1 Purpose of report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present to the Planning Committee a finalised Development Brief for the North West area of Portobello, as supplementary planning guidance. This has been prepared following extensive public consultation, which is detailed at Appendix 2.

2 Summary

2.1 The study area centres on the former Scottish Power site at the western entrance to Portobello, but also includes other neighbouring sites with development potential, and totals 17 hectares in all. In October 2006 the Planning Committee approved a Study Framework which instructed the commissioning of consultants to prepare a master plan framework for the next 15 – 20 years. Once completed, the Master Plan was considered by Committee as the basis for consultation with the public and with stakeholders. This exercise is now complete and a Development Brief, based on the Consultants’ work as amended in the light of consultation feedback, is now being placed before the Committee for approval.

2.2 This supplementary planning guidance will be a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications on the site.

3 Main report

Nature of the Study Area

3.1 The proposed study area covers approximately 17 hectares, comprising a cluster of sites, largely in private ownership, which form the north west approach to Portobello:

a) Baileyfield Industrial Estate (North and Central)
b) All-Weather Pitches, Westbank Street
3.2 The area is contained by Sir Harry Lauder Road to the west and the Promenade to the north east, with the Figgate Burn and Bridge Street defining the southern limits. The Westbank housing area and tenements fronting Kings Road lie immediately to the north, with Portobello High Street and the Portobello Conservation Area situated to the south east.

3.3 The location currently comprises a mix of mainly light industrial and residential uses with some retail, commercial and leisure activities, and incidental areas of open space. Approximately 60% of the study area (the Baileyfield Industrial Estate) is designated in the North East Edinburgh Local Plan for business and employment uses. The remainder of the area is designated largely for housing and compatible uses. The finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan (referenced at 3.6 below) is also a material consideration.

3.4 The area has been subject to incremental change in the past, with a decline in economic activity and fractures in the urban form. However, there is now pressure for change, with interest from a number of developers in several of the key sites. Further changes on several adjacent sites may also be desirable in the future. A planning application for a supermarket on the Scottish Power site was dismissed on appeal, and the issues raised at that time indicated a strong case for co-ordinated regeneration, to take best advantage of the opportunity to prepare and implement a long term holistic design vision.

Policy Considerations

**Edinburgh City Local Plan**

3.5 Following representations on the emerging Edinburgh City Local Plan, the Baileyfield North and Central sites were deleted as specific business/employment sites. However, the finalised Plan's Policy Emp 4 on Employment Sites and Premises states that

"Planning permission will be granted for the development for employment purposes of business and industrial sites or premises which are in the urban area and are not covered by Policies Emp 1, 2 or 3. Development incorporating uses other than business, industry or storage will be permitted provided:

- the proposal includes a significant element of new floorspace designed to provide for a range of business users"
- the introduction of non-employment uses will not prejudice or inhibit the activities of any nearby industrial user or occupier

the proposal will contribute to the comprehensive regeneration and improvement of the wider area."

Small Business Premises: Design and Supply

3.6 A report on small business premises was approved by Planning Committee on 10 August 2006, which identified the increasing trend for piecemeal loss of inner city industrial sites to other forms of development, and the necessity for retention of this land. The Committee also approved the Small Business Premises Design Study, which was prepared as a tool to guide new forms of small industrial and business space within the City. This identified a number of conceptual models which could meet contemporary business and employment needs including workspace within residential development, mews units and multi-layered industrial buildings, and is therefore particularly relevant to the Baileyfield North and Central sites.

Promenade (Boardwalk) Study

3.7 This project, for a 15km coastal route from Cramond to Joppa, was approved by Planning Committee on 12 January 2006, and is now safeguarded within the Edinburgh City Local Plan. There was extensive public consultation and further detailed studies were recently approved by Committee for the identification of funding and areas where early implementation measures could be considered, including initial upgrading of existing sections. Localised widening of the promenade is also being considered where sites are coming up for redevelopment. Portobello Promenade is an integral part of the overall route, and the Master Plan study area includes 3 sites directly fronting the Promenade.

Master Plan preparation and community engagement

3.8 Initial discussions took place with the principal landowners / developers in the area between December 2005 and January 2006. Several developers were keen to move forward with detailed proposals for their respective sites. However, they agreed to defer from submitting detailed plans until a master plan and urban design framework is put in place. Further work was then undertaken to see which areas a master plan framework should embrace, and what issues should be addressed as part of any study.

3.9 A draft Consultants’ Brief was prepared in mid-2006, and was consulted with local Members, Portobello Community Council, local amenity groups and principal landowners, agents and developers. This consultation took place over a 3 week period up to 21 July 2006, and elicited 40 representations to the Department, and a further 90 to Members. The Draft Consultants Brief was re-written as a Study Framework, taking account of the feedback received, and was reported to the Planning Committee on 5 October 2006.
3.10 The objectives defined then, and which still provide relevant criteria against which to assess new development proposals, were:

- to create of a high quality development which reinforces Portobello's sense of place, and enhances the North West entrance to Portobello when approaching from Edinburgh City Centre, Leith and Sir Harry Lauder Road
- to create a coherent urban structure which integrates with the context of Portobello, and complements the wider perspective of the city of Edinburgh, considers the urban environment in an holistic manner and avoids a piecemeal approach being taken to the development of individual sites
- to provide a framework for the development of a strong public realm, improve the functionality of the area, provide an enhanced pedestrian focus, and create a high quality setting for the new environment
- to assist in re-connecting the area with the Promenade, both in visual and functional terms, and also to consider the role the area could play in developing the Promenade and beach as an asset for the wider city
- to assist in developing the role of the Promenade and Figgate Burn both as a strategic pedestrian cycle routes and as linear open spaces

3.11 The Planning Committee approved the Study Framework as the basis for commissioning a Master Plan and Urban Design Framework for the North West area of Portobello. The purpose of the plan was to provide a land use and design framework to guide and co-ordinate proposals in Portobello for the next 15-20 years. From the outset, the Council considered it imperative that the preparation of the plan should be carried out in consultation with the local community, and this was reflected in the brief given to the consultants. The brief set out the planning background, including the role of the area in meeting the city's contemporary business and industrial needs, examination of potential land uses, relevant policy and other issues to address, and details of the component sites which make up the proposed master plan area.

3.12 In April 2007 the Council, after a competitive selection process, appointed Cadell² Wiszniewski Thomson Architects (C²WTA). In order to encourage early engagement with the local community, a Community Planning event was held at Portobello on 24 May, to which representatives from stakeholders, community groups and other local interests, together with members and officials from the Council, were invited. The event was organised by C²WTA and took the form of a presentation followed by interactive workshop sessions to identify local background issues and generate ideas. Around 50 persons attended the event, and the workshop findings provided useful input into the preparation of the next stage of the process.

3.13 The first draft of the Master Plan and Urban Design Framework was completed and placed on public exhibition from 26 June to 20 July 2007 in Portobello Public Library. It generated substantial public interest - the Consultants received 171 formal submissions containing 730 comments.
3.14 Some of the positive key issues which emerged from the consultation were:

- The importance of providing cultural and leisure places and activities on the waterfront, particularly for teenagers;
- Requirement for affordable homes;
- Desire for sustainable development and micro-renewables;
- The landscaping of the Figgate Burn and linking it to the park;
- The creation of space around the Kilns and views to and from the Promenade;
- The orientation of the blocks on the Fun Park site;
- The creation of a gateway or landmark building to the west.

Issues which respondents expressed more concern over included

- Building heights, particularly the proposed 10-storey towers along Baileyfield Road;
- The proposed re-location of the library to a site adjacent to the bowling club, and its remoteness from the High Street and bus stops;
- The pier and hovercraft proposals;
- Loss of the Pitz (5-a-side football pitches) and of amenity / leisure space;
- Potential loss of the tiled square on Bridge Street;
- Impact of the transport infrastructure and parking on the new development;
- Loss of existing parking and concern for how the parking of the new developments would be accommodated;
- Concerns about the stability of the land.

The Consultants' responded in detail to these points in a Community Consultation report, which has been placed before the Committee.

3.15 Individual meetings were also held in August 2007 with the key landowners, and a well-attended public meeting, with a presentation by the Consultants, was arranged in September 2007 by the local Ward Members. The responses from all these streams were collated and analysed, and were used to inform the revision of the Master Plan. In addition, two supplementary pieces of work – the Community Consultation report referred to above, and an Implementation Plan – were undertaken.

**The Consultants' Final Master Plan and Urban Design Framework**

3.16 The Final Master Plan and Framework was prepared by the Consultants in the light of stakeholder and public comments, and was agreed by the Planning Committee on 5 October 2007 as the basis for further consultation with the community and stakeholders. It did not propose to replicate the existing townscape of Portobello but to extend it in a
contemporary version which picked up on aspects of the town’s distinctive character and connected back to it.

3.17 The Framework proposed a regeneration strategy to produce a high quality distinctive residential and mixed use area of landscaped streets, parks and urban squares, extending the High Street and reinforcing the Figgate Burn as a linkage to the Promenade. The Framework proposed a master plan street layout which, subject to the flexibility required as development ideas evolve and progress, would be fairly prescriptive; and also design guidance to ensure that the individual architectural contributions are of high quality and appropriate for the location. The framework sought to guide development in this area over a 15-20 year period.

3.18 Some 500 people are employed in the area, the majority in Standard Life’s operation at South Baileyfield. The Framework retained this use as a contributory site to the wider operations of a major city-wide employer, but also allowed for it to be reconfigured in an appropriate way consistent with the rest of the master plan when the present buildings become life-expired. Otherwise, the main employment thrust was to encourage small business use, in line with the demand profile set out at 3.6 above. Edinburgh’s restricted business land availability and its high cost preclude the traditional single-storey approach, and the Framework envisaged more innovative and sustainable options such as mews types, live/work, and multi-layered solutions.

3.19 The Framework identified significant additional residential potential for Portobello, building on its proximity to the centre, its shopping centre, parks and seafront. The Framework made provision for this, at a density of around 70p/ha. A specific demand for student accommodation was also identified, particularly with the proximity of the relocated Queen Margaret University at Musselburgh. The increased numbers of residents and workers in the area would benefit Portobello’s existing shops, but might also support an additional amount of smaller-scale retail development, which could help extend and strengthen the High Street and anchor the new development into it.

3.20 The character of each of the site edges was analysed and a suitable response prepared. The edge defined by the arterial Harry Lauder Road is the least satisfactory, and amelioration here was proposed by a landscaped border with taller buildings set at right angles to protect views and for sustainability. The High Street edge would be informed by the existing scale and massing to the east. A gateway building at the Kings Road end would relate to both these edges and provide a focus in its own right. To reinforce the morphology, the heights of buildings dropped within the site, while building up locally along the edges, the High Street frontage, and at the sea-front.

3.21 The Promenade is both a local and city-wide amenity, and the Figgate Burn corridor offers opportunities for improvement as a landscape asset and for locating community facilities to form a strong public link through
to the seafront and strengthen this end of the town. Further permeability was suggested by improving pedestrian links from the Pipe Street area. Kings Road is also a major link and, if a new pier is desired at Portobello, the Framework suggested that this could be best accommodated as an extension of this street.

3.22 As well as this primary east-west structure of Harry Lauder Road / High Street / Promenade, the secondary grain of Portobello’s linking cross-streets was also echoed in the master plan layout. Landscape provision of around 40% was integrated within this overall framework.

