The airport boundary at Fairview Mill has been amended to accord with the Edinburgh Airport Master Plan 2011. Whilst the mill site is not currently located within the area covered by the RHC master plan, it could be in the future. Policy Emp5 sets out appropriate uses and principles to guide any future redevelopment proposals. The site is not big enough to justify a bespoke LDP policy. (1703)

**No other changes have been made in response to the above representations:**

Bankhead Drive is separated from the Edinburgh Park/South Gyle area by a railway line. It is not appropriate to include this site in the area covered by policy DtS5. The site is more appropriately included within a business and industry allocation and covered by Policy Emp8. The plan allows small scale ancillary uses in these areas. There is no justification to widen the movement corridor at this location. (1612)

The issue of sustainable development and sustainable economic growth has recently been the subject of a Scottish Government consultation. The outcome of this will be known when the new Scottish Planning Policy is finalised. (1750)

No change is being sought to paragraph 56 (2177)(2213)

The existing function and purpose of the RBS Gogarburn site is as a single user, business headquarters. It is appropriate for the LDP to support this function and purpose in recognition of its importance to the Edinburgh economy. No change has been made (2255).

Any future proposals for mixed use at St Andrews Square (2255) or Swanston Adventure Centre (2262) can be assessed against relevant LDP policies. There is no justification for a LDP proposal.

### Shopping and Leisure

Shopping related representations were submitted by 26 different individuals and organisations, including four Community Councils and five Community Groups. Supporting representations referred to the importance of shopping and leisure to the economy and town, commercial and local centres. There were a total of 28 representations seeking changes to the plan. These included requests for the identification of additional local centres and amendments to the extent of centres. Representations seeking change were also received in relation to the description of and potential for future development in commercial centres.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Change Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Supports Plan</b>				
2149	The Grange Association			We strongly support the preservation of local shopping centres which provide a vital service for the elderly and infirm. Welcomes the inclusion of Ratcliffe Terrance and Marchmont South and North in the list of local shopping centres for accessibility and environmental reasons.
2244	West Blasket Association (WBA)			Welcome the identification and commitment to Local Shopping Centres.
1704	Aldi Stores Ltd	GVA		Supports the third bullet point at paragraph 131 where this seeks to ensure that some basic convenience provision is made or retained within walking distance of all homes.
1704	Aldi Stores Ltd	GVA		Supports the Aims and Strategy of the Proposed plan in respect of growth aspirations. In particular creating local jobs, supporting construction related employment and enhancing links with local suppliers. Aldi stores believe they can help address and support these aims.
2163	Gibraltar General Partner Ltd	Muir Smith Evans		Welcomes the recognition of shopping and leisure uses as major providers of jobs, especially for young people.  Welcomes the recognition that Newcraighall/The Jewel (together with other Commercial Centres) has a clear value to the City of Edinburgh in providing shopping and leisure facilities.
2237	Sainsbury's	Turley		Supports the inclusion of the Sainsbury's store within the

Ref No.	Name	Name	Change Requested	Summary of Representation
	Supermarkets Ltd	Associates		Gorgie/Dalry Town Centre.
2246	Blacket Association			Welcome the identification and commitment to Local Shopping Centres.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>No changes are proposed in relation to the matters raised in these supporting representations.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
2071	Old Town Community Council		Designate St Mary's Street and adjacent streets as a Local Centre.	To provide for local shops for people living in the Old Town.
2161	Grange/Prestonfield Community Council		At Table 6 include shops in Mayfield Road near the West Saville Terrace junction as a local centre.	Considers that the number and local importance of the shops qualify for inclusion as a local centre.
2190	Marchmont & Sciennes Community Council		Change to addresses specified as constituting the shopping clusters in Marchmont North and Matchmont South .	Supports the designation of local shops clusters (Marchmont North and Matchmont South as 'Local Centres'. However property numbers 26-60 in North Marchmont Local Centre (p117) include residential properties on Warrender Park Road. Suggests the removal of 36-46 Warrender Park Road from the shopping block. Suggests checking number in other clusters within the Marchmont Local Centres as some do not seem to be correct e.g. 126-146 Marchmont Road rather than 126-148 and 22-38 Marchmont Road rather than 26-36.
2226	Portobello Community Council		Add in statement about the fact there is no gap in supermarket provision in the city and therefore no need for new supermarkets, as previously mentioned in the MIR.	Would like to see a reference to the statement that the council believes there is no gap in supermarket provision in Edinburgh.
2221	Portobello Campaign Against The Superstore		The Main Issues Report made reference to there being no deficiency in provision of supermarkets in Edinburgh. This should be retained.	The inclusion of a clause to reduce the risk of further inappropriate supermarket applications will help to protect town centres and reduce the likelihood of further trips by car.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Change Requested	Summary of Representation
2244	West Blasket Association (WBA)		Identification of additional local centre.	Suggests the addition of the shopping units at Mayfield Road near the junction with West Saville Terrace as a Local Shopping Centre as it covers a range of shops.
2246	Blasket Association		Identification of additional local centre.	Suggests the addition of the shopping units at Mayfield Road, North of the junction with Saville Terrace as a Local Shopping Centre as they are locally important.
258	Liberton Association		Suggest the redefinition or subdivision of the term 'Local Centre' in order to give some indication as to the size of the centre (e.g. Large, medium, small).	Suggests the definition is misleading. Rather than the definitions simplifying the classification they should indicate the nature of the facility.
1170	Diana	Cairns	Add statement that was previously mentioned in the MIR page57 that there is no gap in supermarket provision in the city and therefore no need for any supermarkets.	Unlike in the MIR there is no reference to the statement that the council believes there is no gap in supermarket provision in Edinburgh. Would like to see a reference to this in the Proposed Plan.
2234	Ken	Wilson	Make changes to Table 7 - Commercial Centres to help ensure the SW corner of the Western Harbour does not become obscured to the general public and to tourists.	Suggests the document reflects the following: ' Any enlargement/extension of Ocean Terminal should not encroach on the open space to the north of the west car park structure'.
121	Britannia Quay Proprietors Association		Suggests rewording of this section of the document to read "Any enlargement/extension of Ocean Terminal should not encroach on the open space to the north of Ocean Terminal west car park structure at the SW corner of Western Harbour."	Suggests this change to ensure the SW corner of the Western Harbour remains accessible to the public and tourists.
1442	Cameron Toll SARL	Montagu Evans LLP	Seeks amendment to Policy Ret 3 and Table 7; Commercial Centres to allow for the support of the future regeneration of Cameron Toll.	Seeks support of the regeneration and extension of Cameron Toll Shopping Centre. Policy Ret 3 does not expect a gap in floorspace provision to enable a justification of any expansion to commercial centres.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Change Requested	Summary of Representation
				It is suggested that due to housing pressures in the south of Edinburgh the demand on Cameron Toll will be increased.
1704	Aldi Stores Ltd	GVA	Delete, or amend the second sentence of paragraph 74.  Delete, or amend the third sentence of paragraph 74.	Concerned by the over-generalisation that there is limited demand for new retail floorspace and absence of any gaps in the overall amount of retail provision in Edinburgh. Own findings and business turnover disagree with this conclusion. Suggests that the methodology used by the Council and the subsequent conclusions are not robust or consistent with best practice recommendations on 'Techniques for Development Planning'.
1960	Scottish Property Federation		More supportive text in para 74 on retail opportunities in Edinburgh whilst still reflecting the sequential approach and assessment of town centre impacts.	Concerns that these negative and unsubstantiated statements may influence decisions on viable opportunities.
2143	Ediston Properties & West Register (Realisations) Ltd	James Barr Ltd	Extend the boundary of the existing Chesser Avenue Local Centre to include the 'commercial' part of the Fruitmarket site/consent and re-designate this as a new Commercial Centre. This is a change to the Proposals Map and Tables 6 and 7 and Figure 8 of the proposed LDP.	There is extant consent for the retail development up to 58,000sq.ft. The site relates to the Chesser Local Centre both physically and visually, there are good transport links and the site is within walking distance of the existing designated Local Centre. Given the scale of the development there is a case to re-designate the extended centre as a Commercial Centre.
2143	Ediston Properties & West Register (Realisations) Ltd	James Barr Ltd	Extend the boundary of the existing Chesser Avenue Local Centre to include the 'commercial' part of the Fruitmarket site. This would include a change to the proposals map.	The LDP should reflect more accurately the planning permission for retail development that has been granted at the Fruitmarket and the significant change this will make to the area and the local centre.
2163	Gibraltar General Partner Ltd	Muir Smith Evans	Delete the existing text under the heading "Existing Role and Characteristics" and replace it with the alternative text suggested.	Suggests replacing the existing text with the following text: "One of the largest out-of-centre shopping areas in the UK. Contains a superstore, and a wide variety of non-food retail units, ranging in size from a DIY superstore to small shop units. Planning permission was recently approved for a

Ref No.	Name	Name	Change Requested	Summary of Representation
			Delete the existing text under the heading of "Current Commitments and Future Role" and replace it with alternative text suggested.	<p>multiplex cinema, which will replace a previous cinema which existed within Fort Kinnaird for almost 20 years. Although currently located on the edge of the urban area, this situation will change with the future development of housing areas at the South East Wedge and at Newcraighall. It provides shopping facilities for the southeast of the city and beyond. Well-served by buses. Also adjacent to Newcraighall railway station which will be served by the new Border rail link. The centre as whole now has 60units".</p> <p>Suggests changes to the text under 'Current Commitments and Future Role' to read as follows: "Planning permission granted in 2011 to reconfigure the centre. Retail floorspace is capped at 71, 502 sq m. There is a commitment to limit retail unit sizes".</p>
2169	Henderson Global Investors	GVA	Amendment of the City Centre Retail Core boundary to include the St. James Shopping Centre. Retention of the St. James Quarter boundary within this area. Removal of inaccurate and unsubstantiated text at paragraph 74 regarding future demand for retail floorspace within the city.	<p>Questions the definition of the 'City Centre Retail Core' set out by Figure 12 of the LDP, which currently excludes the St James Shopping Centre. Suggest the retail core boundary is altered to incorporate the St James Shopping Centre.</p> <p>Query comments on contained within paragraph 74. Suggest the comments are unnecessarily negative on future retail trends and could potentially lead to an investment within the city centre being directed elsewhere due to this negativity towards new retail proposals. Therefore encourage this text to be modified.</p>
2169	Henderson Global Investors	GVA	Amendment of the City Centre retail Core Boundary to include the St. James Shopping Centre. Retention of the St. James Quarter boundary within this area.	Questions the definition of the 'City Centre Retail Core' set out by Figure 12 of the LDP, which currently excludes the St James Shopping Centre. Suggest the retail core boundary is altered to incorporate the St James Shopping Centre.
2179	John Lewis	CBRE Ltd	Insert new paragraph after paragraph 132. The hierarchy and the sequential approach	Suggests the insertion of the following new text and paragraph:

Ref No.	Name	Name	Change Requested	Summary of Representation
			should be identified clearly, similar to way it has been in the draft Scottish Planning Policy document.	'For the avoidance of doubt, the sequential approach should be used when considering the local of new retail developments. This should be in order of preference as follows: - City Centre - Town Centre - Local Centre - Edge of Centre - Other commercial centres identified in the development plan; and - Out of centre locations that are, or can be made, easily accessible by a choice of transport modes'.
2205	NewRiver Retail Limited	Scott Hobbs Planning	Paragraph 54 would benefit from a clear reference to the importance of retail to the economic well being of the City.	Suggests the addition of retail to the following sentence: 'The strength of Edinburgh's economy is based on a range of key sectors, for example retail, tourism, financial services, life sciences and higher education'.
2205	NewRiver Retail Limited	Scott Hobbs Planning	The final sentence of paragraph 75 - Table 7 should be deleted as it introduces uncertainty, which is a deterrent for investment.	Suggests that the final sentence of paragraph 75 Table 7 in relation to Ocean Terminal should read: 'Any future increase in floorspace must reflect the scale and phasing of residential development, and not detract from the vitality and viability of town and local centres.
2212	Ocean Terminal Ltd	Holder Planning	Table 7 should be amended to ensure that it is consistent with the decision made by the Planning Authority when granting planning permission at Fort Kinnaird and the Unilateral Obligation signed by Gibraltar General Partners Ltd. In 2012, which restricts the new retail unit to 4000 sq.m.	Suggests Table 7 is amended to read: 'Planning permission granted in 2012 to reconfigure the centre. Floorspace is capped at 71,502 sq.m including a commitment to limit retail unit size to 4000 sq.m. And the amount of new floorspace'. Also believes 'No further growth beyond existing approvals' should be added.
2229	RDPC Limited		Amend third sentence of paragraph 71. Currently the text causes confliction with Table 6 and with Policy 3 in SESplan	Suggests the following amendments to the third sentence of paragraph 71: 'The LDP also supports the Commercial Centres which form part of the network of shopping centres



Ref No.	Name	Name	Change Requested	Summary of Representation
			causing confusion. Consequently the text should be amended to make clear that the Commercial Centres are part of the established network of centres and that their important roles are supported by the LDP.	and which play a valuable role in meeting shopping, leisure and other community needs across significant catchment areas".
2237	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Turley Associates	Extension of the Craighleith Commercial Centre boundary to include the Sainsbury's petrol filling station and adjacent play area.	Suggests the inclusion of the Sainsbury's petrol filling station and adjacent play area as they offer a range of uses within the centre and as such are consistent with the definition of commercial centres set out in Scottish Planning Policy. The petrol station adds to the vitality of the commercial centre.
2257	Tesco Stores Ltd		Amendment to the text in paragraph 74 to provide more supportive text on retail.	Supports the LDP's recognition of the hierarchy of centres and the economic importance of retail to Edinburgh. However paragraph 74 takes a negative stance on future retail development which may influence decisions on viable opportunities to modernisation and enhancement in the retail provision in Edinburgh. Suggests more supportive text to encourage investment in retail while still ensuring that the proposer cognisance is taken out of the sequential approach and the assessment of town centres impacts.
2257	Tesco Stores Ltd		Amendment to Rodney Street Local Centre boundary in the proposals map to include the Tesco Superstore on Broughton Road.	Suggests the inclusion of the Tesco Superstore within the Rodney Street Local Centre boundary as it plays an important part in connecting the local centre, adding to vitality and viability of the centre and would provide consistency with other Town Centres where Tesco superstores are included within the centre's boundary.

