

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **1 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation This is a positive aspiration which Arcadis fully supports. We recognise that it is much easier to plan and build green infrastructure into new development than retrofit into existing built form, particularly in Edinburgh's historical layouts and buildings. Making optimum choices for the provision should be data-driven; using GIS mapping, census data and visualisation tools to help demonstrate the benefits and drive the agenda. This can include mapping current green infrastructure together with demographic information, as well as using models to understand future climate scenarios. We have extensive experience of such projects, particularly in the Netherlands and have provided a Case Study below: Case StudyLink Connecting The City of Almelo with the Green Belt (Netherlands) The City of Almelo commissioned Arcadis to investigate potential connections between the Town Centre and the Green Belt located around the city. The project was related to Interreg III / Urbaltraject funding. Arcadis worked on a vision for this connection between the 'Noorderpark' and the town centre directly and via another green area as well. The study not only involved a feasibility study of the link, but also ensured quality facilities for pedestrians, canal users (boats/canoes) and the urban quality and character of the area. ImpactThe Almelo Vision links to existing initiatives, such as the public realm quality and mobility projects that facilitate access locally. The new routes use existing links and connections as much as possible. Many parts of the routes are proposed along canals and rivers, to reflect the character of the City of Almelo as a 'river' city. The link also connects two parts of the city that previously were split by a dual carriageway. The associated connectivity is considered to improve economic activities in the vicinity, and increase tourism and recreation cycling in the area as well.

Customer Ref: 01272 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GP8G-W
Name: Paul Bekkers
Response Type: Agent / Consultant
On behalf of: Arcadis

Supporting Info:
Email: paul.bekkers@arcadis.com

Choice 1 B

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

Short Response: Yes

Explanation
We feel that this is a very positive aspiration and would highlight that the quality of green/blue infrastructure is as important as the quantity. Long term stewardship of the infrastructure is also important and should be considered when planning the provision. Our experience shows that there is a need to need to develop metrics on the quality aspects that can be used to monitor and enforce this requirement. Case study NW Bicester Eco development – Landscape Design for Dominion Housing Association. Arcadis are the Landscape Architect, Ecologists and Hydrologists for this exemplar Zero Carbon Development - designing the high quality green/blue infrastructure. Key Principles:
• Alignment of green infrastructure strategies with water management approaches to help alleviate flood risk.
• Following place making principles linking spatial planning decisions with non-motorised connectivity to improve opportunities for walking and cycling.
The key features of relevance to Edinburgh are:
• Green and blue infrastructure approach
• Zero carbon homes
• Zero waste to landfill
We developed the masterplan to provide a Landscape Strategy supporting the creation of a community of homes, employment opportunities and attractive amenities, as part of an environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development. Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment, Green Infrastructure and walkability strategies, planning application and landscape design. The first project phase was awarded Bioregional's One Planet Living status, one of only 10 developments in the world to achieve this rating. The housing is Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5, supported by PV solar panels on every home (covering an average area of 34m² per property), making it the UK's largest residential solar array. Green Infrastructure [GI] connects across flood management, biodiversity and contributes to improved health and wellbeing for the residents. In delivering the GI Strategy for the development, an overall provision of 40 per cent GI was required. We developed a solution via an innovative street type, later named 'Community Streets'. As well as performing the conventional functions of residential access roads, these streets were designed to provide informal play opportunities, community gathering spaces and seating, and include an 'edible streets' theme, enabling residents to gather food from their neighbourhood with planting to include, herbs and fruiting trees and shrubs. We took a coordinated approach that makes best use of available space and created opportunities for access to nature and residents' understanding of the functional aspects of their locality. For example, SUDS swales and street trees were combined at roadsides to reduce overall road corridor widths, and wildlife buffers were designed to incorporate natural play, giving children access to nature and creative play opportunities.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 1 C

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

Short Response

Explanation Surface water management plans are critical in the creation of climate resilience. However the management need to be catchment wide rather than just consider the green/blue corridors. This will require close working with Midlothian, East and West Lothian Councils. The use of permeable paving rather than sealed surfaces and the creation of SUDS is a key aspect of surface water management that should be written into all Place briefs.