3.23 The Framework set out recommendations for sustainability, a mix of uses, a lighting strategy, public space, the location of public buildings, and bridging Harry Lauder Road to connect with the area to the north. It also set out more specific design guidance, which dealt in more detail with the edge conditions, urban grain, heights scale and massing, the design of the public realm, street treatment, materials and architectural standards and considerations. A movement framework looked at a hierarchy of streets, permeability, and parking. Suggestions for phasing were also set out, as were more specific guidelines for each area within the master plan.

Economic considerations

3.24 For any masterplan or urban design framework to be successful, it must be realistic in terms of market demand and capable of being delivered. A parallel workstream therefore estimated the amount and type of development that the area could accommodate within this 15 – 20 year period, taking into account existing market trends, experience of the effect that regenerative activity has on local property markets and the views of the public obtained during the consultation exercises. The conclusions were that market demand will exist over the period of the plan to accommodate the uses and the quantity of uses identified.

3.25 A companion Implementation Strategy provided advice to the Council on how best to ensure that the overall objectives of the Framework are delivered and that public benefits like public buildings, open spaces, improved public realm, etc are all procured at minimal cost to the public purse.

Revisions from the June 2007 draft Master Plan

3.26 The responses from the exhibition at Portobello library were fed back into the Framework, allowing it to be refined and re-focused to address the issues raised, to verify and test various propositions, and to take it to a further level of detail without losing the strategic overview. To the basic concept of the defining edges was added a stronger emphasis on the Promenade, on the extension of an active High Street, and on picking up the form of the urban grain. All of this better aligns the proposed development structure with its location within the existing area of Portobello.
3.27 The master plan layout was also refined in terms of road alignments, building masses and land uses. The road layout was refined to require only a single access from Harry Lauder Road, and to fit with Standard Life's operations. Parking levels have been calculated and can be accommodated within the site. Other non-vehicular connections – eg to Fishwives' Causeway, to the existing and new school sites, and to the Promenade via Kings Road and an extension of the landscape buffer – have been strengthened to encourage pedestrian and cycle access.

3.28 The definition between public and private realm was made more distinct through the use of perimeter-block layouts to avoid ambiguity, and the main central public open spaces were more clearly defined. The Figgate Burn was strengthened as a connection into and through the site, and the layout of blocks was changed to improve the quality of the link. The library was repositioned at the entrance to this link to take advantage of the High Street and bus routes. The stronger emphasis on the Promenade would allow integration of development potential of the adjoining sites. The mix of housing types was refined, with provision for landscaped settings appropriate to each type. Business units were regrouped to give them greater autonomy from the housing, and the High Street frontage was redesigned to include active ground floor commercial and business uses, including a small retail element to strengthen and extend the importance of the High Street.

Final Proposals from the Consultants - Consultation

3.29 In line with the Protocol agreed by Planning Committee in October 2007, the process of community engagement on the master plan proposals was discussed with the local Neighbourhood Partnership on 28 November.

3.30 The Masterplan and Framework were circulated, in paper or CD format as preferred, to key stakeholders. Other interested parties were advised as to where they could find the relevant documents for the consultation process. Inspection copies of the material were available at Portobello Library and the Planning Reception at Waverley Court, and also in electronic format on the Council's website.

3.31 The consultation period ran for 12 weeks from December 2007 to February 2008. This was longer than normal to allow for the Christmas and New Year holiday period and ensure that all interested parties had an opportunity to comment. The consultation also included briefing meetings for stakeholders, and a planning staff presence at the Library. All representations received during the consultation period were considered and are reported in Appendix 2.

3.32 This latest round of the consultation process was additional to all the previous community consultation outlined above. The proposals have
therefore been the subject of very thorough community involvement over
a considerable period.

**Results of the Consultation Exercise**

3.33 The consultation generated a considerable amount of local interest, and
some 140 letters and e-mails were received directly from individuals and
organisations, with additionally some 50 copies of a circular letter
circulated by and supporting the views of the four interlocking local
pressure groups; however, not all respondents consider that these
groups represent the views of the community.

3.34 The representations are catalogued in Appendix 2, and are summarised
(with an indication of frequency of occurrence) in Appendix 3. From this,
it can be seen that there are about ten recurring points of criticism which
were not generally felt to be addressed satisfactorily in the Final Master
Plan. These have therefore been scrutinised in some detail by the
Department when transforming the Master Plan into a Brief for
development guidance.

3.35 In the light of this further assessment, and following discussions with
internal stakeholders, the Department agrees with certain of the points
made in the representations, and recommends that the following
elements of the Master Plan are not pursued further in the final
Development Brief as presented in Appendix 1:

- the inclusion of a metro-type supermarket on the High Street
- the higher flatted blocks along Harry Lauder road edge
- the loss of the Bridge Street public car park
- the Figgate Burn between High Street and Promenade being lost to
  public access behind private back gardens
- student accommodation as the gateway building
- a landmark building on the east side of High Street at Kings Road
- development rising to 5 storeys on the Promenade
- sedum-roofed buildings at the landscaped edge
- development of the 5-a-side football pitches unless another local site
  is provided
- move of the library and community centre from their present sites
  unless further studies show this to be a desirable option

3.36 Representations which have been considered but are not feasible in the
context set by the Committee for the master plan and/or are not material
to general planning guidelines include:

- calls for no development on the site, or for its conversion to parkland
  – *Reason: this would be financially unrealistic, unsustainable at appeal, and
  is also inconsistent with meeting Edinburgh’s development plan policies and
  housing targets*
- loss of private views from individual residences – *Reason: this is not a
  valid planning amenity consideration*
• a requirement for all new building to be maximum 3 storeys and / or lower than existing buildings – Reason: this would indefensible in planning terms and at appeal. Building heights must reflect the surrounding context

• rejection of the possible move of library or community centre on the grounds that it would be a less central location – Reason: the new development sites are within a few hundred metres of those existing and are therefore still very central to Portobello. Any future decision on relocation of any existing facilities must be based purely on functional and operational reasons

• retention for all time of the Baileyfield Cottages – Reason: any current development proposal for Baileyfield must take account of the Cottages’ amenity, daylight and access; but if, by mutual agreement between the developer and the proprietors, redevelopment is proposed, this would also be acceptable

3.37 The development Brief therefore revises the Consultant’s proposals with regard to the points listed in 3.34 above. It was also evident that some areas of the proposals, such as the development of further sites on the Promenade, still require further exploration. However, with the current pressures for development, it would be inequitable to delay the publication of guidelines until these issues are resolved, so it is recommended that the Brief as at Appendix 1 be adopted but developed further as required.

4 Financial Implications

4.1 Principal landowners / developers in the study area have met the costs of the earlier public consultation events. The costs of commissioning the final study, further involvement of the Consultants, and arranging additional meetings or events, had cost implications for the Departmental budget, and have been met within existing budget heads.

5 Conclusions

5.1 A Development Brief incorporating material from the Master Plan and Urban Design Framework, but amended to take account of a more detailed internal assessment and the feedback from public consultation, has been prepared for the North West area of Portobello. It is recommended that this is now adopted by the Council as development guidance for the area, and is developed further as the need arises.

6 Recommendations

6.1 It is recommended that the Committee approves the attached North West Portobello Development Brief (Appendix 1) as the basis for development management within this area.

Dave Anderson  
Director of City Development
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NORTH WEST PORTOBELLO DEVELOPMENT BRIEF

1 Introduction

1.1 Most of Portobello has been built up since Victorian times in the traditional tightly-knit street pattern of a typical Scottish small town. However, with the changing pattern of industry and employment, there is now around 17 hectares of vacant or underused land in the north-west part of the town in various ownerships which have potential for development.

1.2 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. The Council considers this to be a particularly appropriate approach to pursue for this area of Portobello, in order to avoid an unfortunate patchwork of piecemeal and uncoordinated developments which do not relate to each other, do not integrate with and contribute to the existing townscape, and fail to create an attractive and pleasant sense of place.

1.3 The purpose of this Development Brief is to provide a general framework to guide and co-ordinate the development of North West Portobello over the next 15 to 20 years. It is however intended to be flexible, and will be expanded as required as specific proposals, additional sites, or development pressures come forward. Existing uses and buildings will be respected, with no intention to force redevelopment against the wishes of present owners, but when redevelopment becomes desirable or necessary, the brief will provide guidance on acceptable forms which it should take. Meantime all new development must respect neighbouring in terms of existing policies, including amenity, privacy and daylight.

2 Background

Description of Sites & Surrounding Area

2.1 The area covered by this Brief is framed by the main north west approach to Portobello, and is contained by Sir Harry Lauder Road to the west and the Promenade to the north east, with the Figgate Burn and Bridge Street defining the southern limits. The Westbank housing area and Kings Road tenements lie immediately to the north, with Portobello High Street and the Portobello Conservation Area situated to the south east. It also contains two major potential strategic routes, the Promenade / Boardwalk and the Figgate Burn Corridor.

2.2 The area comprises clusters of sites in various ownerships. The main groupings are:
- Baileyfield Industrial Estate, including BL Developments, Standard Life, other owners, and residential cottages;
- High Street to Promenade link, including Figgate burn, 5-aside pitches, Bowling Centre, car park;
- Promenade, including Funpark site, kilns, and seafront area.

Land uses are currently a mix of mainly light industrial and residential uses with some retail, commercial and leisure activities, and incidental areas of open space.

**Policy Context**

2.3 Approximately 60% of the study area (the Baileyfield Industrial Estate) is designated in the North East Edinburgh Local Plan for business and employment uses. The remainder of the area is designated largely for housing and compatible uses. The finalised Edinburgh City Local Plan Policy *Emp 4* on Employment Sites and Premises is also a material consideration.

2.4 Overall, the redevelopment of the site must function satisfactorily within the context of Portobello, but also in the broader Edinburgh context as well – that is, it must satisfy both local and city wide needs with regard to residential, employment, community and leisure provision, and also reinforce the special role of seafront recreation. Redevelopment will inevitably result in additional residential and working population, and development should aim to absorb this, taking steps as necessary to address the impact on the rest of the local infrastructure, while should be addressed positively to absorb the extra numbers while enhancing the viability / vitality for local shops, community facilities, bus routes etc.

3 **Land Uses**

3.1 The area will be developed for a variety of residential, commercial and community uses. The residential use will predominate, but must be intermixed with other uses to achieve diversity and vitality. In particular, continuing the area's contribution to the citywide needs for employment sites.

**Residential**

3.2 The area has great potential for residential development because of its relatively easy access to the city centre combined with its distinctive local ambience and amenities including shops and services, the seafront, and cultural facilities. It is important that the new development complements the existing provision both in Portobello and in the city as a whole, and in particular takes appropriate opportunities to balance deficiencies and shortfalls.

3.3 In this regard, new residential provision should be mixed but, to maximise Portobello's character and assets, with a higher concentration of units more suited to family use. There is an opportunity to explore
more innovative ways of achieving modern densities while retaining the most desirable elements of inner suburbia such as private gardens, tree-lined streets, in-curtilage parking etc.

3.4 Proposals should also provide smaller units for first-time buyers – for instance, through inventive studio flat layouts – and other specialist provision, both “affordable” and mainstream for users such as older residents and wheelchair users. Student accommodation may also be possible, providing it can be incorporated in a way and at a scale which minimises any adverse impact on neighbouring residential property. Conventional 2 or 3 bedroom flats should not comprise more than 25% of the total accommodation provision.

3.5 25% of the housing should meet the Council’s Affordable standards, and this must be mixed in the same proportions as the mainstream developments. This provision should not rely wholly on Registered Social Landlord (housing association) renting, but should also look at more imaginative alternatives such as shared equity and co-ownership schemes.