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

**Some changes have been made in response to the above representations**

**The wording of Para 74 has been amended to reflect changes in retail spending predictions (1704, 2257, 1960)**

**In Table 7, amendments have been made under Newcraighall/The Jewel to provide a more accurate description of the current planning permission and accessibility by public transport (2163, 2212)**

**Figure 12 City Centre Overview Map has been amended to clarify that the St James Quarter lies within the City Centre retail core**

Ref No.	Name	Name	Change Requested	Summary of Representation
(2169)				<p>The boundary of the Marchmont North Local centre has been reviewed and it is now proposed to exclude 36-46 Warrender Park and 1-3 Roseneath Street (2190)</p> <p>The boundary of the Craighleith Commercial Centre has been extended to include the petrol filling station and play area (2237)</p> <p>No further changes have been made for the reasons outlined below:-</p> <p>St Mary's Street does not justify a local centre designation because of its mix of uses and proximity to Nicolson Street/Clerk Street town centre (20171)</p> <p>The number of shops at Mayfield Road do not justify local centre status (2244, 2246)</p> <p>The policies in Part2 Section 6 Shopping and Leisure are considered appropriate to assess future supermarket applications (2226, 2221, 1170)</p> <p>Policy Ret 4 Local Centres requires proposals to be compatible with the character and function of the centre. This enables the different size of local centres to be considered. A subdivision of the terms is not considered necessary (258)</p> <p>Any future planning application to extend Ocean Terminal would be assessed in terms of relevant policies (121, 2205)</p> <p>There is no justification for the plan to specifically support further expansion of Cameron Toll beyond the existing consent. Policy Ret 3 sets out the policy criteria against which any future proposals would be assessed (1442)</p> <p>There is no justification to extend the Chesser Avenue local centre or designate it as a Commercial Centre at this time. This extent and status of the centre can be considered again in future plans once the Fruitmarket site is redeveloped. (2143)</p> <p>The sequential approach and retail hierarchy supported by Policies Ret 1 – Ret 5 are consistent with the Strategic Development Plan and Scottish Planning Policy (2179, 2229)</p> <p>The Tesco store at Rodney Street does not have direct functional or physical links with the Broughtone Road local centre (2257)</p> <p>The key economic sectors listed in para 54 are provided as examples and are of particular relevance to Edinburgh. There is no need to include retailing which is of more general importance across Scotland. (2205)</p>

### Issue 5 Housing and Community Facilities

Issue 5 covers representations to the housing and community facilities matters included in Part 1 Section 3 of the Proposed Plan.

A number of individuals and organisations submitted comments relating to housing and community facilities. However there was only one supporting representation. Representations seeking changes were received from 41 individuals and organisations, including three Community Councils and two Community Groups. A number of representations from landowner/developers relate to the LDP implications of the housing land requirement to be identified in SESPlan Supplementary Guidance. The other representations seeking change cover a wide range of issues such as brownfield development, housing opportunities in the Old Town and Cramond and the need for health and community facilities.

**The purpose of the summary tables is to provide an indication of the number and nature of representations submitted. All representations along with any supporting documents can be viewed at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan). These representations have informed the preparation of the Second Proposed Plan. Each summary table includes sections explaining how the Council has had regard to the representations received on this issue.**

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b>Supports plan</b>				
1727	Mactaggart & Mickel (Shawfair) Ltd & Buccleuch Properties Ltd	Colliers International		Support policy Hou 1 in the LDP. The Shawfair new settlement constitutes committed development in the SESplan area.
<b>Comments</b>				
2161	Grange/Prestonfield Community Council			Questions how the effects of blight are to be mitigated if growth is not achieved. Note all approved sites not shown on proposals map which when taken into account reinforce view that LDP makes provision for a generous supply of land which may not be needed for some time. Questions how LDP will ensure brownfield sites are developed first. Consider it unclear how plan will be sensitive to changes in composition of housing demand.
2244	West Blasket			Question how the effects of blight are to be mitigated if growth

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
	Association (WBA)			is not achieved. Concerned about process of ensuring brownfield sites developed before greenfield. Welcome commitment to provide for 'a range of housing needs' but considers this to be difficult in the current economic climate and with a perceived relaxation of national planning guidance. Suggest guidance to avoid concentrations of property size or type.
135	D Swan			Considers that the plan will have severe consequences on the local infrastructure. Envisage undue pressures on health services. Questions the reasons for building on such a large scale.
1707	A J C Clark			SESplan housing requirements should be treated with scepticism.
1707	A J C Clark			Proposal SCH1 is dependent on parliamentary approval. Better to reuse the existing school building with reduced pupil numbers.
1707	A J C Clark			There is no reference to the Kinleith Mill site for housing.
1707	A J C Clark			Housing should be located near to shops, workplaces and community facilities.
1707	A J C Clark			Insufficient information on education
1960	Scottish Property Federation			Until the SESplan supplementary guidance is finalised, the housing requirement is not known.
1960	Scottish Property Federation			No information is provided on programming of the new housing sites.
1960	Scottish Property Federation			The Council's windfall estimates are unduly optimistic. Windfall sites could provide flexibility towards achieving a generous supply of housing.
1960	Scottish Property Federation			Disappointed that the assumptions made on the housing land supply are not explained. LDP has not taken account of

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				Housing Land Audit 2012.
2246	Blacket Association			Question how the Council will deal with blight of areas not developed until latter part of Plan period and how the LDP will ensure brownfield sites are developed before greenfield.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>The representations above raise a number of issues in relation to housing. However, not all of them can be addressed through the plan. The Second Proposed Plan is accompanied by a number of supporting documents which provide further information on infrastructure and services and housing land. This plan takes account of Housing Land Audit 2013.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
1151	Balerno Community Council		Future housing should happen on brownfield sites	Partially supportive of housing section. However, in favour of Edinburgh retaining its current size. If further housing is required, it should take place on brownfield sites or areas within other Local Authorities.
2071	Old Town Community Council		Identify and include one or more housing sites in the Old Town. Identify a minimum housing capacity on mixed use City Centre sites and at King Stables/West Port.	To provide homes in the Old Town.
2190	Marchmont & Sciennes Community Council		Additional safeguard for new primary school for South Edinburgh at proposed site in current Astley Ainslie Hospital Site.	Questions if there should be a safeguard given statement by Councillor that Council wish to purchase land to build a new school. Considers that there is pressure on school places in South Edinburgh.
537	Edinburgh South West Communities Forum		Seek justification of housing figures demanded for LDP area.	There is no justification for further landbank for housing. Should explore incentives for development of brownfield land. A halt should be made to outward growth of the city. Policies needed to accommodate a broader range of houses within communities. Traffic should be minimised by utilising brownfield sites near the city centre.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
1926	Friends of Craighouse		Greenfield allocation of housing reduced or removed. Brownfield site should be promoted.	There is an over allocation of land against government targets. Allocation of greenfield sites is excessive and if not reduced will leave brownfield sites derelict. Net effect will be economic harm. Excessive to provide strategic development land beyond current 10 year allocation. Housing projections not credible.
55	Anthony Gray		Like to see community facilities appraisal undertaken in relation to all proposed housing developments. Findings should be included in development principles.	Concerned that there appears to be no appraisal of impact on existing or non-existent community services. Any required infrastructure to support Policy Hou 10 should be included in development principles, which would in turn inform the Action Programme.
236	Lauren Guazzelli		Include Cramond as an area for development of new build affordable housing.	Propose development of affordable housing in the Cramond area. Considers that it's location, recreation areas and adjacency to non green belt space make it ideal for development.
258	Liberton Association		Guarantee that "generous" supply of building land will not make provision for large numbers of houses greatly in excess of identified need. More robust commitment to brown field sites and an indication of how windfall sites are included in overall figures.	Suggest some proposed sites should not be considered for development until brownfield sites in South East Edinburgh are built on.
1168	Sarah Boyack MSP		Include reference to the provision of older people's housing generally and in major sites and development areas.	Not clear where new housing for older people and new care homes will be located. Draft SPP requires the issue of housing for older people to be addressed in LDPs.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
1435	Simon Byrom		Driver for increasing population needs to be clarified.	Economic growth is putting pressure on greenspaces and greenbelt land to the long term detriment of environmental and social well being. Questions how this can be reconciled. Asks if a projected assessment has been carried out that envisages the stabilising of the population and economy.
1705	A Allison	Ronald H Oliver	Reword policy to confirm that, as required by SPP, it will meet the demands for plots for inter alia individually designed houses and smaller scale housing development to meet the demands for self-build groups and small scale house builders.	Plan fails to address SPP. Commentary and maps of countryside policy area should be re-examined to determine if there are areas that may be released for development within the countryside policy area. Suggests this could be seen as a modification to the plan which in addition to meeting requirements of SPP would add additional land for residential development.
1707	A J C Clark		Prepare a site brief for Curriehill Primary School	Building could be used for small workshops, offices, training facilities.
2110	John Kelly		Take into account that building on Portobello Park is forbidden by law. Build new school on brownfield site.	Correct procedure to fulfil conditions of title deed and build new school on brownfield site.
2152	Edith Gray		Statement at para 61 that "This LDP must identify sites for 2,000 houses in West Edinburgh", is misleading. Specific housing need for Edinburgh, rationale and supporting statistics should be stated to underpin requirement for large increase in houses.	Sites identified exceed 2,000 in West Edinburgh and 1,000 in South East Edinburgh. Question significance of population increase. Baseline for population increase should be available for scrutiny. Considers there to be some brownfield sites undergoing planning permission that are not in the estimates.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
2191	Ian McPherson		More consideration needed of sporting facilities such as replacement Meadowbank stadium and Velodrome and Saughton stadium.	Believe plan does not comply with Hou 10. Plan ignores necessary leisure development. Would like to see potential development sites for athletics arena and sports village in west of city. Envisage facilities to be in the west beside Maybury to take advantage of transport links. Would like to see a certified outdoor track with indoor training to replace Saughton Stadium.
1737	Trustees of the Catchelraw Trust & Barratt David Wilson Homes	Clarendon Planning & Development Ltd	Delete the last paragraph of Hou 1 and replace with "The need for additional housing sites is being assessed via SESplan Supplementary Guidance, which is due to be prepared in 2013. As such, should additional housing sites be required, these sites will be allocated via a modification to the LDP with associated consultation."	Support Policy Hou 1 and its designations. Consider last para will be made redundant by the SESplan process. Proposed amendment will allow for flexibility to maximise viability and deliverability.
1744	Cala Management Ltd	Ryden	Need to specifically identify smaller sites and provide an appropriate mix of upper market housing, particularly in the North West of the City. Changes needed in relation to housing land to accord with the SDP.	Additional housing land is needed now to meet SDP requirements and accord with SPP. This should provide a range and choice of allocations that are marketable and deliverable. Land at Craigmook Road could help deliver this.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Modify paragraph 65 to explain and justify more clearly the new, greenfield housing proposals in the strategic development areas.	Should explain that certain proposals are intended to fulfil requirement of SDP for sites and the reason for the generosity above the SDP requirement should be given. Questions why reasonable alternatives have also been included in plan.



Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
1750	The Cockburn Association		Difficult to support statements made for more housing land due to concern over accuracy of extrapolated trend data, amount of surplus office stock which could be used for housing, lack of classification of housing need into type, ability of landscape design to convert brownfield to greenfield which is preferable to erosion of greenbelt. Unclear why demolitions have been deducted from housing land requirement.	Believe paragraphs relating to housing land should reflect concerns about the growth of Edinburgh. Question what is meant by growth and where the balance should be. Consider that the inference Edinburgh can only grow its economy by consuming more land is unproven.
1751	Danzan 2003 Trust	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.
1855	NHS Lothian		Request healthcare provision is given due regard.	Welcome the many aspects of Plan that will contribute to improving health. Concerned about the house building programme and resultant population increase which will impact on health services. Seek LDP to positively reflect potential changes to the Health estate.
2141	The Edinburgh & Lothians Health Foundation	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. A substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	
2165	Hallam Land Management Ltd	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure (E&I) UK Ltd	Preparation of supplementary guidance immediately to respond to recommendations of SESplan Report of Examination.	Support principle of Hou 1 but seek to change two years from the adoption of the Plan before consideration of supplementary guidance.
2173	HolderPlanning Ltd		Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.
2174	Homes For Scotland		Rewrite entire housing section following approval of Strategic Plan and supplementary guidance.	Housing technical paper and Plan should use most up to date evidence. Amount of Edinburgh's demand to be accommodated elsewhere in the city region is not identified in the SDP. There is no discussion of how green belt objectives could be supported while allowing development on parts of green belt and reconfiguring boundaries and areas designated. Figures provided at para 60 are redundant and further analysis required by SESplan reporters will increase requirements in Edinburgh. Shortfall in housing land should be treated as a material consideration and a positive approach should be taken to granting consent on allocated and non-allocated sites.
2182	Land Options East	Derek Scott Planning	Amend LDP to conform to supplementary guidance. Additional sites to those identified in Hou 1 will have to be brought forward.	Anticipate that supplementary guidance will require additional sites to be released.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
2189	Mactaggart and Mickel	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.
2194	Miller Homes	Geddes Consulting	Reassess and update Table 3 and Table 4. Reassess and update housing land shortfall and generous land supply in accord with SPP and Reporter's recommendations.	There is no evidence that the LDP complies with SPP. Development strategy adopted will not deliver the required housing completions. Housing land methodology does not comply with SPP. It is based on out-dated evidence and requirement is pessimistic. Recommends a minimum housing land requirement of 26,900 and maximum of 48,490 from 2009 to 2024. Estimates of land supply have not been agreed with house building sector and include many constrained sites. Existing proposals have not been tested for effectiveness. Request that established land supply is reassessed. Further sites are required to meet housing land shortfall.
2194	Miller Homes	Geddes Consulting	Remove last para of Policy Hou 1. Also, insert new Policy to support policy Hou 1 - 'Policy Hou 1a Housing Land Flexibility' "The Council shall maintain a five year effective housing land supply at all times to meet the housing land requirement set out in the SESplan Supplementary Guidance over the LDP period (2009-2024) in accord	Need to implement a policy mechanism to ensure a 5 year land supply maintained at all times as well as identifying a mechanism to ensure compliance. Sites outwith the Strategic Development Areas and the existing settlements should be acceptable. Proposed supplementary guidance in 2017 is too late to rectify any shortcomings in the delivery of the strategy or maintain a 5 year effective land supply.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			<p>with Policy Hou 1. This will be monitored by an annual housing land audit. Additional sites for housing, including greenfield land, may be granted planning permission where it is necessary to maintain a five year effective housing land supply. These new housing developments need to satisfy each of the following criteria:</p> <p>a) The development will be in keeping with the character of the settlement and local area;</p> <p>b) The development will not undermine greenbelt or countryside objectives; and</p> <p>c) any additional infrastructure required as a result of the development is either committed or to be funded by the developer."</p>	
2195	Miller Homes Ltd	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.
2198	Mrs N Bowlby's	PPCA	Change plan to reflect	Object to continuation of existing strategy for Edinburgh

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
	1992 Trust		representation.	Waterfront. No progress has been made in residential development. Area fails test of marketability. Proposed introduction of business and employment will not improve marketability. Suggest solution would be to re-allocate a significant proportion of housing numbers to areas that are marketable such as South Queensferry.
2199	Murray Estates	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.
2204	Ogilvie Homes	Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	All work on proposed plan suspended pending completion of supplementary guidance.	Impossible for the plan to be further progressed until actions recommended in the Report of Examination into SESplan are fully considered and implemented. No strategic basis for housing land requirement. Continuation will cause unnecessary expense for all parties.
2204	Ogilvie Homes	Andrew Bennie Planning Limited	Revise wording of paragraph 93.	Do not agree that the plan is visionary or can state that it aims to make Edinburgh the best that it can be. Plan lacks desire to create conditions to allow Edinburgh to grow and prosper. Generous supply of housing land should be provided at all time not just when economy thriving.
2211	Planning & Architecture Division, Scottish Government		Plan must reflect outcomes of SESplan process with regard to housing land supply and allocation of sites.	Proposed plan should not be submitted to Ministers until the strategic housing position is clear.
2213	Paton and Muir	PPCA Ltd	Change plan to reflect representation.	Consider additional housing land supply insufficient. Mortgage availability and economic conditions are not material planning reasons for not allocating a generous supply of land. Consider