Choice 1 D

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 1 E

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 1 F

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 1 F

We want to identify specific sites for new allotments and food growing, both as part of new development sites and within open space in the urban area. Do you agree with this? - Upload (max size 3mb)

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 1 G

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **1 H**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **2 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **2 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice **2 C**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **2 D**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **3 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice **4 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **4 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **5 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Supporting Info

Email

Response Type

On behalf of:

Choice **5 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **5 C**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **5 D1**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 5 D2

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 5 E

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 6 A

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **6 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **7 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **7 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice **7 C**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **7 D**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **8 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **8 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **8 C**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **8 C**

We want City Plan 2030 to safeguard and add any other strategic active travel links within any of the proposed options for allocated sites. We also want the City Plan 2030 to include any new strategic active travel links which may be identified in the forthcoming City Plan 2030 Transport Appraisal, the City Mobility Plan, or which are identified through this consultation. Do you agree with this? - Upload new cycle routes

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 9 A

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 9 B

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 10 A

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **10 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **10 C**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01272 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GP8G-W

Supporting Info

Name: Paul Bekkers

Email: paul.bekkers@arcadis.com

Response Type: Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Arcadis

Choice 11 A

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

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation

Our proposal to delivering more affordable homes through accelerated uptake of Modern Methods of Construction in the Edinburgh region and Scotland. This response has been prepared by Arcadis. We are a built and natural asset consultant working on many of the UK's most significant housing development programmes. We also directly support the work of the Construction Leadership Council (CLC). Our input here specific concerns measures to increase the output and affordability of housing in the future through accelerating the update of Modern Methods of Construction (MMC). We believe that the accelerated adoption of MMC as a new way to boost housing delivery and develop high quality, zero carbon homes for Edinburgh is an important lever to respond to safeguarding the affordability of our housing stock. And rather than apply an increased provision of up to 35% to all developments, we see the opportunity of using this increased provision requirement as an incentive for the supply chain to increase their output to more off site manufactured solutions and for large sites only of over say 500 units or more. There is a signification risk that applying the 35% to small gap sites, will slow down development by reducing viability. Secondly, a similar sliding scale between 25% and 35% provision of affordable housing, can be used as a lever to attract innovative developers to the City region, who lead the way in transition the industry by embrace these new construction methods. Forward-thinking developers could be rewarded with a reduced requirement around provision, whereas traditional suppliers who stick to the old ways of working are required to deliver a higher provision of up to 35%. There is an expectation and acceptance of modular housing products that it will deliver higher quality and zero carbon solutions, supporting Edinburgh deliver on its ambitions to achieve net zero carbon by 2030. Traditional methods of housing delivery are under threat which in turn is driving up prices whilst increasing the risk of not meeting the demand of our UK housing crisis. This threat is caused by four major issues -:

- Inability of the UK construction sector to drive productivity/ growth fast enough
- The construction sector is experiencing a skills and capacity crisis
- The climate emergency demands low carbon and low waste housing solutions which the current model cannot deliver to the extent required
- Grenfell House and Edinburgh Schools in 2017 demonstrate that the need for a growing emphasis on Quality and Safety - the traditional approach struggles to respond to effectively

Advanced manufacturing approaches - based on digital design, assembly and transparency around component sourcing and quality - will become increasingly relevant in the context of the threats to traditional construction. These are likely to become a means of satisfying the challenging housing targets set in Scotland. Most Scottish local authorities recognise these risks and are reviewing their procurement and delivery strategy with a view to realising the anticipated benefits of MMC for their citizens. There is an urgent need to meet the growing demand, respond to a crisis in housing delivery, safeguard affordability, manage issues around poor quality of products and deliver houses with a better carbon performance.

Through our work with Scottish, as well as UK, local authorities we have identified a fundamental failure in the market for advanced manufacture at present, caused by a co-ordination breakdown between supply and demand. At present, no mechanism exists to aggregate and provide certainty of demand to manufacturers, which in turn limits the confidence of the sector to invest in and grow its production capacity and MMC development is therefore one-off and sporadic. Also, the differences between market dynamics, housing typology, regulatory environment, and current provision of housing between Councils

Customer Ref: 01272 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GP8G-W
Name: Paul Bekkers
Response Type: Agent / Consultant
On behalf of: Arcadis

Supporting Info:
Email: paul.bekkers@arcadis.com

suggest that a one-size-fits-all solution does not exist for Scotland. There is a critical failure of co-ordination between supply and demand in the MMC sector throughout the UK that inhibits growth on the supply side and limits options on the demand side. This is a self-perpetuating problem and market intervention is required to address it and have a resultant impact on affordability. Case study: Arcadis, Cast and Hatch Regeneris were appointed by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) in September 2019 to undertake a short consultancy project considering the potential for Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) to accelerate housing delivery in the Greater Manchester city region. We identified that the first step in identifying a way forward should be for partners including GMCA districts, Homes England and the Housing Associations (potentially co-ordinated by Great Places) to agree to work collectively, ideally to aggregate pipeline and to consider MMC solutions as a collective rather than individually. We also proposed, and it was agreed that, the GMCA MMC solution should draw in some manner on the experience in the market, rather than setting out to create new MMC capacity entirely from scratch. Currently a phased approach to implementation is considered to demonstrate early benefits whilst recognising that whilst the MMC market is growing rapidly, the Government policy agenda is at an early stage of its evolution. Who needs to make it happen and what type of action is required?