Commercial

3.6 The major employer within the site, with some 500 staff, is Standard Life, who is also a major landowner. This Development Brief does not place any pressure on the company to vacate the site or rearrange its accommodation; but when their buildings eventually become obsolete or life expired, it will set the framework for a redevelopment which retains their presence while producing an attractive modern working environment and maximises the estate value through productive use of surplus lands.

3.7 The site should also make a contribution the Council’s strategic employment objective for units suitable for smaller businesses, both for light industrial (subject to suitable safeguards in term of location and construction to protect residential amenity) and studio / office accommodation. There are opportunities for innovative provision, such as live/work units with workshop / studio / office space at ground level and living accommodation above, mews-type developments, and multi-storey provision (up to 20% of these types of units can function satisfactorily on more than one floor). Suitable locations are along the High Street, extending the interest and employment generation without detracting from the retail uses in the town centre, and clustered within the Baileyfield sites.

Retail

3.8 Other than a possible purely local “corner shop” facility within the development, perhaps as the focus of a local centre or at the seafront, no new retail provision is envisaged within the area. Instead, the extended High Street would house other specialist uses that benefit from
a street frontage such as small offices, local services, healthcare, professional offices, graphics and computer design, and artists' studios.

Hotel

3.9 Portobello’s dual role as both part of Edinburgh and as a seaside town in its own right affords an attractive opportunity for a hotel development, possibly as a “landmark” building on the north part of the Baileyfield site at the entrance to the town, or as part of a promenade seafront development.

Civic, Culture and Leisure

3.10 Possible community uses which have been identified, subject to discussion with potential providers, are a health centre practice, perhaps fronting the High Street for ease of accessibility; and a nursery / crèche facility, which could visually link its open space requirement with that of adjoining public space.

3.11 A potential core location for civic uses is an upgraded pedestrian route from the High Street to the Promenade beside the Figgate Burn. These uses would provide interest and vitality to the link, and could include existing community, cultural and sports operations who seek more or better quality space, or completely new uses (either local or city-wide) such as a museum or gallery. Potential users will be identified in further discussions with providers and interested parties.

3.12 Existing sports uses are the Bowling Centre at the Promenade, and the 5-a-side football pitches at the Pitz. The bowling centre will remain but in the longer term should be remodelled to create a more inviting frontage to the promenade, possibly with expansion to accommodate additional facilities. No loss of the football pitches will be acceptable unless a new facility of at least equal standard is provided elsewhere in the near vicinity. Other sports, particularly those related to beach- and water activity, could be introduced.

3.13 If a reinstatement of a pier is desired in Portobello, a possible site could be at the foot of Kings Road. Such a development could culminate in a Winter Garden structure. Alternatively, it could be located further northwest as part of a redevelopment of the Marine Gardens site. The pier would be suitable for small craft and pleasure trips. The impact of a pier on nature conservation in the Firth of Forth would need to be assessed and its use for a regular ferry/hovercraft terminus would require further investigation more generally in terms of noise and traffic generation.

3.14 Other existing community uses, currently housed in unsuitable or sub-standard premises (eg the British Legion, the Islamic Centre) could also benefit from new custom-built provision within the Baileyfield site or along the Figgate Burn link.
4 Urban Structure and Public Realm

4.1 The underlying design objective of any new development is to achieve an urban grain and street structure which reinterprets in a modern fashion the intricate pattern of lanes and streets which are characteristic of Portobello, extending the existing town while creating a distinctive new sense of place and identity. Buildings will normally be grouped into terraces, linked clusters, corners, pends and vennels opening into small courtyards and lanes. Appropriate scale, massing, building lines and street design are important elements.

Urban edges

4.2 To the west, Sir Harry Lauder Road provides a somewhat harsh edge which requires softening through building form and landscaping. This buffer strip will take the form of an embankment or earthworks, and/or structured tree planting to screen and create an avenue effect to Sir Harry Lauder Road itself. Building forms and uses should be selected to minimise amenity issues while retaining sunlight penetration and views out.

4.3 The Portobello High Street edge will extend the existing High Street to create a frontage of similar scale and urban enclosure. New streets from the Baileyfield development will link through to the High Street and across to the seafront. Land uses can be residential on the upper floors but with commercial and civic uses at street level to preserve residents’ privacy and create pedestrian interest. There is an opportunity for a landmark building at the north end to provide a suitable entrance to the town.

4.4 The Figgate Burn provides a potential edge to the south, largely coinciding with the boundary between the existing and new development. The Burn should be opened up wherever possible as a public walkway and linear park, especially to the east of the High Street where it will form an important feature of the link to the Promenade.

4.5 The Promenade edge is already a well-established and high profile feature of city-wide rather than purely local significance. The completion of a complete waterside link onwards to Leith Docks, Newhaven and Cramond is a major city aspiration, and new development at the former Funpark site will therefore be set back 2m to widen the existing Promenade pinch-point. An active frontage is required from the Bowling Centre to Beach Lane, concentrating traditional and new “seafront” leisure uses. Permeability can be improved by opening up the obstructive walls within the Pipe St / Bridge St area to permit through pedestrian movement.

Baileyfield Interior
4.6 The layout concept will be one of development in the form of traffic-reduced shared streets, fronted by terraces of buildings of appropriate scale as indicated below (section 6), linking to and grouped around a central parkland open space. In the event of phased development, this open space should be designed so that it is extendable as further redevelopment takes place, with related road diversions to ensure that the space remains uninterrupted. The layout should work in the first instance with the retention of the Baileyfield Cottages and the protection of their residential amenity, although this would not preclude taking some or all of them into redevelopment at a later stage should they become available.

Listed Structures

4.7 The Kilns are in important link to the area's historical past, and require an improved setting which increases their visibility and links them directly to the Promenade.

4.8 The Tower at Beach Lane is an interestingly eccentric historical building which deserves a better setting, and future development around it should seek to achieve this.

New East-West Axis

4.9 The links to the seafront are currently understated and not particularly clear to visitors seeking access to the Promenade. A more legible purpose-built link would assist in guiding pedestrians and vehicles away from existing streets and therefore minimising nuisance to residents. The redevelopment affords an opportunity to improve the whole east-west link between Baileyfield and the seafront as a key urban design element of the new area, raising its profile through a more formalised design and by using it as a location for suitable social, community, cultural and sporting facilities.

4.10 The western section of the axis already exists, formed by Fishwives Causeway, an historical route from Portobello to Edinburgh, and this will remain as the major pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access to the Baileyfield redevelopment sites. To strengthen it, the pedestrian / cycle link to the west should be reinstated by bridging over Harry Lauder Road. To begin with, it will remain on its present formation but, with the eventual development of the southern part and the extension of the central open space, vehicle traffic will be diverted around the edge of the parkland leaving only pedestrian and cycle traffic on the original alignment. In any redevelopment or refurbishment the architectural design quality of new buildings fronting the Causeway, including the corner site currently occupied by a garage, must be of a significantly higher standard than those existing at present to reflect their key role.

4.11 The pedestrian connection across High Street will be an at-grade signalised crossing, of suitable width and choice of paving, designed to maximise pedestrian priority and legibility.
4.12 The eastern part of the axis will be formed as a pedestrian route with the Figgate Burn as a central landscape feature. This route will currently serve the football pitches and the Bowling Centre, but would be a location for other civic and leisure uses to reinforce its role. A suitable corner building and use would assist in pinpointing its location and function to visitors. The visitor parking will be retained but re-landscaped to an improved standard. A more detailed study is required for the function and design of this area.

**Landscaping**

4.13 The general character of new development will be a reinterpretation of the traditional urban grain of Portobello, with landscaping — surface materials, walls, occasional strategic tree planting as punctuation or for emphasis — complementing this. All existing trees on site are to be surveyed and their retention sought wherever possible. Green landscaping including street planting should be used as a visual linking mechanism.

4.14 The major public open space provision will be concentrated in the centre of the Baileyfield site, designed to accommodate traditional park activities (walking, sitting, games etc). Generally, public open space provision must provide the potential for activity, informal sport, incident, meeting places, seats, shelter, social spaces (such as barbecues and children's play), and integrate with the surrounding architecture. The main space within the Baileyfield site will be parkland and could incorporate some of the advanced principles of innovative open space design seen elsewhere.

4.15 Private realm will be differentiated but must integrate seamlessly into public space where it lies adjacent to it. There is potential to explore interesting inside/outside relationships offered by the configuration of landscape proposals and the interaction between buildings, with potential to enrich the public realm as well as the private spaces and architecture.

4.16 All houses, and all ground floor flats and maisonettes, will have adequate private garden / patio space. Upper floor flatted developments will have a shared backgreen space, and can use roof terraces or balconies to provide a degree of private space for these properties also. The backgreen areas will not be used for parking. Roof terraces must be suitably constructed to support full landscape treatment including tree pits. Where possible, back gardens and back greens should mesh visually into public open spaces to provide continuity of green landscape and planting.

**5 Infrastructure and Movement**

5.1 The main route into the Baileyfield site, Fishwives' Causeway, will be a 7.3m access road with 2m pavements. As it penetrates the site and
splits in different directions, it will reduce to 5.5m. By judicious use of combinations of reduced width and geometry, the design traffic speed will be reduced to 20mph. Other access connections to the High Street, Harry Lauder Road and other parts of the existing network are possible, but may require some restrictions on vehicle use.

5.2 All other streets within the sites will be designed on shared access principles, making them a pleasant social and habitable space. This will be achieved through limiting the impact of vehicle movement, provision of trees and planting, landscape and street furniture, and defensible front garden / parking.

5.3 The High Street – Promenade link will be designed as a pedestrian street, taking account of microclimate and shelter requirements. Eventually it may be bounded by new cultural or leisure facilities, but the design should be sufficiently robust to provide an attractive space from the outset.

5.4 All traffic layouts and proposals will be subject to a Traffic Impact assessment, demonstrating that the connections are adequate to take the additional development from the sites. The assessment should be based on the new junction arrangements to replace the existing roundabout at Seafield Road. If deficiencies or problems are identified, it will be the responsibility of the developers to devise and provide solutions.

5.5 Parking for residents and commercial users should be based on the Council’s standards, and in any case must be sufficient to ensure that there is no over-spill into congested neighbouring streets. On-street parking for visitor and casual users must be located to support the function of the street rather than forming a barrier between occupants and passers-by.

5.6 Parking for visitors to the Promenade is essential, especially at weekends and on busy summer days, and should be largely retained in its present location but with re-landscaping to improve its visual and amenity value.

6 Building Design

6.1 The area is open to both innovative and more traditional architectural design approaches providing they emphasise and reinforce the historic context, provide an imaginative response to the development principles set out in this brief, and are of a humane scale. Building forms must support the vitality of the streets with main-door entrances and active spaces (for instance, living rooms, kitchens, shopfronts, offices etc) overlooking the streets.

6.2 Building heights will largely derive from the general height of the existing adjacent buildings and the surrounding urban grain. Sunlight, overshadowing and daylighting studies will be required to assa
impact of new development on neighbouring buildings, internal courtyards and streets, and adjacent open space and the Promenade. Subject to these, specific height indications are:

- Sir Harry Lauder Road Edge: no higher than the existing Kings Road tenements
- Around the central Baileyfield park: sufficient height to give enclosure without overshadowing the open space
- Elsewhere in the Baileyfield site: street frontages commensurate with the scale of the street hierarchy and to meet daylight and sunlight criteria
- High Street frontage: taking the height from the existing traditional buildings nearby on the High Street
- East of the High Street: stepping down near Bridge St & Westbank to minimise impact on the adjoining housing
- Promenade: of a height which minimises overshadowing of the Promenade and beach; depends on layout but likely to be 3 storey frontage with 4th storey set back
- Gateway site on the east side of the High Street at Kings Road: maximum one floor higher than the existing tenements.