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				<p>approach contrary to SPP. Base land supply does not take account of failure to deliver the Waterfront. Master plans for this area should be re-written. Consider if the tram is not provided the waterfront is undeliverable. More housing land requires to be identified which can only be done through green belt release. Consider that the environmental capacity of the A8 corridor has not been fully exploited by the LDP. Raise concern over the identification of only four strategic sites. Consider this does not provide an adequate range and choice of housing sites. Suggests a number of smaller deliverable sites should be identified.</p>
2213	Paton and Muir	PPCA Ltd	Change plan to reflect representation.	<p>Object to paragraph 8, 93 and Table on page 4 which state LDP is consistent with the SDP. This not the case as SDP subject to significant modification. As such proposed allocations are premature and insufficient to meet the SDP requirements.</p>
2213	Paton and Muir	PPCA Ltd	Change plan to reflect representation.	<p>Object to continuation of existing strategy for Edinburgh Waterfront. No progress has been made in residential development. Area fails test of marketability. Proposed introduction of business and employment will not improve marketability. Suggest solution would be to re-allocate a significant proportion of housing numbers to areas that are marketable such as Ratho.</p>
2216	Persimmon Homes East Scotland		<p>Identify a generous supply of housing land as required by national policy and meet identified need for housing. Identify additional sustainable housing sites to achieve a generous supply of housing.</p>	<p>The amount of Edinburgh's demand to be accommodated elsewhere in the city region is not identified in the SDP. There is no discussion of how green belt objectives could be supported while allowing development on parts of green belt and reconfiguring boundaries and areas designated. Figures provided at para 60 are redundant and further analysis required by SESplan reporters will increase requirements in Edinburgh. Reasonable to think demand may be higher if supply were</p>

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				<p>available given the scale of commuting. Contribution to meeting strategic housing land requirement is not on the basis of an assessed requirement for the city. It is supply-side and has no relationship to demand.</p> <p>No requirement against which to assess supply. Consider that even based on the figures provided the supply cannot be said to be generous. Disregards changes in effectiveness and constraints since 2010 undermining spatial strategy and assertions of generous supply.</p> <p>There has been an increase in the amount of constrained supply. Need to look at existing site allocations and consents and improve understanding of extent to which they are constrained or effective.</p>
2222	West Craigs Ltd	GVA	Insert into para 63 "The market should decide when these locations are built out and delivered to ensure a flexible approach to the delivery and phasing of housing land."	Imposed phasing will hamper provision of an effective 5 year supply. There is likely to be a requirement for sites to come forward earlier than expected. Sites promoted in LDP, including Maybury, should not be delayed with unnecessary phasing. This conflicts with SESplan Report of Examination which expects a greater supply of housing in the Edinburgh area.
2222	West Craigs Ltd	GVA	Remove Edinburgh Waterfront sites as existing housing sites.	Object on grounds that Reporter's Report into SESplan expresses concern on over reliance of existing sites and HLA notes sites undeveloped due to constraints. Combined with likely increase in land requirement for SDAs over reliance on existing proposals compounds ability to maintain 5 year effective supply. Cannot see how inclusion of sites can be reconciled with Reporter's recommendations.
2222	West Craigs Ltd	GVA	Insert text into para 61 "Our client supports the reference to the requirement to provide a minimum of 2,000 houses	LDP must reflect SESplan and West Craigs land should be promoted for a minimum of 1,500 units plus to meet the housing requirements and promote an effective housing supply.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			in Maybury in accordance with the SDP.	
2231	Rosebery Estates Partnership	Strutt & Parker	Undertake assessment of ability of brownfield and SDAs to deliver additional short term housing numbers and assess other opportunities within city boundary. Draw the greenbelt boundary now in accordance with a view to accommodating planned growth.	Object to Housing and Community Facilities Section on grounds that it will have to be revisited when SESPlan Supplementary Guidance has been prepared. To make best advantage of accessibility of Edinburgh Council area an analysis of the area should be undertaken before displacing need and demand to other areas. Plan does not deliver a 5 year effective supply. Believe brownfield and SDAs limited in the number of additional short term housing numbers they can deliver. Consider this justifies a wider distribution of effective sites. Notes that provision made in SESplan Policy 7 to allocate greenfield sites outwith SDAs and suggest sites at Balerno and Dalmeny as suitable. Green belt boundary should be drawn to accommodate growth. Role of plan in promoting development opportunities is not reflected in plan. Suggests North West and South West Edinburgh as areas for consideration as suitable locations for additional growth and this should not be prejudiced by unnecessarily including it within the green belt.
2245	SEEDco	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.
2261	Taylor Wimpey	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.



Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			required by modified SESplan.	
2280	Stewart Milne Homes	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.
2281	Springfield Properties Plc	Holder Planning	Allocate sufficient, effective housing sites to meet the Edinburgh Housing Requirement as defined by the Supplementary Guidance required by modified SESplan.	Publication of the plan is premature. Due to basis on Proposed SESplan difficult to comment meaningfully. Concerned about the housing land methodology. Substantially greater number of effective housing sites need to be allocated by the LDP.

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

**A number of changes have been made to the housing section in Part 1 of the plan to accord with the approved Strategic Development Plan and its Supplementary Guidance and to take account of the points raised in many of the above representations.**

**The increased housing allocations in the Second Proposed Plan are necessary to meet Edinburgh's Housing Requirement identified in the SDP Supplementary Guidance. The LDP has to be consistent with this Supplementary Guidance. (537) (1926) (258) 1435) (2152) (1750)**

**Further information on the housing sites identified to meet Edinburgh's housing requirement is provided in the Housing Land Study, Edinburgh's Housing Land Audit 2013 and the LDP Environmental Report - Second Revision Volume 2.**

**The plan does not introduce any unnecessary phasing (2222)**

**Specific references have been made to healthcare facilities in response to comments from NHS Lothian (1855). No further changes have been made in relation to community facilities generally because the policies, proposals and development principles in the plan provide support for future provision (55)**

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				<p>An addition sentence has been added to Policy Del3 (previously DtS3) in relation to housing in the City centre (2071)</p> <p>It is considered that the policies and the proposals in the plan adequately address the points raised in relation to housing for Older People (1168), affordable housing at Cramond (236), small housing plots (1705), the redevelopment of the former Curriehill school (1707) and the provision of sports facilities (2191).</p> <p>There is no current confirmed proposal for a primary school at Astley Ainslie so no justification for its inclusion as a safeguard in this plan(2190).</p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for Portobello High School – this justifies its inclusion in the plan (2110)</p>

## Issue 6 Existing Housing Proposals

Issue 6 covers representations to existing housing proposals, i.e. sites that already have planning permission and/or were identified in previous local plans. These are listed as Proposals HSG1 – HSG18 in Table 3 of the Proposed LDP. These representations are summarised in two tables, one relating to HSG9 City Park and the other covering other housing proposals.

**The purpose of the summary tables is to provide an indication of the number and nature of representations submitted. All representations along with any supporting documents can be viewed at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan). These representations have informed the preparation of the Second Proposed Plan. Each summary table includes sections explaining how the Council has had regard to the representations received on this issue.**

### HSG9 City Park

There were 77 representations (including one Community Council and one Community Group) objecting to Proposal HSG9 and requesting its re-designation open space.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
68	Marjorie D H	Russell	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
123	Graeme	Tennant	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
126	Sheena	Stewart	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
133	Chris	Taylor	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
137	Hugh	Binnie	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
141	Andrew	Hayes	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be destroyed by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
146	K	Winn	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be destroyed by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
152	Sah Ming	Chen	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be destroyed by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
157	David	Maxwell	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
158	Susan	Kime	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
207	Mounir EL	Quahhabi	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
301	Margaret	Scott	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
335	D A	Beaumont	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
352	Helen	Macleod	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
405	Anne	James	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
452	W	Lowson	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan. The development design will create a 'rat run' between the two rows of buildings from Ferry Road to the cycle path. This will encourage vandalism and burglary and lighting the area will not be enough as lights will be broken by criminals.
486	Bill	Gilmour	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
489	Barbara	McFarlane	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
515	Lynda	Atha	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
516	John	Macualay MBE	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
518	J	Beck	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
779	Dan	Lin	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
835	Fiona	Grove	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
836	Deirdrie	Barclay	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
837	Derek	Saunders	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
844	Alasdair & Elizabeth	Lamont	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
852	Morag	Cumming	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
853	Mark	Barclay	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
854	A P	Mathieson	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1009	D	Wood	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1010	C	Prior	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1011	A F	Welham	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1012	Christine k	Noonan	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1023	Mary	Burnett	Re-designation of HSG 9	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			(City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1024	Linda	O'Neil	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1025	Melanie	Findlay	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1026	Isobel	Kinloch	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1027	Viv	Lauder	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1028	Karen	Scott	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			Winnelstrae) to public open green space	people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1029	Margo	Wimberley	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1030	Robert	Wilson	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1031	James	McArthur	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1032	W I H	Mcgeachy	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1033	Lesley	Murphy	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			open green space	ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1034	Sheila	Collie	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1035	R	McPherson	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1329	Christine	Emmett	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1330	Jen	Robertson	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1332	William	Wood	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1333	C. E.	Wood	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1340	Kirsten	Mutch	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1350	Barbara	Noonan	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1378	Joan	Balfour	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1462	G	Coppola	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1569	Pamela	Geddes	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1611	Katherine	Hart	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1613	Christopher	Harris	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1656	Jenny	Johnston	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1696	Iain	Lauder	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
1759	Viswanath	Matta	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1824	Elizabeth E	Moffat	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1905	Malhar	Patel	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1906	Manisha	Patel	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1924	Paul	Reid	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1952	Raini	Scott	Re-designation of HSG 9	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
			(City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
1964	Jennifer	Short	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
2004	Andrew B.	Tait	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
2007	Robin	Tannock	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
2009	Norma	de Oliveira Tait	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan. Suggests City Park could be used as a space for children/young people, a community garden project, for allotments or as a space for wildlife and wild flowers the community could enjoy.



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
2032	Lee	Tylers	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
2137	Malcolm	Stanton	Remove proposal HSG9	Objects on the grounds that the proposals are not in accordance with the 2008 Statement of Urban Design Principles for the site, proposed residential use has an introverted cul-de-sac layout which does not integrate into its surroundings, development of brownfield sites should take priority over greenfield sites, an assessment has not been carried out regarding the affordable housing provision being above the regional benchmark of 25%, impact on local amenities, the massing, scale, design and mix of units are not in keeping with the surrounding area, the proposals do not meet requirements for pedestrian access, vehicular access and car parking, there is no secondary access road as required for sites over 200 units and open space and playing fields are required in this area.
2186	Isobel	Macdonald	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton Community Council Ward, East Pilton Park will not be sufficient to serve the wider community area around it with housing development at Strada and Telford College North, City Park and the adjoining meadow land offer a well connected and accessible open green space that connects to a 'green corridor' which East Pilton Park does not, loss of amenity, loss of ecological value, loss of wildlife, health benefits, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
2214	David	Page	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
				the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
2284	Beverley	Paterson	Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
2298	Malcolm	Chisholm MSP	Redesignate as public green open space	Supports the demands of the Save City Park action group as there is a shortage of public green open space in this part of town.
1948	Save City Park Action Group		Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton and District Community Council area, health benefits for local people, wildlife and biodiversity will be damaged by development, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan. States that a number of local sporting groups have expressed an interest in using the City Park football pitch and it is suitable for such a use as the pitch is self-contained. Suggests the adjoining meadowland at West Winnelstrae be used as allotments for the local community and would also be ideal a school garden and urban nature reserve.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representations
2160	Granton and District Community Council		Re-designation of HSG 9 (City Park - West Winnelstrae) to public open green space	Re-designation should occur because there is a shortage of green space in the Granton Community Council Ward, East Pilton Park will not be sufficient to serve the wider community area around it with housing development at Strada and Telford College North, City Park and the adjoining meadow land offer a well connected and accessible open green space that connects to a 'green corridor' which East Pilton Park does not, loss of amenity, loss of ecological value, loss of wildlife, health benefits, there is an ongoing need for playing fields, allotments and provision of a community and/or school garden and there was a lack of consultation with residents when the site was designated for housing in the finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
This proposal is included in the Second Proposed Plan. It is currently a housing proposal in the Edinburgh City Local Plan and planning permission was granted in June 2013.				

### Other Existing Housing Proposals

There were only three other proposals receiving representation seeking a change to the plan – HSG1, HSG4 and HSG11 Supporting representations were submitted in relation to Proposals HSG 4, HSG5, HSG7 and HSG8.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Support Plan</b>				
1489	Ediston Properties Ltd	John Handley Associates Ltd		Confirmation of client support for HSG 4 in Table 3 of the Proposed LDP and Proposals Map. The site has outline planning permission with the full permission and legal

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				agreement expected to be agreed later this year. Further information can be provided to CEC and the DPEA as part of any LDP examination.
1809	Miller Homes	GVA Grimley Ltd		Miller Homes supports the continued identification of the former Telford College site as a housing allocation (HSG 8). Development has commenced and the majority of new build residential accommodation is complete or under construction. Miller Homes is continuing to try and find a viable solution to the rest of the site in order to deliver 300 or more units as set out in the Proposed LDP's estimated site capacity.
2227	Ratho & District Community Council			Ratho & District Community Council strongly support housing proposals HSG 4 and 5 at West Newbridge and Hillwood Road, Ratho Station respectively. The proposals will help bring life to an ageing community and are situated on key public transport links.
2235	The Royal Zoological Society of Scotland (RZSS)	GVA		Supports continued identification of land at the western edge of the Zoo as a housing allocation (HSG 7) in the Proposed LDP. The land is surplus to requirements of the zoo and development for housing will help the RZSS realise its ambitions for re-development and enhancement of the entire zoological park.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>All of the housing proposals referred to in these representations are included in the Second Proposed Plan</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
1465	Desmond Coyne		Development should not go ahead at HSG 1	Objects on the grounds of further disturbance to local residents alongside the construction of the New Forth Crossing, the site is not brownfield and is green apart from a temporary works compound for the new Forth Crossing, the development description not accounting for the full context of development, a link road from Bo'ness Road to Society Road

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				will run between the edge of my garden and a SUDs for the new Forth Crossing and the link road will be used for traffic accessing Hopetoun House in West Lothian.
1561	Frasers Hamilton (Shrubhill) Ltd (in Administration)	GL Hearn	Widen range of uses supported across HSG 11 Shrub Place.	Welcome identification of site for housing however request that recognition is given to fact that planning history confirms suitability of site for non-residential uses as part of site falls within Leith Town Centre.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Clarification sought over development at HSG 4: West Newbridge and Dreghorn Polo Fields	Clarification sought over whether houses in HSG 4: West Newbridge are to be excluded from the Airport Public Safety Zone and over the omission of Dreghorn Polo Fields from Table 3 despite being granted outline permission in 2012.
2001	Doug Tait		More complete information should be made to wider local communities in order to enable an effective review and then feedback by them on HSG 1. Full consultation needs to be carried out with local communities.	The level of detail is inadequate to provide an effective review of proposal HSG 1 and information has not been readily provided to local residents. The proposal will have a significant impact on more residents than the few notified around the site boundary. Prior planning permission should be invalidated as an experimental road was built to keep the permission live and has since been removed.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
2181	Ken & Christine Kirkcaldy		Reduction of the proposed site area of HSG 1 to reflect the reduced amount of available land since planning approval and subsequently the proposed housing numbers and public facilities should be re-assessed	The area shown in the Proposed LDP does not account for the major works being carried out on site in connection with the Forth Replacement Crossing. A substantial earth mound now runs along the roadway to mitigate noise and visual impact on housing to the east of the proposed connecting roadway to the new bridge. A SUDS basin constructed on site is larger than originally proposed and occupies a large amount of land along the northern boundary of the site. A major new sewer runs along the northern edge of the site and outfalls to Society Road. The topography of the area is such that a large amount of excavation work will be needed to complete the link road which would be expensive and may make a link road unfeasible. Mitigation works would also be needed along the eastern boundary reducing the amount of housing.