We recommend a client-led strategic regional market intervention in the construction market based on the Arcadis placemaking principles to aggregate demand for advanced manufacturing in the region and bringing manufacturing capacity to the region. Part of this should be a clear signal to partners including local housing associations that the approach to transforming the delivery model is based on collaboration between all partners across the region based on creation of an aggregated housing demand as a means to engage the MMC market. An infrastructure-led approach may be required to aggregate demand and open up sites to MMC to develop a pipeline and grow supplier confidence whilst on the other hand we recommend supporting your people in addressing cultural blockers which still exist against MMC. How much it costs and who will pay? The business case for such a strategic intervention can be developed for any region recognising local characteristics like market dynamics, housing typology, regulatory environment and current provision of housing to demonstrate the benefits case for its people. The GMCA business case was positive in demonstrating that a co-ordinated use of MMC in the region had the potential to accelerate housing delivery, drive faster progress towards zero-carbon development, and utilise regional R&D specialisms including advanced materials and additive manufacturing. At the moment the economic indicators surrounding MMC are that construction costs are fairly consistent with traditional methods of construction in terms of capital expenditure. However, with volume and increased competition, in addition to the traditional market critical factors of reduced workforce and general rising costs, this will soon become a reduction. When combined with whole-life cost reduction and potential reduction in overall taxation due to increased sustainability credentials, this is likely to prevent substantial savings in the medium term. How long the proposal would take to implement and whether it is a temporary or permanent measure? A temporary phased approach should be considered where the first phase is delivered to realise and demonstrate early benefits whilst testing the market for a minimum of three years. These pilots provide due diligence for selecting the preferred more permanent solution for a more standardised regional approach. This will align with the strategic aims of the client organisation that demonstrates vision and leadership, drive jobs and skills growth, wider economic growth and support the zero-carbon goals. The Granton Waterfront development would be an attractive site to deliver a pilot and showcase to Scotland how to deliver a zero-carbon MMC development. When in the period 2021 to 2040 should it begin and does anything need to be done first? A local authority can strategically engage with the construction market now and start to take some short-term and immediate steps like aggregate a number of sites that can be delivered. We recommend the development of a minimum of three-year pipeline, possibly with Edinburgh's City Deal Partners, to provide certainty for the supply chain to invest. Use this pool of demand to partner with one or more MMC suppliers using its existing facilities and products, whilst update local design guides and planning requirements to accommodate the new way of working. Who will benefit and who might lose out and how could this be mitigated? MMC has the ability to continue to

Customer Ref: **Response Ref:**

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

deliver affordable, sustainable and high-quality housing whilst the traditional model is under threat. Introducing an MMC approach of housing delivery in addition to traditional delivery means safeguarding affordable housing and a better chance to deliver the challenging housing targets in Scotland.

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **11 B**

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

Short Response

Explanation Edinburgh City Plan 2030 Choice 11 – Delivering more affordable homes (Option B) This response to the Edinburgh City Plan 2030 has been prepared by Arcadis. Arcadis is a market leader in shaping, enabling, creating, enhancing and renewing the places where people live. Arcadis’ team of experts across the UK and Ireland have been involved in the delivery of over 20,000 homes in the private rented sector. Arcadis has an exceptional track record of experience with clients across the sector, working with lenders, investors, insurers, registered providers, developers, operators and contractors. Our input here specifically relates to the private rented sector part of this question and exclusively on the private Build-to-Rent (BtR) sub-sector and affordable housing provision under this model of tenure and development. The BtR sub-sector designs and constructs homes specifically for renting and this drives specific approaches to design and construction for operation of the asset. How can Build to Rent enable provision of affordable housing There are two predominant affordable housing provisions. Affordable or discounted market rent which is typically reflective of a 20% discount on open market rent (could be more or less though), maintained in perpetuity. And social rent which is typically determined by local income levels, property size and value. Tenure visibility • Affordable or discounted market rent homes are typically spread throughout a development and are indistinguishable from other private market rented homes in a development. • In contrast, social rent homes are typically located together and can be distinguishable from private market rented homes. This can be undesirable because it can increase segregation and drive community division. Management • Affordable or discounted market rent homes are typically managed by the same organisation as the other private market rented homes in a development. This provides the same tenant experience across the development, particularly in relation to any amenities that are provided. It also means the homes can more easily be alternated between the two categories. • The process for how affordable and discounted market rent homes are to be managed is normally set out and agreed in the planning obligations (assume Section 75 in Scotland). • In contrast, social rent homes are typically managed separately by a different organisation, typically a registered social landlord or local authority. This will typically result in a different tenant experience within the same development, which can be undesirable. Rent adjustments • Affordable or discounted market rent homes typically see rents increase on the same basis as rent increases for other private market rented homes in a development e.g. by inflation. • Social rent typically remains determined by local income levels, property size and value. In addition to private and commercial investors and developers, many Registered Social Landlords/Registered Providers view BtR and the private rented sector as an essential part of their development portfolio and provide a range of rented products to suit housing need. They are well placed to provide long term ‘patient capital’ along with asset management teams to own and operate BtR at scale. Private and commercial developers will usually meet affordable housing requirements by providing affordable or discounted market rent homes on their developments. However, subject to agreements, obligations could be met through other payments or other forms of affordable provision as agreed in the planning obligations. The BtR viability equation and affordable housing provision BtR project viability can be challenging, mainly because the schemes can be in stiff competition with ‘for sale’ projects when it comes to acquiring land. The different financial profiles of ‘for rent’ versus ‘for sale’ schemes mean that typically ‘for sale’ investors/developers are