6.3 Materials can include stonework or traditional clay bricks (not concrete or silicate) for lower levels to tie in with Portobello’s industrial past, and with appropriate diversity at upper levels, but still harmonising with the surrounding context.

7 Other Considerations

Ecology, Sustainability and Micro-climate

7.1 All buildings will be subject to ecological investigation to maximise the benefits of situation and orientation. South-facing sunny aspects will be required for open space. Private garden space, balconies and terraces must meet the Council’s sunlight requirements. All development must meet the Council’s Standards for Sustainability.

Phased Development

7.2 It is envisaged that redevelopment will occur in sections which reflect the main land ownership boundaries, and it is therefore important that adjoining developers work together with neighbours to ensure seamless junctions. All submissions will be required to demonstrate this. Where issues over ownership or a lack of co-operation would be to the detriment of the achievement of a satisfactory plan, the Council may, in exceptional cases, consider the use of its compulsory purchase powers to assemble a site for development and enable a satisfactory outcome to be achieved.
Contributions

7.3 The incremental scale of new development on these sites will have a significant impact on the provision of infrastructure and services in the area. Developers will therefore be expected to enter legal agreements to secure appropriate contributions towards meeting identified requirements in line with its policies, such as education, affordable housing, and movement. Developers are referred to the appropriate guidelines. The Council will also seek to secure significant improvements in the public realm through developer contributions.

Policies and guidance

7.4 All development will be in accordance with the Council’s guidelines and policies as set out in the Structure and relevant Local Plans, in Supplementary Planning Guidance, and in other adopted policies, strategies, reports and briefs.

Future development

7.5 This Brief, or parts thereof, will be developed in more detail as required in accordance with the need for additional or more specific guidance for individual sites and developments. In particular, development of the East–West Axis from High Street to Portobello, of the Promenade between the Axis and Beach Lane, and of the Marine Gardens area, will be the subject of further guidance.
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## NORTH WEST PORTOBELLO DEVELOPMENT BRIEF
### APPENDIX 2: REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep number</th>
<th>Name of Person making Representation</th>
<th>Points of Objection</th>
<th>Points of Support</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | Mr and Mrs Graham, 39 Bridge Street  | • Disregard for communities wishes and suggestions  
• Amount of public space being built on  
• Density  
• Height  
• Increased traffic  
• Lack of parking  
• Sustainability of large influx of population  
• Pressure on schools  
• Pollution  
• Ground floor workshops would curtail accessible housing, would empty units be converted to housing?  
• Adverse effect on local shops  
• View of Arthur seat will be obscured  
• The site is insular – what benefit would there be to Portobello?  
• Relocation of library and community centre  
• Building on the car park and Sunny Square  
• Bridge Street is not wide and it will be dark and uninviting with sea views lost by 5/6 storey flats  
• The height of the flats will dwarf the kilns, and the safety of the kilns is in doubt  
• The height of the flats does not relate to the wider area  
• The flats face each other and have no sea views  
• The loss of the picnic area  
• No mention of replacing the toilets  
• No on-street parking spaces left  
• Plans difficult to understand | | | |
|   | Mr and Mrs Strachan, 19 Joppa Terrace | · Plans difficult to understand  
· Student accommodation does not provide a suitable ‘gateway’ into Portobello  
· The whole area could be developed as community gardens.  
· Increase in traffic  
· Loss of leisure facility  
· The library should remain in situ  
· Area will be ‘closed up’ with multi-storey buildings |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | Joe Madden | · Heights of the flats  
· Baileyfield Cottages would be obliterated  
· Raised linear park adjacent to the bypass  
· Tower blocks detrimental to conservation area and character of Portobello  
· No evidence of need or affordability for workshops  
· Location of small shops and branches of national supermarkets would devastate the town centre  
· Library should remain in situ  
· Loss of Pitz facility is not compensated by tennis courts and bowling green  
· Community centre should remain in situ  
· The Figgate Burn will no longer be a walkway, but will form back gardens  
· The buildings on the prom will dominate and overshadow the area and destroy views of the kiln  
· Additional traffic will cause loss of amenity and problems particularly on the High Street, Bridge Street/Pipe Street  
· The visitors car park will be lost  
· The green picnic space and public toilets are being replaced by the amusements. This will also overshadow neighbouring properties  
· Plan difficult to understand and previous concerns |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 | Karen Prince, 8 South Morton Street                  | • The increase in population will place strain on existing schools  
• Traffic problems – increase congestion and impact on existing residents |
| 5 | Mr and Mrs Currie, 16/1 Pipe Lane                    | • Multi-storey flats on promenade – overlooking and overshadowing  
• Dwarf the surrounding area  
• Traffic problem, including young children using this route to access Towerbank School  
• Undermining of kilns  
• Stability of site |
| 6 | Mr Arthur Jeffrey, 11 Baileyfield Road                | • Summarised parts of the local plan |
| 7 | M Olsson, 7 Law Place                                | • Reduce standard of living; space, light and traffic  
• Also included extract from standard letter |
| 8 | Mark Bargon, 7 William Jameson Place                 | • Height of flats are too tall  
• Shops opposite Westbank Housing will suck business away from other shops in the town centre  
• Moving the library  
• Removing the Pitz  
• Removal of car park on Bridge Street – residents spaces will be used and removal of this car park will discourage people from visiting the beach and prom and encourage anti-social parking.  
• Additional traffic could be a danger to children |
| 9 | Miss Catriona McEwan, 3/2 Westbank Place             | • 10 storey properties too high and out of character with surroundings  
• A Tesco style express shop would be detrimental to Portobello is a great place to live and could benefit  
• Gateway feature encouraged |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name, Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10  | Kathryn Burt, 10/7 Promenade Terrace | - 10 Storey flats excessive and will be out of character with area  
- Loss of Pitz - tennis courts will not compensate  
- Height of buildings on prom too high, ruin skyline and should be 3-4 storeys.  
- Traffic and parking – High Street already congested  
- Loss of car park next to bowling centre will result in nowhere for visitors to park  
- Plans difficult to read |
|     |               | Flats should be 5 Storeys  
Parking solutions should be provided  
Plan should be broken down into phases to allow to grow organically and for the infrastructure to adapt  
Council should be sensitive to the existing community |
| 11  | Rachel Harrison, 36 Brighton Place | - High rise buildings excessive  
- Impact on skyline  
- Traffic  
- Buildings at kilns are disappointing  
- Walkway may not be successful when surrounded by high flats  
- Potential for supermarkets to use units would be bad for local shops  
- Services provided by existing community centre cannot be provided within a coffee lounge at the bowling centre  
- Should be an increase in community services  
- Loss of walkway at Figgate Burn |
|     |               | Land will be used for housing  
- Green walkway  
- Tennis courts |
| 12 | Gillian Millar and Jim Burns, 4 Durham Avenue | - Moving library  
- 10 Storey blocks  
- No space in the schools for additional population  
- The centre of Portobello would be shifted, including relocation of library and community centre and this is unacceptable.  
- Existing infrastructure cannot cope with increase in population  
- Houses on the Pitz, Bridge Street car park and fun park sites.  
- Loss of green spaces. |
|---|---|---|
| 13 | Roseanne Erskine, 18 Straiton Place | - Number and height of flats  
- Raised park next to the bypass  
- No need for more than a couple of shops  
- Traffic and parking congestion  
- Relocation of library and community centre  
- School place shortage  
- Plan is difficult to understand  
- Should be more recreation space  
- Large demand for workshops, but need to be run efficiently by existing group e.g. WASPS or OOTB  
- Should be more emphasis on Eco housing |
| 14 | Catherine Bruce, Westbank Street | - Development of Pitz site will block out light and create extra traffic  
- Moving of community centre into a smaller facility  
- Provision of supermarket stores and the impact on existing shops  
- Community centre is well used |
| 15 | Jonathan Thomson, Hillcoat Loan | - Flats are overpowering for a small community  
- Pitz being turned into flats  
- 10 storey flats are ugly and will spoil the skyline and will cause loss of character  
- Pitz are well used |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
<th>John Tulloch</th>
<th>- High street foodstores are not needed e.g. tesco express</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | 17 | Angela Downie, 8 Marlborough Street | - Student accommodation out of place  
- The library and community centre should not be moved  
- Removal of houses on Bailiefield Road  
- Large number of blocks of flats  |
|   | 18 | Damian Kileen for Big things on the Beach | - 10 storey blocks  
- Workshops opposite Westbank  
- Building on current parking, picnic and toilet sites  
- Removal of library and community centre  
- Building on both sides of Figgate Burn  
- Traffic and pollution – difficult to park at present  |
|   | 19 | Betty Addison, 43 Inchview Terrace | - Additional traffic generated by homes, businesses etc  |
|   | 20 | B J Fraser, 24 Lee Crescent | - 10 storey flats – human scale would be lost  
- Green space and community areas appear to be afterthoughts  
- Loss of Bailiefield Cottages  
- Types of shops  
- Removal of Pitz  
- Library and other community facilities should remain where they are  
- Amusement centre is presented as public recreation  |
|   |    |    | - Inclusion of artist as contributor to overall development and artistic input  
- Existing beauty should be enhanced  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ben Seex, 46 Regent Street</td>
<td>- The size of development is too large.&lt;br&gt;- Strain on transport links, schools and leisure facilities&lt;br&gt;- The size of some elements will destroy the area and views into the area&lt;br&gt;- Transport links are already congested and will worsen&lt;br&gt;- Building on the Pitz site – should be maintained for recreational purposes.</td>
<td>- Some development is required&lt;br&gt;- Potential for something better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Giselle Dye, 11 Bath Street</td>
<td>- There should be no supermarket. Local shops are already under strain&lt;br&gt;- 10 storey blocks are too high&lt;br&gt;- The linear park will not be used&lt;br&gt;- No provision for local teenagers. Scope for something like a skate park, crazy golf, adventure playground.</td>
<td>- Masterplan generally well thought out and researched.&lt;br&gt;- Articulation of strong street pattern&lt;br&gt;- Residential and other accommodation&lt;br&gt;- Principle of green strip between houses and road&lt;br&gt;- 5 storey tenements on the prom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bridget Blackmore, 5 St Mark's Lane</td>
<td>- Blocks of flats with shops – should be no provision for a supermarket chain&lt;br&gt;- 10 storey flats are inappropriate – gateway to Outstanding Conservation Area and new development will dwarf the existing houses</td>
<td>- PMAG, PCATS or PPAG or Bailiefield Residents Assoc do not represent the views of the community.&lt;br&gt;- Better use should be made of currently derelict green space&lt;br&gt;- Opportunity for affordable housing provision and housing with easy access for disabled residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Loss of Bailiefield Cottages
- Linear Park will not be a popular recreation space
- Access to and from the site will exacerbate existing problems at the Seafield Junction and resulting in buses running late
- Strain on schools
- Building on car park on the north east site of the Figgate Burn will leave nowhere for visitors to park.