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

**A reference to other uses at Shrub Place (HSG 11) has been added to Table 3 (1561).**

**No other changes have been made in response to these representations**

**Proposal HSG1 is currently a housing proposal in the Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan and planning permission has been granted. (1465) (2181).**

**Airport Public Safety Zones are drawn by the Civil Aviation Authority not the Council (1750).**

**The Polofields is one of a large number of “windfall” sites across the city where planning permission has been granted for housing. These are not LDP proposals (1750).**

### Issue 7 New greenfield housing proposals in West Edinburgh – Maybury and Cammo

Issue 7 covers representations to two greenfield housing sites in West Edinburgh – HSG19 Maybury and HSG20 Cammo. It also includes representations to the school proposal SCH6 at Maybury. These representations are summarised in four tables

- HSG19 Maybury
- HSG20 Cammo
- HSG19 & HSG20 (some representations referred to both sites on one form)
- SCH6 Maybury

**The purpose of the summary tables is to provide an indication of the number and nature of representations submitted. All representations along with any supporting documents can be viewed at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan). These representations have informed the preparation of the Second Proposed Plan. Each summary table includes sections explaining how the Council has had regard to the representations received on this issue.**

#### HSG19 Maybury

67 representations were received on housing proposal HSG 19 Maybury. 61 came from individuals and six from organisations. Two representations were in support of the proposal, two were comments only and 63 were seeking change to the plan. Most of those seeking change are objecting to the principle of development and want the proposal removed from the plan.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Support Plan</b>				
1749	Corstorphine Old Parish Church			Consider the site an acceptable area for housing and will make a significant contribution to the 2000 homes required in West Edinburgh. Believe there are good transport links to this area. Concerned that the proposed roundabout improvements are undertaken at the start of the development to avoid congestion. Suggest the highest part of the site be used for a social space, which respects the landscape.
2012	Taylor Wimpey	Turley Associates		Recognise the importance of a design led approach and phased approach to the development. Agree with the provision of a green network and green space. Acknowledge the form and scale of development and height sensitivity to the northern part of the site.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Comments</b>				
1315	Ian	Rodger		Queries whether brownfield sites have been considered above green belt as the plan does not state whether or not it has.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>The support for this housing proposal and comments relating to the development principles set out in the plan are noted. Further information is now provided in the plan and supporting housing report on how development on brownfield sites will contribute towards meeting the housing requirement.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
74	John	Henderson	Keep site in the green belt	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on existing schools and community facilities. Also it is a flood risk area.
77	Robert	Grossman	Retain nature reserve at north end of West Craigs Industrial Estate	Area is attractive to birds and should not be lost.
120	Graeme	Brownlee	Proposals rejected	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on existing schools. Also concerned about environmental impact.
443	Fiona	Lind	Development should not go ahead.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and impact on community services and local schools.
651	David R	Taylor	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased congestion, loss of green belt, increased air pollution, lack of infrastructure, impact on existing schools and the failure to consider alternative sites.
652	Jennifer	Taylor	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increase in air pollution, loss of green belt and the failure to consider alternative sites.
657	Walter B	Campbell	Remove proposal. Protect the green belt.	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt and agricultural land, impact on traffic. Area to south of bypass should be considered.
736	B	Woodroffe	Better traffic management at Craigs Road and Maybury Junction	Need to address impacts of additional car traffic.
847	James	Fraser		Objects because of impacts on businesses and traffic impact.
995	Christopher	Boam	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt and agricultural land, impact on wildlife, impact on Cammo Park, traffic impact and loss of amenity for walkers



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				and cyclists.
1083	Rosemary	Purves	Change any plan which will result in further congestion of traffic at Maybury and Barnton Junctions	Concerned about further traffic congestion at Maybury and Barnton junctions and impact on current and potential businesses.
1089	David S	Stephen	Don't approve proposed plan	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and loss of green belt.
1090	E B	Sproul	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, pollution, no infrastructure and impact on Cammo Park.
1096	E	Allan	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion and school capacity. Suggests land at Craigiehall as alternative.
1101	William	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion and traffic management problems.
1106	Saba	Aichtor	Don't want houses built.	Objects to school proposal because it will cause accidents and increase traffic congestion.
1108	Nasim	Saeed	Don't want houses built.	It will be dangerous for traffic and pedestrians.
1110	Isabel	Smith	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, inadequate schools and medical facilities and land for development available at Granton Harbour.
1111	Kathleen	Anderson	No houses to be built.	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion, traffic management concerns and added pressure on schools. No clear plans or information for discussion at local level.
1112	A C	Lorimer	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality and school facilities. Suggests development at Craigiehall instead.
1113	E	Lorimer	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality and school facilities. Suggests development at Craigiehall instead.
1114	R R	Lorimer	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality and school facilities. Suggests development at Craigiehall instead.
1115	M L	Lorimer	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality and school facilities. Suggests development at Craigiehall instead.
1118	Frances	Malone	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of effect on the environment, increased traffic, road safety concerns and increased pollution.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1166	Fraser	Breckenridge	Reconsider proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality, noise pollution and schools and concerns about traffic management measures.
1167	Jenny	Breckenridge	Reconsider proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality, noise pollution and schools and concerns about traffic management measures.
1180	Anita	Morrison	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental issues, impact on local services and failure to complete existing sites.
1181	Keith	Williamson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and traffic management concerns. Not sure if any market demand.
1182	Lawrie	Elliot	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental issues, impact on local services and failure to complete existing sites.
1185	Lousie	Eckford	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, environmental impact and building disruption.
1186	Kirsty	Eckford	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, effect on community, views and CO2 impacts.
1187	Alan	Shanks	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, lack of schooling/facilities, additional traffic and loss of views.
1194	Thornton	White	Remove proposal	Concerned about impact on infrastructure - roads, schools and medical facilities.
1195	Alisa	White	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on schools and health facilities, traffic impact and loss of green belt.
1203	W. R.	Armstrong	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, impact on infrastructure and traffic congestion and road safety.
1282	William	Anderson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and concerns regarding traffic management and change to school catchments.
1298	Maggie	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, availability of other undeveloped land, increased CO2 levels, impact on schools and local facilities and impact on habitats.
1299	Jana	Williamson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact.
1302	Peter	Malone	Remove proposal	Concerned regarding increased traffic and potential for accidents, increase of

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				pollution, effect on the environment and need for schools and amenities.
1306	Derek	Lee	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on local amenities, and devastation of a beautiful area. Should consider other sites with less impact.
1307	Lorna	Lee	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, environmental issues, wildlife impact, pollution and impact on existing schools and services. Also concerned about development close to an existing and a potentially expanding flight path.
1308	J R	Thompson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of environmental impact, loss of landscape, loss of green belt and traffic impact. Concerned it is setting a precedent for development on green belt land.
1309	Judith	Thompson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of environmental impact, transport impact, loss of green belt and increased pollution.
1310	Beverley	Bridge	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic and congestion impact, pollution, overcrowding and impact on the character and amenity of the area.
1311	Charles	Sidey	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing community facilities and amenities, increased pollution, environmental impacts and loss of green belt and associated views and amenity of this space.
1312	Diane	Sidey	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of impact on existing community facilities, traffic impact, increased congestion and pollution, loss of green belt and associated views and amenity with this space.
1313	John	Hollis	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and increased congestion and pollution.
1314	Neil	Purves	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of amenity for walkers, impact on landscape and landscape heritage, impact on ambiance and views.
1345	Caroline	Campbell	Greater consideration given to traffic impact	Objects due to traffic impact, congestion, roads inability to cope with the proposed number of housing.
1752	Bernard and Julie	Matthews	A reduction in the number of houses being proposed.	Suggests further assessment of the traffic impact from additional cars.
1991	Chris	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of greenbelt, access issues and traffic impact. Concerned about proximity to the railway line and the 'Crosswind runway'.
2111	David	Lilley	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				community facilities.
2128	John	Sowrey	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on water table, traffic impact and congestion problems.
2144	Lorraine	Fraser	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, general road and pedestrian safety, impact on local amenity and community facilities.
2187	Mr & Mrs	Mackenzie	Provision of an additional 30m wide woodland adjoining Maybury Drive along the west edge of the site.	This would provide a sound barrier, mitigation against fumes and provide a habitat for wildlife.
2187	Mr & Mrs	Mackenzie	Re-routing of air freight traffic through the International Gateway Development	There is no mention of the airport freight traffic within the plan. Ideally this will be re-routed within the airport perimeter and exit through the proposed International Gateway Development.
2196	Patrick	Mitchell	Amend proposed access requirements for HSG19	Seeks amendment on basis that no detailed traffic impact assessments have been undertaken. Consider that proposal will have significant traffic impacts. Consider that schools will be under pressure.
2230	Steve	Ritchie	Reconsider the proposed development	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing schools, increase in traffic noise and pollution.
2251	Douglas	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of increased congestion and pollution, traffic impact, decrease in road safety and the impact on existing schools and community facilities.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Modify boundary and reduce extent of site	Objects on the grounds of landscape capacity and visual intrusion. Edinburgh Green Belt Review Stage 2 indicates no landscape capacity for development of this elevated and exposed site
2222	West Craigs Ltd	GVA	Text deletion - remove bullet point 5, 9 and 11 of the text and change bullet point 8	Supports the site brief in general terms and the development principles. Suggests there should be no requirement for 2 hectares of open green space, civic space or a community focal point and suggest there is no requirement for a foot bridge over the railway.
2231	Rosebery Estates Partnership	Strutt & Parker	Include land at Lennie Cottages in the Maybury allocation and amend Table 4,	Support the inclusion of additional land at the western end of Maybury allocation but seek the inclusion of an additional area of land at Lennie There are cottages in that allocation.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			the green belt, and the settlement boundary accordingly.	
2236	SAICA Pack UK Limited	Trilogie CRE Limited	An effective buffer strip is required between existing factory site on south east side of Turnhouse road and the proposed new residential development on the adjacent site.	Think it is appropriate to have a distinct separation between the existing manufacturing and proposed residential to avoid any potential disturbance.
2236	SAICA Pack UK Limited	Trilogie CRE Limited	Removal of the bus route through the long term development opportunity site	Objects given the impact on existing buildings and the loss of significant manufacturing facilities and employers.

#### **How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

**There have been a significant number of objections to this proposal. The details of these objections have been considered, taking account of the increased housing requirement for Edinburgh set out in the approved Strategic Development Plan and its Supplementary Guidance and information available in the LDP Environmental Report - Second Revision, Transport Appraisal and Education Appraisal.**

**This proposal is included in the Second Proposed Plan. The assessment criteria used to identify suitable housing sites and the outcome of the assessment for this site and others are set out in the LDP Environmental Report - Second Revision. The Strategic Development Plan requires the LDP to give priority to sites in West and South East Edinburgh before allocating greenfield sites for housing elsewhere in Edinburgh. Further information on how the LDP is meeting its housing requirement, including the contribution from brownfield sites, is provided in the supporting document “Housing Land Study”.**

**The extent of the proposal site has not changed. However, the number of houses anticipated in the period up to 2024 has increased to 1,700 – 2000. Within the context of economic recovery and increased house-building rates, the plan supports development of the site in full.**

**Some representations have suggested that land at Craighiehall should be identified as an alternative to HSG19. This site has been assessed. However, for the reasons set out in the Environmental Report – Second Revision, it is not considered suitable. Further work is being undertaken in relation to the transport and education proposals identified in the LDP. Discussions are also taking place between the Council and NHS Lothian regarding impact on health facilities. As more detailed information becomes available on these matters, this will be incorporated into the LDP Action Programme through its annual review.**

**There has been no objection from Edinburgh Airport about the site’s proximity to the airport (1991, 1307, 2187)**

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				<p>Lennie Cottages are not included in the site as Craigs Road provides an appropriate green belt boundary. (2231) There is no justification for a reduced site boundary (1750)</p> <p>The reason for showing the bus route through the SAICA site is to ensure that development does not prejudice the potential for this to happen if the SAICA site is vacated in future. Any conflict between the existing business uses and new housing can be addressed at the masterplanning stage.(2236)</p> <p>The requirements relating to open space provision and a foot bridge over the railway are essential to achieve sustainable development and high quality place-making. It is appropriate to highlight the opportunity to create a community focal point. (2222)</p> <p>Airport freight traffic may use alternative routes in future. There is no justification for the plan to require further woodland planting. (2187)</p>

### HSG20 Cammo

267 representations were received on housing proposal HSG 20 Cammo. These included two from Community Councils and two from Community Groups. A supporting representation was received from the owner of the site. The other 265 representations were seeking change, almost all objecting to the principle of development and seeking removal of the proposal from the plan. One representation is seeking a change to extend the boundary of the site to include an additional area of land to the west.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Support Plan</b>				
1746	Cramond & Harthill Estate	Halliday Fraser Munro		Directing housing growth to Strategic Development Area of West Edinburgh and the allocation of this site are fully supported. A Development Framework has been prepared to support this allocation.
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>The development intentions of the landowner are noted.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
119	Craighleith/Blackhall Community Council		Remove proposed development and safeguard green belt land	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and environmental impact.
1747	Cramond & Barnton		Remove proposal or considerably reduce in size.	Consider site inappropriate for 500 houses and community facilities. No consultation on change from reasonable alternative

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
	Community Council		Include alternative sites that expand existing communities.	in MIR. Does not benefit from access to Gogar Interchange. Consider site unsuitable on grounds of traffic impact, landscape, community facilities and schools. Suggests expansion of existing communities could be beneficial to provision of improved transport and communal facilities. Suggests Ratho, Gogarburn and Ratho Station.
1738	Cammo Residents' Association		Remove proposal and have this site scrutinised at a public inquiry	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, impact on landscape setting, loss of open space, environmental impact, biodiversity impact, coalescence, traffic impact, traffic management, pollution, inadequate public transport, good urban design principles have not been taken into account, there are enough housing sites in West Edinburgh, site selection lacks justification, education provision and loss of prime agricultural land.
2150	Friends of Cammo		Remove proposal. If not removed then reduce the number of houses.	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, new boundary is not strong enough, loss of important views across the Estate, loss of open land resulting in an impact on wildlife, traffic impact. If the site remains in the plan suggest better off-site connectivity including the provision of a green corridor.
2155	Friends of Craighouse Grounds and Woods		Removal of HSG20 from the proposed plan	Objects on the grounds of loss of open space, impact on wildlife, impact on amenity for walkers, loss of important views and noise pollution.
19	Brian	Minshull	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of environmental impact and traffic impact.
21	Sabine	Nolte	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on the resident's recreational area and traffic impact.
59	J R	Gray	Delay any housing development until significant infrastructure upgrades take place	Roads cannot cope safely with extra traffic with gridlock at Maybury and Barnton roundabouts currently. More public transport is not the full answer.
60	Mary	Henderson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on local amenities and community services. The site is



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				also a flood risk area.
80	Ruth	Gladwell	Remove proposal or significantly reduce scale of development	Objects on the grounds of transport impact, local amenities and community facilities and education provision
86	Alyson M	Thomson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, education provision and lack of facilities for residents.
120	Graeme	Brownlee	Proposal rejected	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on existing schools and community facilities. Also concerned about environmental impact.
144	Grahame	Whitehead	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds that housing figures do not support greenfield development.
201	M	Gilmour	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on wildlife, loss of agricultural land and alternative site is more appropriate - east of RBS.
202	Melanie	Gillies	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt and traffic impact
205	Susan	Gearing	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, removing land from the green belt and not considering brownfield sites and environmental impact of development
238	John	Allan	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of key views and impact on setting, infrastructure, development density and lack of consideration to brownfield sites.
246	GB	Whyte	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of transport impact, loss of green belt and environmental impact, infrastructure provision and economic reasoning for new housing.
274	J Ruth	Henderson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and impact on local amenities and school provision.
355	Roger	Buchanan	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and road safety.
403	Stewart James	Morrison	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, pollution, infrastructure, education provision, failure to consider alternative sites and lack of consultation on change from 'reasonable alternative' to 'definite site'.