Area of outdoor swimming pool was to be kept for recreational use, therefore housing on this site should not be considered
- Density and height, particularly on the Pitz contrasts unfavourably with the development to the west of the site at Seaviewgate estate
- Increase in traffic and lack of parking, particularly with the removal of the car park at Bridge Street.
- Parking issue not been fully considered
- Disabled access
- Figgate Burn and Bridge Street car parks are flood plains
- Relocating of library and community centre as many people will find it difficult to get there
- New community centre not large enough, so many activities would stop.
- The proposals at the kilns and fun park site are out of character and will overshadow and destroy the kilns
- 10 story flats are out of context, especially where other flats around Edinburgh are being demolished. They will dominate the skyline and obliterate views of surrounding areas, including Arthur’s Seat.
- Small retail units may add up to a superstore, which is against the wished of the community
- The plan is difficult to understand
| 25 | Rhoda Glanville, 1 Rathbone Place | - Traffic congestion, worsened by the loss of car park at Bridge Street/Figigate Burn  
- Selling off of Council owned land (car park) which is a much needed amenity for residents and visitors  
- Houses on the fun park site will intensify traffic problems  
- Houses on fun park site will overshadow existing homes  
- Multi storey blocks  
- Buildings are not in-keeping with rest of Portobello  
- Demolition of Baileyfield Cottages  
- Not good visual aspect as gateway to Portobello  
- Workshops would be an extension of the local industrial site  
- Relocation of library and community centre  
- Relocation of Tower amusements onto the picnic space/public toilet area  
- Council land loss  
- Block out light to homes and gardens in Rathbone Place | - New developments should be in-keeping with the area  
- Developments should enhance Portobello and encourage visitors  
- Affordable homes should be provided  
- Library and community centre could be upgraded  
- Toilets need upgraded  
- The amusement arcade attracts anti-social behaviour |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 26 | David and Ida Turner, 7 Straton Place | - Local views have not been fully taken into account  
- Scale of development too large  
- Past increases in population have occurred incrementally  
- 10 storey blocks – dominate the environment, visually unattractive, not required  
- Potential for supermarkets to move into new retail units  
- Relocation of community centre  
- Proposed community centre too small  
- Relocation of library  
- Traffic and parking – narrow streets limiting parking means that there will be a heightened competition for spaces, resulting in a loss of amenity for residents | - Workshops supported in principle but numbers should be re-examined and should be suitable for conversion to housing | - Plan should enhance sense of community with opportunities for young people of all ages and abilities to develop potential  
- Blocks should be maximum 3 storeys  
- May be scope for skate park, adventure playground etc  
- Portobello needs a well-run community pub and hotel |
| 27 | Agnes Douglas, 10 Rathbone Place | - Schools at capacity  
- Loss of recreation space and play provision. | - Town might benefit from a museum – could be provided in a joint building with visitors centre, info centre and meeting rooms |
| 28 | Gary Dickson, 25A Abercorn Terrace | - Removal of car park in Bridge Street  
- Removal of green area for the relocation of Tower Amusements – will also block light out of Rathbone Place and Bridge Street  
- Library and community centre relocation  
- More thought should be given to the plans | - Masterplan proposes another Portobello which is reconfigured and redesigned to conform to an outmoded model of good planning. |
| 29 | Miss Linda Corson and Mr Ryan Evans, 37/6 Westbank Place | - Problems with high rise flats (social problems, access problems)  
- Skyline will suffer a drastic and uncharacteristic alteration  
- Traditional Portobello will be lost  
- Relocation of centre  
- Community facilities displaced  
- Impact on local shops | - No objections to moving the community centre, or the possible increase |
| 30 | Linda Miller, 4 Kings Road | - Size and design of the plans and general principle of development  
- 10 storey flats  
- Overshadow promenade with high rise buildings  
- Removal of car park  
- Traffic congestions – tailbacks are common on the High Street | - Encouraging design  
- Improved the |
| 31 | Alison Anderson, 64/2 Moira Terrace | - 10 Storey flats would destroy the appearance of the area
- Schools could not cope with influx of pupils
- Linear Park would be unattractive and dangerous
- Relocation of library
- Removal of Pitz/Powerleague site
- Bowling centre car park is much used
- Proposed café is not large enough to replace the community centre
- Loss of car parking area to flats and tennis court
- Tennis courts may fall into disrepair.
- General objections – more parking needed (not less), traffic congestion would be worsened
- Medical practices would be stretched
- More shops may impact on existing ones | - in traffic
- Land has been vacant and in decline so proposals are encouraging.
- Rosefield Park is underused at present and this could be used as the site for the new High School. |
| 32 | Josh Fennell, 3f1 6 Kings Road | - Masterplan differs from framework document and this may mean that a higher building could be built.
- 10 storey buildings will dominate the streetscape and will overwhelm Kings Road tenements | - Support regeneration, in the main, this plan will enhance the |
| 33 | Michael Craig, 5 Durham Square | - Destruction of communal green area at Kings Road gateway  
- Lack of consultation with regard to the Kings Road gateway development |  
- Supportive of general principle of regeneration  

| 34 | Anne Byrne, 18 Bath Street | - Existing infrastructure will be inadequate (schools, recreation facilities, healthcare, transport etc) to cope with large increase in housing  
- Relocation of library and community centre  
- Buildings over 5 storeys may impact on landscape and quality of life  
- Removal of Pitz/Powerleague pitches. Tennis court would be an inadequate facility  
- Relocation of library area  
- Heron often visits the burn but would be unlikely to return if plans approved |  

| 35 | Morag Donaldson, 28 Figgate Street | - High rise development so close to main road – reassurance sought for preventing families with children in this area as it would be dangerous  
- Relocation of library  
- Need for more housing  
- Need for more shops (not  
- Library could be located on opposite side of the High Street |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 36  | Alan and Jaqueline Brown, 5 Mountcastle Drive South | - Loss of football pitches  
- Loss of car parks  
- Multi storey flats out of keeping with area – will overdominate the skyline  
- Parking and congestion area already problems  
- Residents have already voiced opinion on supermarket  
- Small shops proposed but existing shops on the High Street are empty or charity shops  
- Local opinions not being taken into account |
| 37  | Mrs Margaret Smith, 30 Rosefield Avenue | - Plan difficult to read  
- 10 storey flats  
- 4 storey flats opposite Westbank  
- Houses being built on car park  
- Relocating library  
- Community centre being located in café at Bowling Centre  
- Increase in traffic |
| 38  | BL Developments, c/o Broadway Malyan, Multrees Walk, St Andrews Sq EH1 3DQ | - Various comments of support, although stated that the masterplan should remain flexible in order to respond to changing market demands across the plan period.  
- Concern expressed regarding the densities of the proposed housing in the North Baileyfield area. |
| 39  | Steven Bowron, 82/3 Inchview Terrace, Portobello Road, EH7 6TF | - 10 storey buildings  
- Should be no buildings over 3 storeys  
- Need more family housing  
- Local Schools at full capacity  
- Additional traffic and parking would be detrimental to entire area |

- Should be incentives for traders to use existing shops  
- Scale model would be helpful  
- Should be no buildings over 3 storeys  
- Need more family housing  
- Local Schools at full capacity  
- Additional traffic and parking would be detrimental to entire area  
- Tower blocks would be detrimental to the adjacent Conservation Area and the character of Portobello
| 40 | Sylvia Tillman, 50 Kings Road, EH15 1DX | - Demolition of Baileyfield Cottages  
- Linear park would not be successful and may be dangerous.  
- Inclusion of shops and possible branches of supermarkets would devastate existing town centre.  
- Workshops could cause noise and increase industrial traffic and could convert to retail units, to the detriment of the town centre.  
- Loss of green space at Kings Road – building here would reduce privacy and light. No need for shops here.  
- Relocation of community centre and library  
- Residential blocks at the Figgate Burn. This area should remain public.  
- Car park and unnamed square should not be built on.  
- 5-6 storey buildings on the Fun Park site and 3-4 storeys on the Bowling Centre/car park would overshadow the promenade and nearby housing.  
- Relocation of Tower Amusements. This land is a vital public facility and should remain in public use. Redevelopment of this site would also block light to houses on Bridge Street/Rathbone Place.  
- The plan is difficult to read and not easy to follow.  
- Residents' criticisms of the first plan have not been taken into account.  
- Phasing of the land is unclear.  

- 10 storey buildings  
- Should be no buildings over 3 storeys  
- Need more family housing  
- Local Schools at full capacity  
- Additional traffic and parking would be detrimental to entire area  
- Demolition of Baileyfield Cottages  
- Linear park would not be successful and may be dangerous.  
  
|  |  | - Buildings should be no higher than the existing low rise housing and should safeguard public views of the Kilns  
- Tower blocks would be detrimental to the adjacent Conservation Area and the character of Portobello  
- Buildings should be no higher than the existing low rise housing and
dangerous.
- Inclusion of shops and possible branches of supermarkets would devastate existing town centre.
- Workshops could cause noise and increase industrial traffic and could convert to retail units, to the detriment of the town centre.
- Loss of green space at Kings Road – building here would reduce privacy and light. No need for shops here.
- Relocation of community centre and library
- Residential blocks at the Figgate Burn. This area should remain public.
- Car park and unnamed square should not be built on.
- 5-6 storey buildings on the Fun Park site and 3-4 storeys on the Bowling Centre/car park would overshadow the promenade and nearby housing.
- Relocation of Tower Amusements. This land is a vital public facility and should remain in public use. Redevelopment of this site would also block light to houses on Bridge Street/Rathbone Place.
- The plan is difficult to read and not easy to follow.
- Residents’ criticisms of the first plan have not been taken into account.
- Phasing of the land is unclear.

---

Robert McCall, 4 John Street, EH15 2EE

- 10 storey flats
- 8 storey flats

---

should safeguard public views of the Kilns

- Great opportunity if the view of the community are taken into account
- Balance should be reached between money and ambiance
- Potential for site should not be lost
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Richard Hamilton            | 23a Bath Street, EH15 1HB                    | - 10 storey buildings  
- Local Schools at full capacity  
- Additional traffic and parking would be detrimental to entire area  
- Inclusion of shops and possible branches of supermarkets would devastate existing town centre.  
- Workshops could cause noise and increase industrial traffic and could convert to retail units, to the detriment of the town centre.  
- Loss of green space at Kings Road – building here would reduce privacy and light. No need for shops here.  
- Relocation of community centre and library  
- Relocation of Tower Amusements  
- Residential blocks at the Figgate Burn. This area should remain public.  
- Car park and unnamed square should not be built on.  
- The plan is difficult to read and not easy to follow.  
- Residents’ criticisms of the first plan have not been taken into account. |
| Peter Wraith                | 3 East Brighton Crescent, EH15 1LR            | - Density too high. Development on this scale will alter the character of the area.  
- Traffic congestion  
- Relocation of library and community centre  
- Building on Bridge Street car park  
- Fun park site – proposals overshadow the existing two storey houses and block the view of the kilns.  
- 10 storey blocks of flats  
- Plan is vague and implementation may be difficult. |
| John B Lau                  | 10/6 Marlborough Street, EH15 2BG            | - 10 storey flats.  
- Impact on traffic and parking.  
- Linear Park is ill-planned. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45</th>
<th>Mrs Small, 16 Kekewich Avenue, EH7 6TZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for workshops and retail units questioned – housing would be more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocation of library and community centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phasing of development – Standard Life premises may be an issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46</th>
<th>B J Butchavt, 211, 26 Southfield Place, EH15 1LZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blocks over 5 storeys – not in keeping with the character of Portobello and could result in social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large increase in housing will put a strain on schools and roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on existing local shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relocation of the library and community centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans do not respect the area’s history and heritage – views of the kilns will be obscured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing problems with anti-social behaviour are not addressed and may worsen with a large increase in population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47</th>
<th>Alison Robinson, 49 Adelphi Place, EH15 1BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 storey buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any buildings over 3 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tower blocks detrimental to conservation area and existing character of Portobello.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density too high – ‘new town’ created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strain on local services e.g. schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition of Baileyfield Cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raised linear park is pointless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible branches of national supermarkets coming into area to the detriment of the town centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|    | Should be more recreational facilities for young people. |
|    | Should be more family homes |
|    | New buildings should complement the existing. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 48   | Kathleen Keir,  | 1 Laing Terrace, EH15 2DY | 10 storey buildings  
5/6 storeys on the fun park site are out of keeping with the area and will affect the 'feel' of the area  
Removal of parking area, and future parking problems  
Increase in traffic |
| 49   | Patricia Roger, 1 Laing Terrace, EH15 2DY | | Plans have no substance and do not offer any reasons for why Portobello should expand to this extent  
Extra intake for schools and health centre  
Increase in school age children and young people  
Existing problems with anti-social behaviour  
Increase in traffic  
10 storey flats  
5/6 storey flats  
Development must be sympathetic to design of existing properties  
Raised linear park is nonsense  
Retail space inappropriate  
Football pitches should remain  
Relocation of community centre  
Student flats unviable |
| 50   | Ken Bowler, 21 Dalkeith Street, EH15 2HP | | Height of buildings – objection to all buildings over 3 storeys  
Implications for traffic flow, congestion and pollution  
Impact on local services e.g. schools  
Demolition of Baileyfield Cottages  
Linear park would be undesirable and dangerous  
Inclusion of national supermarkets  
Relocation of library and community centre |
| 51   | Christine Bowler, 21 Dalkeith Street, EH15 2HP | | Height of buildings – objection to all buildings over 3 storeys  
Implications for traffic flow, congestion and pollution |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>52</th>
<th>Margaret Munro, 16 Bellfield Lane, EH15 2BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on local services e.g. schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demolition of Baileyfield Cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linear park would be undesirable and dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of more shops and possibly national supermarket chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation of library and community centre – community centre needs more space than proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53</th>
<th>Peter Yates, 1 Law Place, EH15 1TJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 storey flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of Standard Life site dubious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 storey mixed use building on King's Road would dominate Hillcoat housing and overshadow properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation of library and community centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 104 flats ignores the historical designations as a culture/leisure site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shops with houses above on the High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Light industrial premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building on Bridge Street car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linear park does not serve a purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Height of blocks around the kilns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building on the site of the public toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relocation of amusement arcade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional retail may not be sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Road infrastructure implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School capacity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan difficult to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• View of community not taken into account</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     | • Roundabout will be reconfigured and the plan does not take account of this |
|     | • Area of student housing should be a gateway feature |
|     | • Shops should include provision for creative artists such as jewellers, potters etc |
|     | • Clarification of maintenance for open space areas |

<p>|     | • Would Pipe Street be opened to through traffic? |
|     | • Encourage more |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Marie McGrory, 2/2 Pipe Lane, EH15 1BS</td>
<td>• Traffic problems • 10 Storey flats • Parking problems • Could doctors and dentists cope with influx of people? • Traffic congestions will be exacerbated • Unsightly tower blocks within conservation area • Houses on Figgate Burn/Bridge Street car park • Selling of square for flats • Relocation of library and community centre • Relocation of Tower Amusements</td>
<td>independent cafes and bistros, green spaces and promote Portobello as a vibrant seaside town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Shirley Shepley, 35 Marlborough Street, EH15 2BD</td>
<td>• Impact on local shops • Impact on character of Portobello • Selling off space for car park for multi storey flats • Congestion • Lack of parking</td>
<td>Need more cafes and seaside shops along the prom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>John West, 23 Durham Road, EH15 1NY</td>
<td>• High density flats – should be more balanced • 10 storey flats • Any flats over 4 storeys • Development around the kilns unacceptable • Linear park • Demolition of Baileyfield Cottages • Green space at Kings Road should be preserved • Traffic congestion</td>
<td>Changing use from commercial to residential Should be more green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Lisa McCann, 68/8 Portobello High Street, Eh15 1AN</td>
<td>• Local character should be retained • Height of buildings – particularly 8 storeys opposite Pipe Street</td>
<td>Regeneration welcomed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 58  | Katrine West | • Traffic  
• Impact on existing local businesses  
• Removal of car park  
• Redevelopment with tall buildings on Fun Park site  
• Removal of 5 aside pitches  
• Relocation of library  
• Removal of public square  
• Public areas between blocks of flats  
• Local character should be retained  
• Height of buildings – particularly 8 storeys opposite Pipe Street  
• Traffic  
• Impact on existing local businesses  
• Removal of car park  
• Redevelopment with tall buildings on Fun Park site  
• Removal of 5 aside pitches  
• Relocation of library  
• Removal of public square  
• Public areas between blocks of flats  
• Not enough car parking provision  
• Regeneration welcomed |
| 59  | Frances Wraith, 3 East Brighton Crescent, EH15 1LR | • Traffic congestion  
• Parking problems  
• Noise and fumes  
• 5 storey flats on Bridge Street  
• High rise flats  
• Relocation of community centre and library  
• 10 storey flats  
• Pitz and Kings Road sites developed may obstruct views to the sea  
• Kings Road flats will be situated at a busy traffic  
• Significant need for regeneration and welcome the vision for mixed housing  
• Society must meet the needs of each generation, but not at the cost to the aesthetic environment  
• Should be more family housing  
• Flats should be max. 3 or 4 storeys |
|   | Kerry Oliver, 7 Regent Street, EH15 2AY | Density of development, particularly 10 storey blocks | Use of development | Portobello could benefit from a 21st century community learning and resource centre. There is a need for more community facilities.
Scope for more open space, pathways and environmental facilities along the Figgate Burn.
More youth facilities required e.g. a skate park.
Keen to see family orientated restaurants, pubs or bistros.
Sustainability should be considered (biodiversity, recycling etc)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Dr J'Allison, 51 Regent Street, EH15 2AY</td>
<td>Tower blocks of flats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flats along Figgate Burn and Bridge Street car park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flats on the promenade/Fun Park site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relocation of library and community centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little proposed green space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Simpson Coupar, 27 Durham</td>
<td>10 storey flats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Address</td>
<td>Concerns and Comments</td>
<td>Other Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Drive, EH15 1PH  | • Inclusion of possible sites for supermarket chains  
• Relocation of library and community centre  
• Flats at Figgate Burn  
• Removal of Tower amusements to the picnic space on Pipe Lane  
• Increase traffic and parking demands  
• Plan fails to take account of comments already made, it is difficult to read and understand. |               |
| Mr W W Brand, 12 Esplanade Terrace, EH15, 2ES | • Concerns and comments not taken into account from previous consultation process  
• Scale and density – 10 storey blocks and 5/6 storey blocks  
• Loss of quality amenity areas  
• Relocation of library and community centre  
• Building on Pitz site – loss of sports facility  
• Student accommodation | • New development should reflect the architectural styles of the area. |
| Ian + Helen Wood  
2 John Street  
EH15 1EE | • Height and quality  
• Lack of public Car Parking  
• Relocation of library  
• Student Flats |               |
| J Ridge  
3/1  
50 Portobello High street  
EH15 1DA | Standard Letter =  
• Height of buildings  
• Density of development  
• Increased traffic and parking demands  
• Removal of Baileyfield cottages  
• Loss of local shops  
• Building of workshops  
• Kings road building  
• Re-location of library and community centre  
• Loss of public space  
• Loss of views | Concerned about proposed building heights. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Miss Agnes Bell 5/4 Mount Lodge Place EH15 2AD</td>
<td>Plan is difficult to read, Phasing may not be completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Josephine Burns 20 Esplanade terrace EH15 2ES</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Dr S.H.Lloyd and Dr A.F.M. Thompson 22 Regent Street EH15 2AX</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
<td>Increase in vehicle traffic will lead to more pollution, accidents, injuries and fatalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mrs Anna Phillips 43 Kings Road EH15 1UE</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
<td>Loss of area character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Lindsey Lavender PF1 7 Straiton Place EH15 2BA</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ann Milovic Flat 2 41 Bath Street EH15 1HB</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 73  | John Stewart Portobello Amenity Society 4a Elcho Terrace EH15 2EF | • Relocation of Library/community centre  
• Removal of Bridge Street Car Park  
• Height of fun park site development  
• Height of Pitz Site  
• Height and size of units at Scottish power site as well as impact of use on local businesses  
• Increase in traffic  
• Against the removal of suggested linear park for private gardens  
• Removal of public space on the promenade for new Tower Place arcade  
• Against new building at Kings Road | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Margaret O'Neill</td>
<td>10 Harbour Place EH15 1TQ</td>
<td>Worried that entire Masterplan relies on co-operation of all current land owners and may stall if one disagrees. Ability of schools to cope with increased demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Masterplan is unclear both image wise and language wise. Height of buildings at fun park site go against the recommended 3-4 storeys and will lose public space. Creation of a canyon effect on Bridge Street as well as a lack of permeability. Loss of parking at Bridge Street. Redevelopment of Pitz site. Removal of Baileyfield cottages. Too many small industrial units. Student accommodation does not serve as a landmark/gateway. Raised linear park is unattractive. Large retail units will detract from existing smaller retail units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mary Jane Elton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community centre is too small. Loss of public space. Baileyfield flats are too high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Mr Colin Macdonald</td>
<td>10 Shrub Mount EH15 1TP</td>
<td>Relocation of tower amusements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mrs Rosalind Hughes</td>
<td>39/R Joppa Road EH15 2HB</td>
<td>Standard Letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Mr Jamie Hughes</td>
<td>39/R Joppa Road EH15 2HB</td>
<td>Standard Letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Mark Gellaiety</td>
<td>8 William Jameson Place EH15 1TG</td>
<td>Buildings over 10 storey or 3 storey. Housing density is too high. Loss of Bridge Street car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Redbond</td>
<td>27 Espanade Terrace EH15 2ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Baird</td>
<td>17 Coillesdene Avenue EH15 2JF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock and Becky Lueck</td>
<td>16 Brighton Place EH15 1LJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bee</td>
<td>9/2 Promenade terrace EH15 1DT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosea Huth</td>
<td>64 Adelphi Place EH15 1BE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla van Bunderen</td>
<td>15 Baileyfield Road EH15 1DL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portobello Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Public Display information was unclear
- Removal of wall subdividing Pipe Street/Lane
- Increased traffic
- Re-location of library and community centre
- Lack of new doctors surgery
- Lack of school spaces
- Scottish Power Site being mixed use as opposed to residential
- Relocation of Library and community centre
- Building heights of 10 stories
- Standard Letter
- Location of hovercraft terminal
- Standard Letter
- Removal of Baileyfield cottages
- Inclusion of new shops/supermarket
- Number of new houses in plan
- Height of buildings
- Workshops
- Relocation of library and community centre
- Obscured view of the kilns
- Loss of public space and car parking
- Insufficient consultation
- The layout of