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
407	Jean	Morley	Remove proposal or delay development to assess impact of new Forth Crossing	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, reduction of quality of life, education provision and impact on local amenities
434	Evelyn	Buchanan	Remove proposal.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and congestion and environmental impact.
439	Patrcia	Stott	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on health and local amenities, lack of community facilities proposed and not consider other suitable sites - Craigie Hall.
441	James	Wilson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and loss of green belt.
442	Graeme	Lind	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of lack of infrastructure upgrades.
443	Fiona	Lind	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, pollution, education provision and impact on local amenities especially health facilities.
449	Margaret	Harrison	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of environmental impact, infrastructure, loss of green belt land and wildlife impact.
495	Yin	Tai Liu	Make appropriate provisions to mitigate the traffic impact resulting from development. Use developer contribution to improve existing facilities at the Cammo Estate	Maybury Road (A902) should be widened to a dual carriageway, the A902/Cammo Gardens should be provided with traffic signals as the junction is difficult to negotiate now especially turning right. Traffic signals should be adjusted appropriately at T19 (Barnton Junction). A developer contribution of £20,000 is required to improve walkways, seating and overall management.
528	Irene	Woodroffe	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact. Concerned sufficient upgrading to the present infrastructure is not included in the plan.
528	Irene	Woodroffe	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and decreased air quality.
532	George	Braithwaite	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, access issues, increased air pollution, unacceptable use of green belt, impact on school catchment area and a lack of proposed infrastructure improvements.
592	W & R	Stewart	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of natural habitats and impact on landscape, loss of agricultural land, traffic impact, insufficient traffic management proposed, impact on

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				existing schools and lack of consideration for additional sites.
601	Gillian M	Massie	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, pedestrian safety, insufficient amenities, impact on existing schools and community facilities, loss of green belt and lack of consideration given to alternative sites.
606	J B	Murray	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, lack of consideration given to alternative brownfield sites and impact on local infrastructure including education, medical facilities and traffic impact.
607	Terry	Heneaghan	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact. Concerned that proposed cycle and footpath bridges will not be utilised and that a tunnel would be better.
614	Ian	Stott	Remove proposal.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased pollution levels, impact on quality of life and impact on educational and medical facilities.
618	M E	Murray	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and lack of consideration for alternative brownfield sites.
623	Elaine	Bailey	Object to the proposal and the number of houses proposed.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, access issues, decreased pedestrian safety, loss of and impact on the existing character, loss of amenity for walkers. Concerned the development may never be finished becoming a potential eyesore.
624	Robin	McLeish	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and environmental impact including loss of amenity.
630	Gary R	Trapp	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of visual amenity, impact on traffic, lack of civic amenities, lack of consideration for alternative sites, loss of amenity for walkers, loss of green belt and agricultural land.
633	Alan M	Horne	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, proposed improvements would not change congestion levels. Better alternative sites

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				should be sought.
638	Catherine M	Gray	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact. Housing should not be built until a suitable road system has been agreed.
651	David R	Taylor	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of increased traffic congestion, loss of green belt, increased air pollution, lack of infrastructure, impact on existing schools and the failure to consider alternative sites.
652	Jennifer	Taylor	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increase in air pollution, loss of green belt, lack of infrastructure on the proposed site and failure to consider alternative sites.
655	L R	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects due to traffic impact. Alternative site with better existing infrastructure should be sought.
656	Dorothy	Campbell	Remove proposal. No construction at proposed site.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and access issues.
657	Walter B	Campbell	No housing on land to south of Cammo Grove.	Building should not be carried out on green belt land. Development would compound traffic problems. Suggest a better location would be land to south of bypass from Torphin to Straiton junction.
658	Lawrence H	Liston	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt and traffic impact.
736	B	Woodroffe	Scale back development and some of the developer contributions be used for facilities for existing residents	Concerned about infrastructure capacity and the impact on local amenities for existing residents.
858	Lydia	Derbyshire	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, education provision and environmental impact.
866	Patricia	Stone	Development should not go ahead	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, education provision and impact on local amenities.
927		Robb	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased pollution, impact on the character of the area and the impact on local amenity.
946	Iain A M	Ross	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact,

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				impact on wildlife, impact on property values and past refusals of planning permission.
948	Jean	Paterson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and loss of views and open space.
974	AD & SK	Mackie	Remove proposal, keep site in the green belt	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, infrastructure and lack of consideration for the Craigie Army site.
977	Barbara & Malcolm	Wright	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, , loss of green belt, environmental impact, education provision and impact on local amenities.
987	Andrew I	Massie	Development should not go ahead	Objects to the grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, loss of wildlife, impact on existing local amenities, lack of consideration to the Craigie Army site and cumulative impact of the McCarthy and Stone development at Barnton.
988	Alison	Burnley	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of agricultural land, wildlife impact, loss of views and traffic impact.
995	Christopher	Boam	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, loss of agricultural land, adverse effect on Cammo Park, loss of amenity and increased traffic.
996	Katerine	Massie	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, impact on local amenities, inadequate community facilities, education provision and cumulative impact of McCarthy and Stone's Barnton development.
1004	Stephen	Warwick	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental issues and minimal accessible public transport. Other sites in Edinburgh should be revisited.
1083	Rosemary	Purves	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt.
1088	David	Purves	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt.
1089	David S	Stephen	Don't approve proposed plan	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and loss of green belt.
1090	E B	Sproul	Removal of proposal.	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, pollution, no infrastructure and impact on Cammo Park. Suggests land at Craigiehall as an

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				alternative.
1091	Alex	Carmichael	Remove proposal.	Objects on the grounds of environmental impact and loss of wildlife and green space.
1092	Emma	Carmichael	Development should not go ahead.	Objects on the grounds of impact on wildlife, general environmental impact and lack of consideration to alternative sites.
1093	Kirsty	Carmichael	Development should not go ahead.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact/carbon footprint and infrastructure capacity.
1094	Kay	Wallace	Remove proposal.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt and environmental impact.
1095	Jim	Tait	Remove proposal and keep site in the green belt.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing local amenities and education provision.
1096	E	Allan	Removal of proposal.	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of views, traffic impact, concerns over road safety from increased traffic and education provision.
1097	Alexander	Burrell	Remove proposal until traffic problems are resolved.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, inadequate public transport and lack of amenity provision for the site.
1101	William	Smith	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion and traffic management problems.
1104	Omeear	Saeed	Remove proposals.	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion.
1105	Adnan	Saeed	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of overcrowding in the area, pollution and traffic congestion. Also concerned that the school would be unsafe for children.
1106	Saba	Aichtor	Don't want houses built.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and congestion.
1107	Mohammed	Saeed	Remove proposal.	Object on grounds of traffic impact and congestion.
1108	Nasim	Saeed	Development should not go ahead.	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and congestion.
1109	Aamna	Qureshi	Remove proposal.	Objections on grounds of traffic congestion and pedestrian safety.
1110	Isabel	Smith	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, inadequate schools and medical facilities and land for

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				development available at Granton Harbour.
1111	Kathleen	Anderson	No houses to be built.	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion, traffic management concerns and added pressure on schools.
1112	A C	Lorimer	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality and school facilities. Suggests development at Craigiehall instead.
1113	E	Lorimer	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality and school facilities. Suggests development at Craigiehall instead.
1114	R R	Lorimer	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality and school facilities. Suggests development at Craigiehall instead.
1115	M L	Lorimer	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality and school facilities. Suggests development at Craigiehall instead.
1118	Frances	Malone	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of effect on the environment, increased traffic, road safety concerns and increased pollution.
1154	Joanne	Beautyman	Development should not go ahead	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on wildlife, impact on wellbeing of existing residents, funding should be given to better maintain Cammo Estate, traffic impact, traffic management and safety concerns.
1162	Mark	Beautyman	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on wildlife, impact on wellbeing of existing residents, funding should be given to better maintain Cammo Estate, education provision, traffic impact, traffic management and safety concerns.
1166	Fraser	Breckenridge	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality, noise pollution and schools and concerns about traffic management measures.
1167	Jenny	Breckenridge	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on traffic congestion, air quality, noise pollution and schools and concerns about traffic management measures.
1171	Sally	Chalmers	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, alternatives such as Craigie not being considered, environmental impact, traffic impact, traffic management, impact on existing local amenities and past

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				precedents of refusing planning permission
1172	Gus	Chalmers	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, alternatives such as Craigie not being considered, environmental impact, traffic impact, traffic management, impact on existing local amenities and past precedents of refusing planning permission
1180	Anita	Morrison	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental issues, impact on local services and failure to complete existing sites.
1181	Keith	Williamson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, impact on wildlife and sites with infrastructure in place are not being considered.
1182	Lawrie	Elliot	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental issues, impact on local services and failure to complete existing sites.
1185	Lousie	Eckford	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, environmental impact and loss of views
1186	Kirsty	Eckford	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, effect on community, views and CO2 impacts.
1187	Alan	Shanks	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, lack of schooling/facilities, additional traffic and loss of views.
1188	John	Carmichael	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and traffic management.
1188	John	Carmichael	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green space, traffic impact and traffic management.
1189	Fiona	Carmichael	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt and impact on wildlife.
1190	Judith	Arrowsmith	Remove proposal and keep site in the green belt	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, views, environmental impact, loss of wildlife, traffic impact and traffic management
1191	Sara	Wood	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, pollution, infrastructure, impact on local amenities and education provision.
1192	William H	Price	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt.
1193	Mary	Price	Remove proposal and keep site in	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			the green belt	
1194	Thornton	White	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, impact on local amenities and not considering viable alternatives - Craigie Army HQ
1195	Alisa	White	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on schools and health facilities, traffic impact and loss of green belt.
1196	Stephen	Duncan	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and impact on local amenities.
1197	Alison	Duncan	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and pollution.
1198	Orla	Duncan	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic congestion, loss of green belt, pollution and impact on local amenities.
1199	Christine	Shaw	Remove proposal and keep site in green belt	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, air quality and pollution.
1200	Alan	Harrison	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, infrastructure provision, pollution, impact on wildlife and loss of green belt.
1201	Maria	Douglas	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact and impact on local amenities.
1202	Lindsay David	Wilson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and traffic management.
1203	W. R.	Armstrong	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, impact on infrastructure, traffic congestion and road safety and education provision.
1204	M. H.	Armstrong	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, environmental impact and infrastructure.
1205	Stephen	Manning	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management and air quality.
1206	Cara	Manning - Diabira	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and loss of green belt.
1212	M P	Allen	Remove proposal. If retained requests a green corridor, low rise	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, lack of engagement, loss of green belt, loss of agricultural land, loss of



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			housing, open space and traffic lights.	views, poor public transport provision and education provision
1216	Carol	Abbey	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and congestion, environmental impact, loss of green belt, impact on local amenities and pollution.
1217	Moussa	Manning-Diabira	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of environmental impact
1218	Sian	Shepherd	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, environmental impact and traffic impact.
1219	Michael	Shepherd	Remove proposal.	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt and environmental impact.
1233	Iain and Carolyn	Baikie	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, loss of green belt and no consideration of alternative sites.
1239	Denise	Barison	Development should not go ahead	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on local amenities.
1243	N	Benge	Do not build housing	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, traffic management and loss of views.
1246	Gary	Bennett	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, unsatisfactory new boundaries for the green belt and education provision.
1247	Justine	Bennett	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, traffic management and road safety.
1251	Samuel	Bennett	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, lack of amenities being provided, lack of consideration for alternative sites e.g. Craigie and Queen Elizabeth Yard. Suggests using more of Edinburgh Business Park for housing or using land at RBS Gogarburn.
1282	William	Anderson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and traffic management.
1283	A	Box	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and pollution.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1284	H	Hawthorn	No new housebuilding	Objects on grounds of not considering Craigie Army HQ site
1285	Rebecca	Mill	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and traffic management.
1293	Daryl	Boyd	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact stifling business and forcing re-location of a small business employing 9 people.
1295	Alistair	Mill	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt and education provision.
1298	Maggie	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, impact on local amenities and not considering alternative sites e.g. Granton, Western Harbour and Craigie Army HQ site.
1299	Jana	Williamson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of impact on wildlife and loss of recreational amenity and green space.
1301	June	Brigmen	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact and schools.
1302	Peter	Malone	Remove proposal	Concerned regarding increased traffic and potential for accidents, increase of pollution, effect on the environment and need for schools and amenities.
1306	Derek	Lee	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, impact on local amenities, devastation of a beautiful area. Should consider other sites with less impact.
1307	Lorna	Lee	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, environmental issues, wildlife impact, pollution and impact on existing schools and services. Also concerned about development close to an existing and a potentially expanding flight path.
1308	J R	Thompson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of environmental impact, loss of landscape, loss of green belt and traffic impact. Concerned it is setting a precedent for development on green belt land.
1309	Judith	Thompson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of environmental impact, transport impact, loss of green belt and increased pollution.
1310	Beverley	Bridge	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic and congestion impact, pollution, overcrowding and impact on the amenities in the area.
1311	Charles	Sidey	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				community facilities and amenities, increased pollution, environmental impacts and loss of green belt and associated views and amenity of this space.
1312	Diane	Sidey	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of impact on existing community facilities, traffic impact, increased congestion and pollution, loss of green belt and associated views and amenity with this space.
1313	John	Hollis	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and increased congestion and pollution.
1314	Neil	Purves	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of amenity for walkers, impact on landscape and landscape heritage, impact on ambiance and views.
1315	Ian	Rodger	Keep site in the green belt	Objects on grounds that alternative sites were not considered for Proposed LDP.
1345	Caroline	Campbell	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, infrastructure and impact on local amenities.
1348	William	Eckford	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt and traffic impact.
1357	Anne	Marquis	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of lack of community facilities, traffic management, impact on local amenities, environmental impact and loss of views.
1362	Gordon M.	Clark	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, loss of green belt and lack of need for new housing.
1363	Kathleen	Clark	Reject proposals	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, loss of green belt, pollution and education provision.
1365	Michael J.	Barrow	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, loss of agricultural land, traffic impact, education provision and lack of consideration for alternatives.
1366	G. R.	Barrow	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, impact on local amenities, pollution, noise, traffic impact, education provision and lack of consideration for alternatives.
1379	Fiona	Kennedy	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic management,

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				traffic impact, education provision and air quality.
1381	Justin	Kennedy	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and congestion, traffic management and lack of amenities provided in proposal.
1384	Ross	Mitchell	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, congestion and road safety. Recommends if development goes ahead then housing should be screened by trees along Maybury Road.
1385	Rachel	Stewart	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic congestion and lack of consideration of brownfield sites.
1386	Bruce	Pattullo	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management and traffic congestion.
1388	Wendy	Cooke	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, impact on local amenities and lack of consideration to Craigie Army site.
1414	Ian E	Massie	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, inadequate public transport, impact on local amenities and environmental impact at Cammo Park.
1415	Ronald	Wharton	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, pollution, infrastructure and lack of consideration for alternative sites.
1416	Maria	Wharton	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, infrastructure and lack of consideration for alternative sites.
1422	Barbara and Leslie	Bennie	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, pollution, infrastructure and road safety.
1428	I A	Brown	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, pollution, infrastructure, environmental impact, non compliance with green belt policies, wildlife impact, education provision, lack of recreation facilities and lack of consideration for alternative sites - Craigie Army site.
1431	S A	Brown	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, pollution, infrastructure, environmental impact, non compliance with green belt policies, wildlife impact, education provision, lack of recreation facilities and lack of consideration for alternative sites - Craigie Army site.
1456	Jeff	Chalmers	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, pollution, infrastructure,

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				environmental impact, wildlife impact and loss of green belt and lack of need for the development.
1466	Fiona and John	Crutchfield	Remove proposal or reduce size and protect green belt directly visible from Maybury Road.	Objects on grounds of erosion of green belt boundary, traffic impact, traffic management and loss of views.
1476	Ailsa	Davidson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, pollution, impact on wildlife and loss of amenity.
1486	Fiona	Constable	Remove proposal and keep site in the green belt and work towards increasing biodiversity.	Objects on grounds of loss of visual amenity, loss of recreation, loss of rural character, loss of a clear city boundary, loss of air quality from pollution and loss of quality of life from continuous congestion.
1499	Celina	Davis	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of lack of amenities, traffic congestion and reduction in green spaces.
1508	Annalisa	DiTano	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, environmental impact, impact on local amenities, traffic impact, infrastructure and education provision. Concerned that affordable housing provision will cause problems in the area.
1509	Armando	DiTano	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, environmental impact, impact on local amenities, traffic impact, infrastructure and education provision. Concerned that affordable housing provision will cause problems in the area.
1510	Francesca	DiTano	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, environmental impact, impact on local amenities, traffic impact, infrastructure and education provision. Concerned that affordable housing provision will cause problems in the area.
1511	Gabriella	DiTano	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, environmental impact, impact on local amenities, traffic impact, infrastructure and education provision. Concerned that affordable housing provision will cause problems in the area.
1512	Giovanna	DiTano	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, environmental impact,

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				impact on local amenities, traffic impact, infrastructure and education provision. Concerned that affordable housing provision will cause problems in the area.
1514	Keith	Doig	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, environmental impact, air quality and safety
1521	Donald	Drury	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, loss of amenity, impact on local amenities, education provision, public transport not close enough to the site and lack of consideration of alternative sites
1522	Irene	Drury	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, impact of school changes on current residents and overstretched supporting amenities.
1523	K	Duckett	Remove proposal	Object on grounds of impact on schools, loss of green belt and traffic impact.
1524	Dominic	Duncan	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion, traffic management, impact on local amenities, loss of green belt and pollution.
1548	Marion	Finc	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, traffic management, impact on wildlife, loss of views, lack of guarantee of public transport, coalescence of West Edinburgh, West Craigs and East Craigs, excessive housing allocations, education provision, brief not in accordance with placemaking and urban design principles, existing committed housing sites can satisfy 5 year supply, need and demand in West Edinburgh and advice from SNH and SEPA has not been taken into account
1559	Stuart	Fraser	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, encroachment, pollution, infrastructure and lack of consideration to alternative sites e.g. Craigie Army HQ
1560	Tanya	Fraser	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, encroachment, pollution, infrastructure and lack of consideration to alternative sites e.g. Craigie Army HQ
1564	Claire	Glancy	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt/green space, road safety,

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				traffic impact and impact on local amenities including schools.
1578	Jane	Gould	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt and impact on infrastructure and local amenities. Development should not commence until funds in place to deliver infrastructure and amenities.
1608	James	Helliwell	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, pollution and impact on local amenities. Should finish existing sites first.
1625	Mr & Mrs	Hetherington	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt and education provision. Questions need for more housing in the area with many new build properties unsold or unoccupied.
1653	Lesley	Hoyle	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and congestion, traffic management, loss of green belt and education and health provision
1662	Richard	Jamieson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, infrastructure, congestion detracting investment, impact on local amenities, flooding and loss of green belt.
1663	Cynthia	Jamieson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, infrastructure, loss of agricultural land, impact on wildlife, pollution, impact on local amenities and loss of green belt. Questions if priority should be given to developing brownfield sites and only developing green field once need has been clearly established.
1666	Simon	Jackson	Remove proposal from the plan.	Should not build on green belt. Objects on grounds of traffic impact and impact on views. Suggests Craigie as an alternative.
1667	Judith	Jackson	Preserve green belt between Cammo and Maybury and do not use for housing.	No need to build on green belt when market is stagnant. Consider this a poor choice of site, housing would lead to further traffic congestion. Scanty local facilities and schools already oversubscribed.
1681	Michael	Kerr	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, loss of views, traffic impact and traffic management

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1685	Sheila	Kennedy	Remove proposal	Concerned about the impact the development will have on existing schools and nurseries. Concerned about the impact on Cammo Estate, the loss of green space and traffic impact.
1723	Alasdair MacGregor	MacIntyre	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, loss of amenity, pollution and lack of consideration of alternatives. Suggests re-developing the former RAF Turnhouse
1726	Pamela and Alasdair	MacKay	Remove proposal	Objects on the ground of traffic impact, traffic management, loss of green belt, impact on wildlife, loss of views, impact on local amenities and education provision. If development goes ahead lower densities of housing and restrict height to two storeys. Create a green corridor south of Cammo Grove to replace loss of green belt
1730	James	MacPherson	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, impact on wildlife, noise, impact on property values and environmental impact.
1731	Caroline	Macpherson	Remove proposal or scale back development	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management, air quality, impact on wildlife. Loss of agricultural land and loss of amenity for residents. If plan goes ahead asks that green corridor is enlarged.
1734	Alasdair	MacLennan	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, impact on local amenities, inadequate public transport, education provision, flood risks, pollution and impact on property values
1736	Bruce	Johston	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and impact on quality of life for existing residents.
1763	Andrew Grant	McCulloch	Remove proposal. Re-appraise HSG 19, T13, T17 and T19	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, air quality, infrastructure, loss of green belt, education provision, loss of identity of area and lack of consideration to alternative sites e.g. Craigie
1764	Cara	McCulloch	Remove proposal and keep site in the green belt	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion, poor public transport, pollution and impact on local amenities.
1768	S E	McClelland	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, traffic management and lack



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				of consideration to alternative sites e.g. Craigiehall.
1781	Nicola	McKirdy	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, education provision and lack of consideration to alternatives e.g. Craigie MOD site.
1782	Gordon	McKirdy	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, education provision and lack of consideration to alternatives e.g. Craigie MOD site.
1790	Scott	McCulloch	Remove proposal and keep site in the green belt	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion, infrastructure, inadequate public transport and impact on local amenities
1791	Mave	McCulloch	Remove proposal and keep site in the green belt	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion, green belt, environmental impact, pollution, lack of consideration to alternative sites e.g. Craigie Army HQ site and infrastructure issues.
1832	Robert and Morag	Moore	Remove proposal	Object on the grounds that no account is taken of existing traffic, no indication of access which is already difficult. If additional housing required should be at Craigie.
1849	Fiona Jane	Morrison	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, loss of views, pollution, infrastructure, education provision, lack of consideration to alternative sites e.g. Craigie and Cammo becoming a 'definite' site from a 'reasonable alternative' without explanation or consultation
1850	Ian Stewart	Morrison	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, loss of views, pollution, infrastructure, education provision, lack of consideration to alternative sites e.g. Craigie and Cammo becoming a 'definite' site from a 'reasonable alternative' without explanation or consultation
1861	Derren	Oliver	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, infrastructure, lack of evidence for housing requirements and lack of explanation for site selection in the LDP.
1875	Alan	Pithie	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, air

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				quality, infrastructure, education provision and lack of consideration to alternatives e.g. Craigie Army site.
1876	Alasdair	Pithie	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, air quality, infrastructure, education provision and lack of consideration to alternatives e.g. Craigie Army site.
1877	Maggie	Pithie	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact, environmental impact, air quality, infrastructure, education provision and lack of consideration to alternatives e.g. Craigie Army site.
1880	Ewan	Poseley	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of education provision, traffic impact, traffic management, loss of green spaces, impact on infrastructure and social amenities and impact on property values. Unlikely to be a switch to public transport or cycling. No justification for increased number of houses.
1881	James	Poseley	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of education provision, traffic impact, traffic management, loss of green spaces, impact on infrastructure and social amenities and impact on property values. Unlikely to be a switch to public transport or cycling. No justification for increase in housing numbers.
1887	Adam	Oliver	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of agricultural land, impact on wildlife, loss of views, impact on landscape, noise and dust disturbance during construction and traffic impact.
1888	Anne	Oliver	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of agricultural land, loss of recreational amenity, loss of historic views, loss of green space, impact on landscape, questions the designation when so many properties currently lie vacant, impact on existing schools, impact on environment, loss of privacy, traffic impact with inadequate improvements suggested.
1894	Leah	Poseley	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of education provision, traffic impact, traffic management, loss of green spaces, impact on infrastructure and social amenities and impact on property values. Unlikely to be a switch to public transport or cycling. No justification for increased

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				number of houses.
1895	Suzanne	Poseley	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of education provision, traffic impact, traffic management, loss of green spaces, impact on infrastructure and social amenities and impact on property values. Unlikely to be a switch to public transport or cycling. No justification for increased number of houses.
1896	George	Preston	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased pollution levels, lack of infrastructure on the proposed site, loss of green belt, loss of views, loss of recreational amenity and failure to consider alternative sites. Concerned consultation wasn't undertaken given the 'upgrading' of this site.
1898	Kenneth D	Pye	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, insufficient proposed road improvements, loss of natural habitat, impact on wildlife and the impact of the development on the character of Cammo Park.
1934	Gary	Roberts	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, access issues, insufficient proposed traffic mitigation measures, loss of green belt, loss of amenity for walkers, loss of green space and loss of views.
1950	Dave and Sarah	Scott	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on pedestrian safety, impact on existing schools and community facilities, landscape impact, loss of views and impact on wildlife. Concerned about the affect on house prices.
1966	Jacquie	Simpson	Remove proposal	Objects on the ground of traffic impact, no additional local amenities and infrastructure provided as part of development, impact on the environment, increased air pollution and loss of green belt. Concerned the Council hasn't given adequate consideration to alternative sites.
1967	John	Simpson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on pedestrian and cyclist safety, access issues, increased pollution levels, loss of agricultural land and loss of green belt, impact on existing schools

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				and community facilities, impact on wildlife and increased pollution levels as well lack of infrastructure in terms of local amenities proposed as part of the development.
1969	Alan	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased pollution levels, impact on existing schools and community facilities, loss of green belt and loss of views.
1971	Anne	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on traffic and local infrastructure, impact on the quality of life, loss of amenity and the development will create an increase in over-crowding and anti-social behaviour.
1981	Eric	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on traffic and local infrastructure, impact on the quality of life, loss of amenity and and the development will create an increase in over-crowding and anti-social behaviour.
1983	Fraser	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, access issues, risk towards pedestrian safety, loss of green belt, loss of important views, loss of habitats, impact on wildlife, increased pollution, flooding issues, impact on existing schools and inability to consider alternative sites.
1990	John	Somerville	Better consideration needs to be given to the obvious needs of the local community which will arise if the development is implemented in its present form.	Concerned about the traffic impact, inadequate education facilities, inadequate recreational facilities and inadequate medical facilities.
2006	Alan	Struthers	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, risk to pedestrians, increased pollution, lack of alternative means of transport
2026	Nicola	Taylor	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, inadequate proposed improvements, impractical pedestrian and cycle paths, flooding issues, loss of green belt, loss of views, lack of social amenities, increased pollution, lack of consideration given to alternatives.
2027	Lynn	Taylor	Remove proposal from the plan.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impractical footpaths and

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				cycle paths, flooding issues, loss of green belt, loss of important views, lack of social amenities, increased pollution and lack of consideration to alternative sites.
2028	John	Taylor	Remove proposal from the plan.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impractical footpaths and cycle paths, flooding issues, loss of green belt, loss of important views, lack of social amenities, increased pollution and lack of consideration to alternative sites.
2031	Susan	Tyler	Remove proposal - do not allow development in the vicinity of Cammo Park	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased danger for pedestrians/cyclists, loss of recreational amenity, increased pollution, impact on wildlife, structures of importance more liable to vandalism and mis-use, likely re-opening of the civic amenity dump site will create a nuisance.
2038	Chris	Vettraino	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of increased traffic, increase in on street parking, negative impact on Cammo Park, increase in users of Cammo Park, impact on wildlife and natural habitat.
2039	Derek	Whitting	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site, impact on the character of the area, traffic impact, loss of access due to development of Cammo Walk, no infrastructure proposed as part of the housing development and loss of green belt and a green belt boundary.
2042	Alan	Wilson	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, loss of the distinctiveness of Edinburgh, lack of consideration for brownfield sites, impact on traffic, lack of amenity to support new development as well as a reduction in the quality of the environment.
2045	Sue	Warwick	Remove development	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt causing urban sprawl, impact on the character of the area, loss of important historic views, loss of arable agricultural land, impact on wildlife. Concerned as future development should be concentrated on brownfield sites.
2046	John and Norma	Watkins	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased pollution, loss

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				of green belt, insufficient educational facilities and community facilities.
2062	Colin	Stewart	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, impact on important views, increased pollution, lack of local amenities provided with proposed development, impact on existing schools. Believes alternative sites should be looked at.
2063	Grant	Stewart	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, impact on important views, increased pollution, lack of local amenities provided with proposed development, impact on existing schools. Believes alternative sites should be looked at.
2064	Valerie	Stewart	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, impact on important views, increased pollution, lack of local amenities provided with proposed development, impact on existing schools. Believes alternative sites should be looked at.
2066	Amanda	Stewart	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, impact on important views, increased pollution, lack of local amenities provided with proposed development, impact on existing schools. Believes alternative sites should be looked at.
2114	Ian	MacLennan	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing schools and community facilities, impact on wildlife, flooding issues, loss of recreational amenity at Cammo Walk, bus route proposed is not efficient in time, construction noise, dirt and congestion impact. Concerned about the impact on house prices.
2117	Diane	McCutcheon	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and impact on existing schools.
2144	Lorraine	Fraser	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased congestion and pollution, decreased road safety, impact on existing schools and community facilities, impact on amenity for walkers and effect on amenity of existing houses in the area, noise impact, loss of green belt, impact on landscape, loss of high quality agricultural land, loss of existing character of the area, flooding issues, impact on