Existing open spaces could be better cared for. Public toilets should be kept and upgraded. More flowers and plantings. More facilities for young people. Upgrade the library.
| Celia and John Butterworth | • Building heights and density  
• Removal of town centre facilities i.e. library and community centre  
• Addition of mixed used units at the Scottish power site most notably a supermarket  
• Four storey building at kings road  
• Height of building on fun park site  
• Powerleague site development would not interact with the rest of the area and should be retained for leisure use  
• Loss of car parking  
• Masterplan phasing |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| George Morrison           | • Masterplan seems to have ignored public input  
• Height and density of buildings  
• Loss of views  
• Re-instate plans for linear park at Figgate Burn  
• Removal off public toilets/space at tower amusements  
• Re-location of library and community centre  
• Lack of additional community facilities  
• Increase in traffic and need for parking  
• No consideration of how education and essential services will cope  
• Sale of public land |
| UDF is well intentioned   | • Blue Sky method restricts some development, ignores the needs of the public and is not holistic  
• Realignment of “grain” of Portobello  
• Height of new buildings  
• Lack of new views and loss of existing  
• Overshadowing of promenade  
• No mention of method of reimbursement for land owners  
• Target development levels based largely on guess work  
• Loss of character of the area |
| Appears to have taken some consideration of public views |
| 89       | Ms Helen Spence  
           | 16 Milton Drive  
           | EH15 2JK          | Loss of parking  
                        | Increased traffic and noise pollution  
                        | Re-location of library  |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 90       | Brenda Molony  
           | 9 Bedford Terrace  
           | EH15 2EJ          | Re-location of library and community centre  
                        | Height of 10 storey flats  
                        | Loss of bridge street car park  
                        | Inclusion of large shops  |
| 91       | Mrs L McMillan  
           | 12 Electra Place  |                      | Loss of public toilets  
                        | Increase in crime/anti-social behaviour  
                        | Increase in traffic/noise pollution  |
| 92       | Ms A.H.M.Christie  
           | 7 The Pottery  
           | EH15 1TH          | Height of buildings  
                        | Loss of parking  
                        | Arrival of supermarkets  
                        | Re-location of library and community centre  
                        | Increase in traffic  |
| 93       | Mr and Mrs H.B. Allison  
           | 279 Milton Road East  
           | EH15 2LD          | Height of buildings  
                        | Loss of character  |
| 94       | Morag Grant  
           | 37 Adelphi Place  
           | EH15 1BE          | Loss of bridge street car park  
                        | Height of buildings  
                        | Re-location of library and community centre  
                        | Loss of the Pitz  
                        | Density of development  
                        | Loss of views  |
| 95       | Dr Joyce Holt  
           | 1 Esdaile Bank  | Duplication – used in 131  |
| 96       | Mrs J McKeen  |                      | Home will be demolished (Baileyfield Cottage)  |
| 97       | Jaap Prins  
           | 18 GF Bath Street  
           | EH15 1HD          | Height of buildings  
                        | Loss of views  
                        | Loss of open/public space  
                        | Re-location of library  
                        | No facilities for the elderly  |

Retain the cottages and incorporate them into the plan.

Offer cottage owners option to remain until buildings are life expire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disregarded communities thoughts</th>
<th>UDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Ishbel Tannahill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Height of buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demolition of cottages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of Pitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Mr J Clements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 Mountcastle Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH8 7SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Height and amount of new housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-location of library and community centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plans were hard to understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Jeffery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Baileyfield Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH15 1DL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contrary to North East Edinburgh Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Margaret Thomson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/2 Hilcoat Loan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH15 1UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unruly behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alter the character of the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Mrs Sheila Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portobello Traders Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Findlay's of Portobello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116 Portobello High Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH22 2HQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supermarket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-location of library and community centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Mrs Lorraine Whalen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Hilcoat Loan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH15 1UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number and height of new housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Added strain on existing doctors and schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extra shops would lessen the community feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-location of community centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>E Doherty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Promenade Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EH15 1DT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Height of buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in traffic and parking pressures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hovercraft terminal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-location of library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>I Gellaitry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 William Jameson Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Height of buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Create lots of green spaces and walkways
- Model helped understand plans
- Reduction in housing and commercial use
- New housing is welcome
- Family housing needed
| EH15 1TG | No need for additional retail  
| 106 | Height of buildings  
| Andy McGregor  
7 John Street  
EH15 2EB | Increase in housing  
|  | Loss of green space  
|  | No desire for new retail  
|  | Re-location of library and community centre  
|  | Masterplan was unclear both in text and diagram  
|  | 3D visualisations or artists impressions  
| 107 | Standard Letter  
| Stephanie O'Gorman  
1/1 Mentone Ave  
EH15 1HZ | Detrimental to community  
| |  
| 108 | Insensitive to historic nature of Portobello  
| Susan Elsley  
23 Marlborough Street  
EH15 2BD | Height and density of buildings  
|  | No need for additional retail units  
|  | Loss of open space  
|  |  
| 109 | Increased traffic  
| Robin Torrie  
21 Pittville Street  
EH15 2BZ | Loss of character  
|  | High density of development  
|  |  
| 110 | Tower blocks on Harry Lauder road  
| Paul Burns  
69 The Promenade  
EH15 2DX | Housing density  
|  | Development along Figgate Burn  
|  | Housing meeting the promenade  
|  | Blockage of the cycle route  
|  | Re-location of library and community centre  
|  | No objection to housing on the Scottish power site  
| 111 | Standard letter  
| Alison Campbell  
31 Bellfield Street  
EH5 2BR |  
| 112 | Centre shifted to the west  
| Paul Steer | Further retail not needed  
|  | Building on Figgate Burn  
| | Houses are needed  
| 113 | Height of buildings  
| Rebecca Reid |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 Morton Street EH15 2HN</td>
<td>• Use of public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azra Qayyum Azra Qayyum 201 Portobello High Street EH15 1EU</td>
<td>• Increase in traffic • New retail threatens existing retail • Height of buildings • Re-location of library and community centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Sinka Joppa Road</td>
<td>• Height of buildings • Supermarket • No mention of improved public transport links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Mander 77 Brunstane road EH15 2QS</td>
<td>• Density of development • Increased traffic and parking pressures • Demolition of Baileyfield cottages • Increased retail presence • Re-location of library and community centre • Development on Figgate Burn • Masterplan was hard to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Turnbull 31/3 Brighton Place EH15 1LL</td>
<td>Standard letter • Poor public notification • Disregard of local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Clifford 53 Adelphi Place EH15 1BE</td>
<td>• Lack of sensitivity to area character • Height of buildings • Lack of family housing • Increase in traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian and Shirley Wilson</td>
<td>• Re-location of library and community centre • Removal of projected linear park • Height of buildings • Size of supermarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portobello regeneration is welcome</td>
<td>• Increase in leisure facilities • Public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregard of local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise and Andrew Holligan 120</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara and Peter Jones 121</td>
<td>8C/6 Bath Street EH15 1EY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archie Foley 122</td>
<td>21 Joppa Road EH15 2HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Marriott 123</td>
<td>7 James Street EH15 2DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Connelly 124</td>
<td>8 West Brighton Crescent EH15 1LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs C Symington 125</td>
<td>8/9 Kings Road EH15 1EA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 126 | Irene Bell  
4 The Pottery  
EH15 1TH | • Lack of affordable family housing  
• Height of buildings  
• Creation of wind tunnels  
• Re-location of the library and community centre  
• Loss of Pitz  
• Loss of car parking at Figgate Burn  
• Flood risk  
• Provision of small industrial units and shops  
• Moving tower amusements would lose public space  
• More public toilets are needed  
• Consultation document was hard to read | Impressed with consultation | • Would like a signature building on the Scottish power site  
• affordable family housing with gardens  
• no buildings higher than 3 storeys  
• Library and community centre remaining where they are  
• Bridge street car park and community square landscaped and maintained as public space  
• Suitable site to replace the Pitz |
| 127 | Sandy Sutherland  
37 Bellfield Street  
EH15 2BR | • Unimaginative  
• Adverse effect on traffic  
• Building heights  
• Demolition of cottages  
• Re-location of library | | • Buildings should be no more than 4 storeys  
• Basketball court placed somewhere |
| 128 | Barbara and Robert Telford  
27 Pitville Street  
EH15 2BX | • ignored the public  
• Re-location of the community centre  
• Height and density of buildings  
• Removal of open spaces  
• Increase in traffic | | |
| 129 | Eleana Connolly  
5/2 Hamilton Terrace  
EH15 1NB | Standard Letter  
• Create an overcrowded ghetto | | |
| 130 | E Buckland  
33 Pitville Street  
EH15 2BX | • Increase in traffic  
• Proposed shops  
• Height of buildings  
• Loss of views | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Dr J C Holt</td>
<td>1 Esdale bank EH9 2PN</td>
<td>Standard letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Mrs T McIay</td>
<td>8 Brickfield EH15 1TF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduce the standard of living for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in traffic and parking pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>K Hossack</td>
<td>35 Wakefield Avenue EH7 6TN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of amenities and character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Plan was hard to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>N Benigan</td>
<td>11A/3 Milton Road East EH15 2ND</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Pauline Neish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Graham</td>
<td>39 Bridge Street</td>
<td>Loss of the Pitz could lead to anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Bill Flockhart</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pressure on schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Gavin Strang MP</td>
<td>54 Portobello High Street EH15 1DA</td>
<td>Proposals hard to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-location of library and community centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Building of multi-storey buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Open space and the Pitz should be retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Donna Watters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Building height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillcoat Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction noise/traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-location of library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of Pitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of the promenade character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Dorothy Reid</td>
<td>22 New Tower Place EH15 1TS</td>
<td>Height of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pressure on Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gavin Cheyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | • Demolition of cottages  
   | • Park should not be close to bypass  
   | • Loss of parking  
   | • Re-location of library and community centre  
   | • Lack of public links to the sea via Figgate Burn  
   | • Graphics in the document are unclear  
   | • Document is wordy and inaccessible  
   | • Creation of awkward, meaningless and impractical spaces  
   | • No need for a new town centre  
   | • Lack of information on development mix  
   | • Community consultation summary is waffling and patronising  
   | • Study area is restricted and lacks context  
   | • Gateway buildings do not reflect the character of Portobello  
   | • Loss of the Pitz  
   | • Re-location of library  
   | • Should be notes on graphics  
   | • Keys are unclear  
   | • How do the 1000 new residencies relate to the local plans  
   | • How does the open space allocation relate to the local plans  
   | • Parking issues, how much is underground, how much for disabled parking  
   | • The landscape border is not robust  
   | • Re-location of community centre instead of regeneration  
   | • No reference to existing architecture reflected in proposed architecture  
   | • Extension of pier  
   | • No mention of rail link  
|   |   |   |   |
| 142 | Elizabeth Fergus |   |   |
|   | • Height of 10 storey buildings  
<p>| | | |
|   |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 143 | Helen McDaid          | 94/3 Inchview Terrace EH7 6TF                | • Loss of views of the kilns  
• Increase in traffic and parking pressures  

| 144 | Helen Gray            | 8 Seafield Road East EH15 1EB                | Standard Letter                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 145 | Steve Lavender        | Flat PF1 7 Straiton Place EH15 2BA          | Standard Letter                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 146 | Carolyn Dougill       | 9/6 Promenade Terrace EH15 1DT              | Standard Letter                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 147 | Dr M Barnett          | 3F2 54 Kings Road EH15 1DX                 | • 10 storey buildings will be an eyesore  
• Closure of the Pitz – leading to increased health problems and anti-social behaviour  
• Unsympathetic to the kilns  
• Development on park  
• Loss of community spirit  
• Unprofessional presentation  

Delighted at development of area

| 148 | Ian Maxwell           | 5 St Marks Place EH15 2PY                   | Cyclepath between high street and fishwives causeway should be maintained and improved                                                                                                               |
| 149 | Nick Stroud           | 72 Promenade EH15 2DX                       | • Area planned in isolation  
• Re-location of library and community centre  
• Pressure on school places  