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				quality of life and impact on wildlife. The proposal fails to consider alternative sites.
2148	Mark	Gilmour	Remove proposal or decrease proposed housing numbers.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, proposed primary school is in an unviable location and issues with flooding in the area.
2148	Mark	Gilmour	If the development is to go ahead then the proposed Site Brief should include play facilities. A pond should also be created.	Play area is needed on site or as part of improving the recreational facilities in the immediate area. A pond should be created somewhere on or near to the site to facilitate birds.
2158	Kim	Cosans	Remove proposal, keep as green belt land.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased noise and air pollution, loss of rural character, impact on wildlife, loss of scenic views, loss of green belt and impact on existing resources.
2196	Patrick	Mitchell	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, the new green belt boundary is not robust enough, impact on landscape, impact on amenities for walkers, loss of green space, loss of views, impact on wildlife, traffic impact, insufficient transport assessment and impact on existing schools and facilities. Concerned by a lack of consideration for brownfield sites and that the Cammo Development is not needed to meet the required housing numbers.
2230	Steve	Ritchie	Reconsider the proposed development.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increase in traffic noise and pollution, decrease in road safety. Concerned that no improvements to the infrastructure are proposed.
2251	Douglas	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of increased congestion and pollution, traffic impact, decrease in road safety, the impact on existing schools and community facilities, loss of amenity for walkers, loss of green belt, increased risk of flooding, impact on the character of the area, impact on wildlife and the impact on residents quality of life. Concerned that alternative sites have not been considered.
1214	Friends of the River Almond Walkway		Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, impact on wildlife and traffic congestion.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1746	Cramond & Harthill Estate	Halliday Fraser Munro	Rewording of bullet point 6 in respect of Cammo HSG20	Supports the focused growth to west Edinburgh and supports development at Cammo. Asks for the rewording of bullet point 6 in respect of provision of green network connections.
1746	Cramond & Harthill Estate	Halliday Fraser Munro	Until there is evidence to verify that HSG20 development will result in traffic mitigation being required at junction T18 all reference to contributions towards that junction in relation to HSG20 should be removed from the Plan.	Suggests that until there is evidence to verify that development at HSG20 will result in traffic mitigation being required for junction T18 then HSG20's contributions toward this junction should be removed.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Modify boundaries of the site and reduce total site area to 15 hectares	Concerns regarding landscape capacity, visual intrusion and traffic impact. Believe that some housing in this location may be justified if well designed and sited and landscaped to minimise its visual impact and presence. Lack of weight given to Edinburgh Green Belt Review Stages 1 and 2.
2217	Peter Scott Planning Services		Remove proposal. If the proposal is not removed then more open space should be provided as part of the development.	Concerned that representations from the MIR stage were not considered, does not believe infrastructure improvements and requirements will be delivered, loss of green belt and unsure that proposed green belt will be a robust measure against future development. Objects on the grounds of loss of views, impact on landscape and cultural heritage features, loss of amenity loss of agricultural land and traffic impact.
2247	Scottish Environment Protection Agency		Include reference to flood risk assessment within design principles.	Inclusion of reference would make it clear to developers that a flood risk assessment will be required. Will help promote sustainable approach to managing flood risk.
2295	Braehead Partnership & Gladman Developments	Gladman Developments	Increase the site boundary and capacity (additional 75 -100 units) of Proposal HSG20 to include land to the east of Cammo Walk and revise development principles.	The site should be extended to maximise the potential for development to meet the shortfall in housing land supply, create a strong green belt boundary, protect the Designed Landscape to the west and help create footpaths and cycle routes.



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
2231	Isla	Browning	Remove HSG20 proposal from plan.	Wishes the proposal to be removed on the grounds that housing could be provided elsewhere on brownfield sites and at higher densities, the land should be preserved for agriculture or community growing projects. Also concerned about traffic congestion, distance from the tram and airport, and impact on biodiversity and historic views.

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

There have been a significant number of objections to this proposal. The details of these objections have been considered, taking account of the increased housing requirement for Edinburgh set out in the approved Strategic Development Plan and its Supplementary Guidance and information available in the LDP Environmental Report - Second Revision, Transport Appraisal and Education Appraisal.

This proposal is included in the Second Proposed Plan. The assessment criteria used to identify suitable housing sites and the outcome of the assessment for this site and others are set out in the LDP Environmental Report - Second Revision. The Strategic Development Plan requires the LDP to give priority to sites in West and South East Edinburgh before allocating greenfield sites for housing elsewhere in Edinburgh. Further information on how the LDP is meeting its housing requirement, including the contribution from brownfield sites is provided in the supporting document “Housing Land Study”.

Some representations have suggested that other sites such as at Craighiehall, Ratho, Ratho Station and Gogarburn should be identified as an alternative to HSG20. Other sites have been identified in the Second Proposed Plan as explained in the Environmental Report - Second Revision. However because of the increased housing requirement for Edinburgh, these are in addition to HSG20, not alternatives. The suggested sites are not considered appropriate for the reasons set out in the Environmental Report - Second Revision.

One change has been made to the Cammo development principles to address comments about place-making and to be consistent with other site briefs.

Further work is being undertaken in relation to the transport and education proposals identified in the LDP. Discussions are also taking place between the Council and NHS Lothian regarding impact on health facilities. As more detailed information becomes available on these matters, this can be incorporated into the LDP Action Programme through its annual review.

The site area has not been increased to include land to the east of Cammo Walk (2295) because development on this site would have an unacceptable impact on the Special Landscape Area and Cammo Estate. The site area has not been reduced because the boundaries as proposed are appropriate in terms of the site assessment criteria (1750)

Open Space provision will be addressed at the masterplanning stage taking account of policy Hou3. The Open Space strategy does not require a large park at this location. The development principles set out the requirements for additional green network. However, there is no justification to require developer contributions for improvements to Cammo Estate. (2217, 2148, 495)

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<p><b>The issue of flood risk for all developments, not just LDP proposals is addressed through policy Env21. (2247)</b>  <b>The transport appraisal considers the cumulative impact of Proposals HSG19 and HSG20 on the transport network – this includes junction T18. (1746)</b>  <b>The wording of bullet 6 in the Cammo Development Principles has not been changed because the enhancement of off-site links is important. (1746)</b></p>				

### HSG 19 Maybury and HSG 20 Cammo

47 individuals/organisations submitted joint representations to both HSG 19 and HSG20. 40 of these were from individuals and seven from organisations including one community group. One representation was in support of the proposals and 46 were seeking change.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Support Plan</b>				
87	D	Duncan	Extend bus routes and ensure Maybury roundabout is adequately extended	Both sites seem well thought out in terms of layout and impact on the surrounding area. Maybury Roundabout needs to be adequately extended to ensure it does not become an accident black spot
<b><u>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</u></b>				
<b>The comments in relation to bus services and improvements to Maybury junction are addressed in the plan and supporting documents.</b>				
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
1528	East Craigs Wider Action Group		Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact. Concerned by the lack of a traffic management system within the plan and suggests a new access road to the west of the proposed housing is developed.
20	Aleksander	Wito	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt and agricultural land, traffic impact and loss of views to Cammo Park and Mauseley Hill. Concerned these developments will set a precedent for further development.
69	James	Robertson	Remove proposals Access to Maybury needs to be addressed or proposal removed from the development plan.	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, traffic mitigation not being sufficient and loss of green belt. Development potential at Leith and Docks in period to 2025.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
77	Robert	Grossman	Remove proposals	Objects to because of loss of green belt and will cause urban sprawl.
78	Ian R	Cameron	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing schools and community facilities and loss of views.
113	David J	Porteous	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing schools and community facilities, loss of amenity, lack of playground facilities, Cammo site is flood prone. Concerned that the associated infrastructure is established before any development of housing proceeds.
129	Colin	Thomson	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of green belt, concerned about a delay in the provision of cultural/social facilities by the developer and does not agree there is a need for additional housing.
163	K J	Tait	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of greenfield, loss of amenity, traffic impact, poor access and increase in pollution. Approves Cammo Walk being made into a cycle/pathway.
167	Kathryn	Scott	Requires more explicit information regarding provision for schooling; both primary and secondary education.	It is imperative that the proposed new school be a definite and absolute requirement and meet demand for now and for the proposed additional housing after 2025.
233	Francoise	Horrocks	Neither proposal should go ahead.	Consider proposal will have serious consequences for the community and environment. There will be pressure on schools, traffic disruption, reduced green space and access to it. Should develop cycling lanes to make cycling in and around towns less dangerous.
263	George & Sheila	Holmes	Rejection or substantial reduction of HSG 19 and HSG 20.	Consider the development will impact on the quality of life and environment for existing residents. Character will be lost and traffic effects could be catastrophic. Requests that traffic models are looked at again. Unclear about the required infrastructure.
265	Alan	O'Connor	Rejection or at least substantial reduction of new housing at HSG19 and HSG20	Objects on the grounds of impact on quality of life, loss of green belt and traffic impact. The required infrastructure in the plan is vague and unclear.
435	Elizabeth	Johnson	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing schools,

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				environmental impact and loss of green belt. Concerned that proposed infrastructure will not be delivered and considers the plan fails to consider alternative sites.
642	Aileen	Williams	Remove proposals	Objects because the character of the area will be changed, loss of green belt, loss of open space, loss of walking and cycling amenity, traffic impact, increased road hazards, impact on wildlife as well as the excessive housing numbers proposed.
643	Chantel	Tuke	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, increased pollution, loss of green belt. Concerned the value of houses will decrease.
787	A and W	Kinniburgh	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on pedestrian safety, impact on existing schools and local facilities. Concerned whether the current agricultural land growing crops is land zoned Grade 1 in which case it should remain as agricultural use.
940	Ian C	Adam	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, decreased air quality, loss of green belt, loss of recreational facilities, impact on wildlife and impact on medical facilities. Questions if development is required in this area.
1063	W G	Whyte	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and environmental impact.
1482	Sheena and Andrew	Cleland	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of landscape impact, loss of privacy, impact on the character of the area, loss of green belt causing urban sprawl, loss of agricultural land, loss of recreational amenities, traffic impact, loss of access as residents use Cammo Walk for access to their homes, impact on existing schools and community facilities.
1540	Ivor	Fennell	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact and unclear commitment from CEC regarding the necessary infrastructure upgrades required to mitigate against these developments.
1553	C	Flannigan	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt and amenity, not delivering best use of other land, traffic impact, environmental impact and increased pollution.
1636	Robert	Hope	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, impact on existing schools, impact community and recreational facilities, impact

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				on the character of the area. Believes that the area should be given time to settle following recent large development prior to any further development of housing.
1639	Stephen	Horrocks	Remove proposals or significantly reduce the proposed figures.	Objects on the grounds of impact on the existing community, impact on the environment, impact on existing schools, traffic impact, loss of green belt and reduced access to Cammo Park.
1684	Fiona	Kenny	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic and congestion impact, impact on existing local schools and community facilities and infrastructure, impact on the airports expansion. Main concern is that there is no consideration for the education of children at secondary school. Craigmount and Royal High Schools are at or near capacity.
1687	Colin	Keir MSP	Remove proposals	Objecting on the grounds of loss of green belt, increased traffic congestion, pressure on existing services, e.g. doctors and dentists and education facilities, consideration to further expansion of freight access in and out of the airport.
1733	Anne	MacLennan	Disapproves of the proposals for West Edinburgh.	Objects on grounds of impact on roads, schools, health services, wildlife, flooding, impact on walkers, increased bus travel time and construction disturbance. Does not believe up to 2,100 houses needed in West Edinburgh.
1899	Maureen	Pye	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and increased air pollution.
1946	Katherine	Ross	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on wildlife, traffic impact, increased pollution, impact on existing schools and community facilities, loss of recreational amenity. Concerned that brownfield areas have not been utilised, the effect on house prices in the area and that affordable housing is not a priority for developers.
2092	Clare	Alexander	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of amenity, landscape impact, loss of views, traffic impact, increased parking pressures, loss of green belt and impact on existing schools.
2093	Jill	Alexander	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of amenity, loss of views, impact on landscape, loss of green belt, increased parking

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				pressures, impact on existing schools and community and local facilities.
2094	Patrick	Alexander	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, loss of amenity, loss of views, impact on landscape, loss of green belt, increased parking pressures, impact on existing schools and community and local facilities.
2095	Graham and Sandra	Baker	Remove proposals	Concerned about the impact on traffic as well as there being no mention of any upgrading of road junctions as part of this development.
2096	Colin	Ballantyne	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of agricultural land, impact on wildlife, traffic impact and impact on existing schools.
2098	John and Carolyn	Blackhall	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact, impact on existing schools, loss of road safety, loss of green belt. Concerned as the plan does not propose any improvements to existing road infrastructure.
2107	Magnus & Hazell	Drummond	Remove proposals	Objecting on the grounds of increased traffic congestion, pressure on health services and concerns over funding and delivery.
2118	David	McDougall	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt causing urban sprawl, traffic impact, loss of resident's amenity, impact on existing schools and community facilities. Concerned about what additional utility infrastructure there will be and who will pay for it and if other areas would benefit more from this development.
2121	Michael	McWilliam	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of loss of residential amenity, traffic impact, increased air pollution, impact on road safety, impact on wildlife and loss of a green space.
2131	Philip and Jennifer	Welsby	Remove proposals	Objects on the grounds of traffic impact.
2187	Mr and Mrs	Mackenzie	Remove proposals HSG19 and HSG20 from the development plan	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on existing schools and traffic impact.
2283	Thomas	Shippey	Removal proposals and retain HSG19 and HSG20 as green belt.	Objects on the grounds of loss of green space, loss of walking and cycling amenity, loss of green belt causing urban sprawl.

Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1746	Cramond & Harthill Estate	Halliday Fraser Munro	Amendment to the Action Programme so Cammo and Maybury contribute to the T19 Barnton junction capacity enhancement scheme.	The transport actions detailed do not take account of the impact HSG20 and HSG19 will have in the Barnton junction. Both schemes should contribute to the upgrading of this traffic interchange.
1750	The Cockburn Association		Modifications to both site briefs are necessary.	Housing allocation at Maybury viewed as intrusive and prominent in views to urban area. Consider Cammo allocation will have impact on setting of city, traffic and cannot be justified by rail/tram some distance away. Consider some housing may be justified in both locations if well sited and designed.
2036	TNT UK Limited		Would like to see full details of the proposed highway improvements at the junction of Turnhouse Road with Maybury Road and Glasgow Road (A8).	Concerned about the increased number of vehicles and the impact this will have on their time sensitive business.
2209	West Lothian Council		Do not object to the terms of the proposed LDP but wish to see amendments relating to Newbridge roundabout to address cross-boundary considerations.	Transport appraisal should be informed by the likely effect of committed development as well as new allocations in both Edinburgh and surrounding local authorities and make appropriate provision to address the cumulative impact. Proposals should therefore be changed to include the phrasing "cross boundary agreement/discussion and developer contributions".
2222	West Craigs Ltd	GVA	Text change - remove Maybury and Cammo Site Brief.	Concerned that a site brief will delay proceedings and early development and could lead to sites not coming forward in an effective timescale. Believe additional units can be put on this site.
2236	SAICA Pack UK Limited	Trilogie CRE Limited	Amend the 'Maybury Development Principles' so that new housing traffic is routed on to an improved and upgraded Craigs Road.	Considers the use of Turnhouse Road as the principal access to the proposed new Maybury housing development inappropriate. Traffic increase would be greater than the existing capacity of Turnhouse Road.



Ref No.	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</b>				
<p>A number of representations object to both HSG19 and HSG20 or relate specifically to the Maybury and Cammo Site Brief. The issues raised are similar to those for each site individually. The Council's response is the same.</p> <p>The details of these objections have been considered, taking account of the increased housing requirement for Edinburgh set out in the approved Strategic Development Plan and its Supplementary Guidance and information available in the LDP Environmental Report - Second Revision, Transport Appraisal and Education Appraisal.</p> <p>These proposals are included in the Second Proposed Plan. The assessment criteria used to identify suitable housing sites and the outcome of the assessment for these sites and others are set out in the LDP Environmental Report - Second Revision. The Strategic Development Plan requires the LDP to give priority to sites in West and South East Edinburgh before allocating greenfield sites for housing elsewhere in Edinburgh. Further information on how the LDP is meeting its housing requirement, including the contribution from brownfield sites is provided in the supporting document "Housing Land Study".</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken in relation to the transport and education proposals identified in the LDP. Discussions are also taking place between the Council and NHS Lothian regarding impact on health facilities. As more detailed information becomes available on these matters, this will be incorporated into the LDP Action Programme through its annual review.</p> <p>A mechanism for measuring and mitigating cross boundary transport impacts is currently being developed at SESplan level, involving the six SESplan authorities, SEStran and Transport Scotland. (2209)</p> <p>The Maybury and Cammo Site Brief sets out the Council's expectations in relation to essential development principles (2222)</p> <p>Turnhouse Road runs through the HSG19 site and will be used to access the new housing development. Further information on road and junction improvements will become available as planning applications come forward (2036, 2236)</p>				

### SCH 6 Maybury

Four representations were received specifically in relation to school proposal SCH6 Maybury, two from individuals and two from organisations. Two of the representations object to the school in principle and the other two representations are seeking change on points of detail.

Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Seeking Change</b>				
1104	Omead Saeed		Don't want any schools built.	Objects on grounds of pedestrian safety and increase in journey times.
1107	Mohammed Saeed		Don't want schools built.	Objects on grounds of traffic congestion and that it will be dangerous for children.



Ref No.	Name	Consultant (where applicable)	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
1749	Corstorphine Old Parish Church		Changes to the text to say "New Community Primary School" and reference made to the building providing social facilities after school hours	Concerned that such a large housing scheme will have no community facilities. Believe the school is an opportunity to provide a meeting place for the community. Also concerned about the size of the school and if it is of sufficient size to cope with demand.
2222	West Craigs Ltd	GVA	Text addition at Table 5 advising that the provision of a new primary school will be on the basis there is full and up to date capacity information provided. Any school provision will only be necessary whereby there is a need resulting from the proposed development. Text addition at para 69 explaining that any requirement for a new or expanded school will be directly related to a full catchment review at the time of the housing coming forward.	Provision of a new school should be assessed as part of site brief and not a prerequisite. Full catchment reviews are required to assess existing capacity prior to seeking any new provision and strict adherence of catchment enforcement. Developers can only pay for education provision that is fully justified and necessary for their development.

**How the Council has had regard to the above representations**

The LDP Education Appraisal has identified the need for a new primary school to serve new housing development in West Edinburgh and the Maybury site is the preferred location. It is therefore appropriate that a school proposal on this site is included in the LDP. Further information on the implementation of this proposal will be provided through the LDP Action Programme. (1104, 1107, 2222)  
How the school is managed in terms of community use is not a LDP matter (1749).

### Issue 8 New Greenfield housing proposals in South East Edinburgh - Broomhills and Burdiehouse

Issue 8 covers representations to two greenfield housing sites in South East Edinburgh – HSG21 Broomhills and HSG22 Burdiehouse. It also includes representations to the greenspace proposal (GS9) and school proposal SCH8 on the Broomhills site. These representations are summarised in four tables

- HSG21 Broomhills
- GS9 Broomhills
- SCH8 Broomhills
- HSG22 Burdiehouse

The purpose of the summary tables is to provide an indication of the number and nature of representations submitted. All representations along with any supporting documents can be viewed at [www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/localdevelopmentplan). These representations have informed the preparation of the Second Proposed Plan. Each summary table includes sections explaining how the Council has had regard to the representations received on this issue.

#### HSG21 Broomhills

There were 489 representations to proposal HSG21 Broomhills, the vast majority of which were objecting to the principle of development and requesting that the proposal be removed from the plan. The representations were mainly from individuals with one from a Community Council and one from a Community Group. There were two supporting representations.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>Supports Plan</b>				
55	Anthony	Gray		Support proposed 50m tree belt to south and west of site.
1737	Trustees of the Catchelraw Trust & Barratt David Wilson Homes	Clarendon Planning & Development Ltd (Consultant)		Supports the allocation of land at 'Broomhills' for residential development within the Proposed LDP. A number of supporting documents submitted.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
<b>How the Council has had regard to the above representations</b>				
<b>The supporting representations are noted.</b>				
<b>Seeking a Change</b>				
75	John M	Fletcher		Questions the decision to build on green belt given flooding issues and that the land is used for food production. Questions why the school is at Burdiehouse as this would have an impact on pedestrian safety in terms of accessing it. Describes the affect the development will have on views to the Pentlands and does not welcome any access road and the associated traffic increase along their cul-de-sac.
2183	Liberton & District Community Council		Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of traffic impact and existence of alternative sites at Edmonstone, Alnwickhill, Liberton Road and Burdiehouse. Requirements for School could be met by redeveloping former Burdiehouse Primary School. Acknowledge, however, that the site has the ability to fit into the landscape in an acceptable manner.
1258	Association of Proprietors, Mortonhall Estate Phase 1		Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
1259	Bryan	Ryalls	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
10	M	Baillie	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, loss of good quality agricultural land, traffic impact, wildlife, school capacity, loss of winter sunshine to existing houses and underground electrical pipeline from Straiton Power station. Brownfield land and poor quality farm land sites should be developed first.
15	J	Lothian	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, loss of good quality agricultural land, traffic impact, wildlife, school capacity, loss of winter sunshine to existing houses and underground electrical pipeline from

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				Straiton Power station. Brown field land and poor quality farm land sites should be developed first.
25	Allan	Melville	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of creeping urbanisation, transport impact and impact on open space. Refers to the representation from SNH and SEPA to the MIR which states that the site is "not currently a reasonable site"
26	Elizabeth	Melville	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of creeping urbanisation, transport impact and impact on open space. Refers to the representation from SNH and SEPA to the MIR which states that the site is "not currently a reasonable site"
30	Sheila	Clarke	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land and access to Broomhills from Frogston Road.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity. Concerned about vehicle access to Broomhills from Frogston Road.
31	Paul	Fong	Do not make any changes to the area.	Objects to the development of housing but supports the bus route.
44	Karen	Howe	No development on site. Rebuild Gracemount primary School rather than provide a new school and make transport changes.	Objects on grounds that proposal will lead to further development and erosion of green belt, traffic impact, creation of school which will not have a good social mix, capacity of schools if new school is not built. Budget for Broomhills Primary School should be used at Gracemount.
48	Colin	Brown	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of creeping urbanisation, transport impact and impact on open space.
55	Anthony	Gray	Requests that a community facilities appraisal is undertaken and included in development principles. Remove proposal.	Concerned about impact on local medical facilities. Objects to proposal on grounds that it does not comply with policy Des 9.
57	Lewis	Kennedy	Reduce the scale of the development proposed to at least 50% of the figure	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt in part, traffic impact and impact on existing schools and community facilities. Concerned about the additional impact of developments proposed in the surrounding

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			proposed	area combined with this development.
64	Caroline	McCabe	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools, loss of amenity and that the character of the area as edge of city will be detrimentally affected.
70	Geoff	Eddy	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of development setting precedent for loss of green belt land, traffic impact. Brownfield sites should be used.
72	Peter	Hart	Remove proposal or scale down	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, impact on infrastructure and services and need for open space.
73	Derek	Smith	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on public facilities.
76	R M & I M	Brydon	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact as well as flooding issues.
101	Carol	Roy	Proposal not viable.	Objects on grounds of effect on environment, traffic and public transport, loss of green belt and existing housing being built in area.
139	Eric	Sim	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on public facilities.
140	George	Baxter	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, pollution, impact on landscape, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools, loss of amenity, poor accessibility to public transport, difficulty forming green belt boundaries, loss of trees and dangerous access.
160	Margaret	Baxter	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity and on basis that site has great natural beauty.
189	Lydia	Ward	Vehicle access onto Frogston Road East from Broomhills.	Objects on grounds of dangerous access and traffic impact.
223	Paul	Oldroyd	Remove proposal, does not want any development on this site.	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and impact on wildlife.
224	Alexander	Cockerell	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding,

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
245	Robert & Irene	Brydon	More understanding of traffic problems.	Impacts of traffic will be significant and access for emergency services needs to be available.
261	Mary & Michael	Hughes	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, impact on wildlife and local facilities and lack of public consultation. Questions demolition of Burdiehouse School and reasons behind greenspace proposal.
280	Linda	Watts	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
286	Fiona	Gomes	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, impact on local facilities, traffic impact, drainage, late public consultation and lack of information.
331	Ruth	McKendrick	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
332	Winnie	Smith	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
333	H & W	Dott	Remove proposal	Object on the grounds of loss of green belt and traffic impact.
340	Ruth Brady	Greenock	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
341	Sally	Wilson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
342	Patrick	McCaw	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
349	Louie & William	Wright	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact, impact on wildlife and local facilities and lack of public consultation. Questions

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
				demolition of Burdiehouse School and reasons behind greenspace proposal.
371	Duncan	Wilson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
372	Scott	Wilson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
373	Amanda	Wilson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
374	Robert	Mac Innes	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
375	Natasha	Broomfield	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
376	Gordon	Broomfield	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
377	Alison	Broomfield	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
378	LVH	Martin	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
379	Carole	Valentine	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
380	Andrew	Letton	Remove proposal and build on	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding,

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
381	Richard	Bell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
382	Kirsty	Bell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
383	Ian	Forrest	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
384	James	Young	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
385	Pamela	Taylor	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
386	Brian	Simpson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
387	Margaret	Dougherty	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
388	Elizabeth	Young	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
389	Julia	Mikrouli	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
390	E	Sanderson	Remove proposal and build on	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding,



Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
391	Wendy	Bleazard	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
392	Rosemary	Bayne	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
393	Mary	Healy	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
394	Morag	Simpson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
395	George	Forsyth	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
396	Patrick	Vaughan	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
397	W	Shaw	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity and loss of exclusivity of the area.
398	Yuk King	Ching	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
399	Kam Bun	Leung	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
400	Eleanor	Barnard	Remove proposal and build on	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding,

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
401	A	Russell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
402	Louise	Turnbull	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
404	Kathleen	Cockerell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
409	Helen	Cowan	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
410	Tom	Cowan	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
411	Philip	Burt	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
412	Stuart	Combe	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
413	Josephine	Swan	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
414	Donald	Swan	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
418	Chris R	Mitchell	Remove proposal and build on	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding,

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
419	Rosemary	Mitchell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
426	Anne	Gillson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
429	Eric A	Mitchell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
436	Linda	Wylie	Remove proposal and build on non-green belt sites.	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt, loss of amenity, impact on local amenities, unsuitability of land for building and traffic impact.
437	Peter	Branney	Reduce scale of proposal and extend green belt to all remaining agricultural land.	Object on the grounds that the proposal is too large and will destroy agricultural area and wildlife, impact on surrounding area and that green belt should be extended.
450	Alex	Collins	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
454	Jeffrey	Phillips	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
458	Steven	Yuill	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
459	Rico	Kosedy	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
460	Catherine	Burnett	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			land.	
461	Bruce	James	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
462	Jeanette	James	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
463	Laura	Oliver	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
464	Ronald	Davidson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
465	Helen	Davidson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
466	Neil	Davidson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
467	Alex S	Thomson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
468	Anita	Thomson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
469	Elizabeth	Gray	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
470	Alex	Jackson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			land.	
471	James	Haggarty	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
472	Jamie	Maidan	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
473	Natalie	Hunting	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
474	Richard	Forsyth	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
475	Carol	Forsyth	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
476	Evelyn	Faulkner	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
477	James	Dickson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
478	Neil	Young	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
479	Hannah	Young	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
480	J	Wallace	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			land.	
481	Craig	Heaslip	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
482	Anne	Bleazard	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity. Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
483	M	Mikrouli	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
484	Walid	Al-Kames	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
487	Elaine	Hunt	Removal of HSG21 from the proposed plan, build on non-agricultural, non green-belt land	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt land and agricultural land, landscape impact, increased traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence issues, impact on existing schools and community facilities and loss of amenity. Objects to the proposed bus service.
491	Alan	Mitchell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
493	Cynthia	Palmer	Remove proposal	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, traffic impact and poor consultation.
531	S	Armstrong	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
538	Peter	Connolly	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
539	Maureen	Matgar	Remove proposal and build on	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding,

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
540	Tony	Mowat	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
541	Andrew	Taylor	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
542	Anne	Reilly	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity, and loss of exclusivity of the area. Considers the proposed bus route to be a danger to children and pedestrian safety.
543	Ailsa	Campbell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
544	Anne	Campbell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
545	Alex	Campbell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
547	David	Morgan	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
548	Jackie	Mowat	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
549	Liam	Burns	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
550	Audrey	Phillips	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
551	Louise	Laidlaw	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
552	Alan	Dawson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
553	Hazel	Kerr	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
554	Deighton	Arnott	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
555	William	Wait	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
556	Jane	Morgan	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
557	Peter	Booth	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
558	Susan	Booth	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
559	Kira	Burns	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.



Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
560	Neil	Hamilton	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
561	Ian	Hamilton	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
562	Mark	Harris	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
563	Karen	MacKenzie	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
564	Kay L	Munro	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
565	Lilian	Fotheringham	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
566	D J R	Fotheringham	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
568	Diane	Gibb	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
569	Andrew	Gibb	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
570	Jacqueline	Mitchell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
571	Nicola	Fox	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
572	Thomas	Reilly	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
573	Kay	McLean	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
574	Margaret	Wardell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
575	E M	Taylor	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
576	N	MacKenzie	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
577	Esther	Forrest	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
578	John	Deuchar	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
579	Sandra	Deuchar	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
580	Alexandra	Campbell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
581	Duncan	Campbell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
582	David	Campbell	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
583	Grant	Wanstall	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
584	John	Wanstall	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
585	Louise	Wanstall	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
586	Brenda	Wanstall	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
587	John	Webster	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
588	Yvonne	Webster	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
589	Rachel	Webster	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
590	Thomas W	Jamieson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land. Create direct access from	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.

Ref No	Name	Name	Changes Requested	Summary of Representation
			site to city by-pass.	
591	Lynda	Ardern	Should not use green belt or agricultural land, exit on Frogston Road East to be repositioned, site should be relocated to avoid damaging wildlife, TPO implemented, housing numbers reduced.	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt and impact on views, loss of agricultural land, impacts of traffic, air and noise pollution, flooding, drainage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools, loss of amenity, impact on wildlife, impact on trees and conservation area, scale of proposal and the consultation process.
593	Elaine	Anderson	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
595	Finlay	Valentine	Remove proposal	Objects on grounds of loss of green belt land, loss of agricultural land, traffic, impact on wildlife and availability of brownfield sites.
596	I D	Stavert	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
597	Peter	Bonnington	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
602	Raymond	Turner	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
603	Michaela	Turner	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
604	Joan	Turner	Remove proposal and build on non-agricultural, non-greenbelt land.	Objects on grounds of green belt land, traffic and pollution, flooding, sewerage and subsidence, infrastructure, schools and loss of amenity.
610	Kenneth	Falconer	Remove proposal and retain site as green belt.	Objects on the grounds of loss of green belt, impact on traffic and poor consultation.