• Places houses on seafront between Leith and Portobello
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colin Hepburn</td>
<td>3 Abercorn Terrace</td>
<td>Not forward looking enough</td>
<td>Look more into the future – Abu Dhabi's future city as an example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne &amp; Grant Ward</td>
<td>13 Baileyfield Road</td>
<td>Not taking public consultation into consideration</td>
<td>Revive promenade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Height of buildings</td>
<td>Open pipe street for pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of Pitz</td>
<td>Portobello is a strong, happy community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-location of library and community centre</td>
<td>Suggestion of park in NW Portobello as well as recreational land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans are unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Details on tower amusements are lacking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of green space at kings road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No definition of mixed use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No junction at Bridge St/Baileyfield Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased traffic and parking pressures, with no second access road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of information on how infrastructure will cope e.g. schools, doctors,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>waster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of public space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No mention of affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opposed to new retail/supermarket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flood risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Against private flats on Figgate Burn, should remain public space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of Bridge St car park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unnamed Square should remain as public space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overshadowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of fun park parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-location of the library and community centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missed opportunity to revive promenade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening of pipe street to general traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Ros Sutherland</td>
<td>13 Park Ave, EH15 1JT</td>
<td>Loss of public space and toilets for tower amusements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Light pollution at the beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns over hovercraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Alan Burgess</td>
<td>3F3, 40 Kings Road, EH15 1DY</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Anne &amp; Tony King</td>
<td>4 Esplanade Terrace, EH15 2ES</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Sinead Cannell Cook</td>
<td>95 Joppa Road, EH15 2ES</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Eileen Cook</td>
<td>95 Joppa Road, EH15 2HB</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Portobello History Society</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Munro, 16 Bellfield Lane, EH15 2BL</td>
<td>Development may have an adverse effect on the kilns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kilns should be protected and become a feature of any development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Alan and Sheila Fletcher</td>
<td>27 The Causeway, EH15 3QA</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>M &amp; Mrs Paton &amp; Family</td>
<td>2 Spa Place, EH15 1TR</td>
<td>Height of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volume of housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve beach for tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create an aquarium and sea bird centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Diana Cairns</td>
<td>12 West Brighton Crescent, EH15 1LU</td>
<td>Consultation deficiencies – ideas re: hotel/ primary school not identified. Presentation was unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building heights excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Density excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of affordable housing/ poor housing mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eclipse of kilns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pleased to see this part of Portobello improved and revived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment of single-story cottages on Baileyfield Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A gallery, museum or arts centre would be welcome near the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | 162 | Ian Campbell  
10 Harbour Place  
Portobello  
Edinburgh  
EH15 1TQ | • Noise from workshops  
• Traffic congestion issues  
• Loss of recreational open space  
• Concern re: proposed scale of retail stores  
• Proposed Relocation of community centre and library  
• Recreational provision is deficient  
• Development at top of Kings road is undesirable. | High Street.  
• Hotel or conference centre should be established as a gateway landmark rather than student flats |
|   | 163 | Sigrid Neilsen  
70/2 Park Avenue  
Edinburgh  
EH15 1JP | • Alarming cartographical errors  
• Graphics are misleading  
• Document mis-represents scales and proposed heights  
• Regeneration focussed on 'wrong area' of Portobello  
• New retail development will damage existing shops  
• Loss of views  
• Lose view of the kilns  
• Removal of cottages  
• Proposed heights at bridge street car park and Figgate burn are unacceptable.  
• Housing on Powerleague would be unacceptable  
• Reduction in total car spaces  
• New linear park unappealing  
• Potential light pollution. | Recommend that Cllr Hawkins model is presented to committee  
• UDF should be rejected and replaces with a revised version of the Study Framework produced by CEC (2006) |
|   | 164 | M. Connelly  
21/29 Queen’s Bay Cres | • proposed heights  
• increased traffic congestion  
• high rise development socially unacceptable  
• concerned about proposed relocation of the library. | |
|   | 165A | T. H. Taylor  
21/29 Queen’s Bay Cres | • proposed heights  
• existing retail may be compromised  
• relocation of library  
• increased traffic congestion | Concerned that hand submitted objection(s) not |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edinburgh EH15 2NA</th>
<th></th>
<th>received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>T. H. Taylor 21/29 Queen’s Bay Cres Edinburgh EH15 2NA</td>
<td>Standard letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>E. J. Carmichael 4 Hamilton Gardens Edinburgh EH15 1NH</td>
<td>Standard letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>J. Dunbar 8/3 Marlborough Street Portobello Edinburgh EH15 2BG</td>
<td>Standard letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>R. Nisbet 8/3 Marlborough Street Portobello Edinburgh EH15 2BG</td>
<td>Standard letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>W. Nisbet 12 Rosefield Street Portobello EH15 1AY</td>
<td>Standard letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Mrs V Nisbet 12 Rosefield Street Portobello EH15 1AY</td>
<td>Standard letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 171 | Mr S Hawkins 12 West Brighton Crescent Edinburgh EH15 1LU | • Criticism re: the consultation process  
• concern re: relocation of the library  
• concern re: the omission of the linear park in the package of proposals  
• concern that there is no demand for mixed use development.  
• Lack of clarity over the provision of retail use within | • Promotion of the development of a hotel  
• Welcome new museum and community centre | clarify status of the UDF vis a vis the masterplan |
| 172 | Diana Cairns  
12 West Brighton  
Edinburgh  
EH15 1LU | - Objection to the loss of core facilities within the existing town centre  
- Objection to the proposed amount of mixed use development  
- Concerned that the consultants are not adequately conversant with the geography and urban fabric of the study area.  
- Concerned that the communities concerns have not been incorporated into the decision making process.  
- Objection to some of the proposed building heights.  
- Objection to the loss of car parking at Bridge Street  
- Objection to any proposals for a supermarket. | - Support principle covered parking  
- Support for a Gateway high rise building at Edinburgh end of town. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 173 | Caroline Hosking for PMAG,  
2F4, 50 Portobello High Street EH15 1DA | - Views of residents not been taken into account  
- Height of development – anything over 3 storeys (4 storeys at Baileyfield North site)  
- Moving library and community centre  
- Plans difficult to understand  
- Removal of linear park  
- Impact on kilns  
- Traffic  
- Parking  
- Building on Pit site | - Additional community facilities  
  e.g. art gallery, museum  
- Mix of housing tenures |
| 174 | Marc Giles  
Rapleys  
Caledonian Exchange  
19A Canning Street  
Edinburgh  
EH3 8EG | - Too great emphasis on flats  
- Impact on infrastructure  
- Need more green spaces, not less  
- Phasing unclear  
- Demolition of Baileyfield Cottages  
- Raised linear park would not be viable  
- Inclusion of retail units  
- Workshops  
- Employment uncertainties  
- Building on Figgate Burn and Bridge Street car park  
- Building on Bowling Centre car park  
- Light pollution | - Submission in support of a retail-led mixed use regeneration scheme  
- Submission on behalf of Macdonald Estates |
| 175 | Caroline Owen  
GVA Grimley  
Quayside House  
127 Fountainbridge  
Edinburgh  
EH3 9QG | (Response on behalf of Standard Life Investments) | - Standard life welcomes the preparation of the UDF  
- Submission in support of a retail-led mixed use regeneration scheme |
| 176 | M. Abbott | - Proposed building heights are unacceptable  
- Objection to large edge of centre supermarkets  
- Objection to relocation of the library  
- Objection to building that would compromise views of the Pottery Kilns  
- Objection to increasing traffic congestion | |
| 177 | I Forrest  
31 Adelphi Place  
Edinburgh | Standard Letter | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EH15 1BE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178 Lou Leaske 19 Marlborough Street Edinburgh EH15 2BD</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179 Annie Griffin 1 Portobello High Street Edinburgh EH15 1DW</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 180 J. Killeen | | Consultation materials have been difficult to understand  
- Concern re: relocation of the community facilities such as library and the community centre.  
- Object that the plans do little to promote regeneration of the beach front area.  
- Concern re: degradation/reduction of PUBLIC open space.  
- Particularly opposed to the proposal for 5-6 storey development along the promenade in the area of the current "Fun City". | Welcome the development in terms of its provision for affordable housing  
- Welcome the creation of masterplan for NW Portobello.  
- The masterplan should include a comprehensive public arts strategy which engages with all aspects of the proposed development. |
| 181 Damian Killeen OBE Big Things on the Beach c/o Portobello Community Centre 3 Adelphi Grove Edinburgh EH15 1AP | | Objection that the 'arts' not given a great enough role in terms of the regeneration of the area. And that this should be rectified. |
| 182 A. Watson 19 Regent Street Edinburgh EH15 2AY | Standard Letter | |
| 183 Eco Committee Tower Bank Primary School | Submitted by a group of primary school children  
- Concern re: proposed building heights | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Ms Terrie Ogg</td>
<td>Portobello Optics 172 Portobello High St</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Mr D. McGovern</td>
<td>25 New Tower Place Portobello Edinburgh EH15 1TS</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>E. Penman</td>
<td>23/2 Mount Lodge Place Portobello Edinburgh EH15 2AD</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>L. Randall</td>
<td>3/4 Mount Lodge Place Portobello Edinburgh EH15 2AP</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>I Taylor</td>
<td>47 Windsor Place Portobello Edinburgh EH15 2AF</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>C. Brockway</td>
<td>6/1 Chessels Court Edinburgh EH8 8AD</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Concern re: increased traffic congestion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Letter Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>E. Leatham 26 Southfield Road West Edinburgh EH15 1RJ</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>M. Mackenzie 1 Whins Place Portobello EH15</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J M Strachan 23 Durham Avenue Edinburgh EH15 1PA</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>M. Bryson 4 Callesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 194 | Cllr Ewan Aitken (forwarded letter from K Hossack, 35 Wakefield Ave, Edinburgh) | Objection to proposed building heights  
- Objection to detrimental impact upon amenity and views  
- Objection to increased traffic congestion and pollution  
- Objection to creation of areas of anti-social behaviour  
- Objection to proposed relocation of community services  
Standard Letter |
<p>| 195 | A Averbuch 72 Seaview Cres Joppa Edinburgh EH15 2LR                              | Standard Letter        |
| 196 | S Broadway 212 Gilberstoun Edinburgh EH15 2RG                                    | Standard Letter        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>I Sandall</td>
<td>11 A/6 Milton road East, Edinburgh, EH15 2ND</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J Wall</td>
<td>95 Northfield Drive, Edinburgh, EH8 7RG</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Mrs C Dippie</td>
<td>45 Kekewich Ave, Edinburgh, EH7 6TY</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>I Birrell</td>
<td>23 Stapeley Avenue, Edinburgh, EH7 6QR</td>
<td>Standard Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 201 | Mrs C Brunton              | 4 Whins Place, Edinburgh, EH15 1JQ           | • Concern re: proposed building heights at the west end entrance of Portobello  
• Baileyfield cottages should not be demolished  
• Objection to proposed linear park on grounds of impracticality and traffic fume risk  
• Objection to proposed workshops on the basis that there is no proven demand for them  
• Objection to proposed supermarket  
• Objection to proposed relocation of the public library  
• Objection to proposed relocation of the community centre  
• Objection to reduction of car parking space.  
• Objection to relocation of Tower amusements on the basis of loss of public green space and potential 'bad neighbour' uses.  
• Suggested that meadowbank house could be redeveloped for mixed uses  
• New residential development at fun park site should be in keeping with Pipe Street and should not impact upon exiting residential and the kilns |
### NORTH WEST PORTOBELLO DEVELOPMENT BRIEF

#### APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS with frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Objection</th>
<th>No. of objections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of public space</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height and density of buildings</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic and removal/lack of parking</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on Infrastructure</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-location of Library and Community centre</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of views and overshadowing, and effect on the kilns</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on existing retail and provision of workshops</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Pitz</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans difficult to understand</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Baileyfield Cottages</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Accommodation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massing/ overdevelopment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear park</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 'Arts' not included in proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of areas of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregard of community</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution (inc. noise pollution)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>