Customer Ref:

01272

Response Ref:

ANON-KU2U-GP8G-W

Supporting Info

Name

Paul Bekkers

Email

paul.bekkers@arcadis.com

Response Type

Agent / Consultant

On behalf of:

Arcadis

able to pay more for the required site and potentially outcompete those developing 'for rent'. As a result, BtR schemes may need to be relatively denser in order for them to be viable and deliver the required amount of affordable housing. Furthermore, it means that BtR schemes are typically appropriate for potential joint ventures between organisations that hold suitable sites and developers who can provide finance, capability to build out, brand and market penetration. There are many benefits of this but for local authorities, key ones include sharing of development risk and the receipt of revenues over the long term from land holdings. This has proved attractive for many local authorities who can partner with a developer, providing land and receiving an income from it over the longer term. Case study A recent example involving Grosvenor and changes to their scheme in Bermondsey, London in relation to affordable housing provision has been widely reported on. In February 2019 they did not get planning permission, partly because it was felt the local authority's requirements on affordable housing had not been met. Planning permission has now been granted following changes. On the provision of affordable housing, these changes included:

- Moving from 27.5% affordable homes within the development to 35%.
- All the affordable homes were originally discounted at an average of 25% of market rent. This changed to 30% being at social rents and the other 70% discounted from market levels at 40%.
- Density of the development also increased to enable increases in affordable homes. The total number of homes increased by over 200 to 1,548 and heights of structures on the development increased by up to 7 floors in some cases.

The scale of this development would be a significant contributory factor to enabling the scale of affordable housing provision achieved. Impact Assessment 2019 saw a record delivery of almost 10,000 BtR homes (BPF). There was an estimated £2.4 billion invested in BtR projects in 2019 (CBRE). All things being equal, further growth in investment is expected and there is a widely held view that there is a lot of appetite from institutional investors for BtR. We think the BtR sub-sector has an important part to play in meeting the housing challenges faced across the UK and within Edinburgh because it:

- Attracts long term investment, particularly from institutional investors
- Provides flexibility that matches generational changes in housing need
- Focuses on high-quality purpose-built rental homes
- Provides long term tenancies providing stability for tenants
- Centres on professional management increasing standards
- Can provide a variety of home sizes at a variety of rental price levels
- Can provide suitable accommodation for downsizers releasing larger family homes
- Has potential scale of investment meaning the scale of supply could increase significantly potentially
- Can enhance the quality of life for tenants because BtR developments typically include amenities and services such as concierge, gyms etc
- May be less impacted by a downturn in the market than 'for sale' development meaning it may provide more consistent supply.

In summary, the BtR sub-sector can, at volume, provide good quality homes for a variety of people at a range of price levels with security of tenure.

Customer Ref: 01272 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GP8G-W

Name: Paul Bekkers

Response Type: Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Arcadis

Supporting Info:

Email: paul.bekkers@arcadis.com

Choice 12 A

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

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation: Not Answered

Choice 12 B1

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

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation:

Choice 12 B2

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

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation:

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **12 B3**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B4**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B5**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **12 B6**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B7**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **12 B8**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref:

01272

Response Ref:

ANON-KU2U-GP8G-W

Supporting Info

Name

Paul Bekkers

Email

paul.bekkers@arcadis.com

Response Type

Agent / Consultant

On behalf of:

Arcadis

Choice 12 B9

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

Short Response

Not Answered

Explanation

Choice 12 B10

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

Short Response

Not Answered

Explanation

Choice 12 BX

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

Short Response

Not Answered

Explanation

Not Answered

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 12 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 12 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 12 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **12 D**

Do you have a brownfield site you wish us to consider in the proposed Plan? - Brownfield sites upload

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **13 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **14 A**

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 14 B

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 14 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 A

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 15 B

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 D

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 15 E

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 15 G

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 A1

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice **16 A2**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 A3**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice **16 A4**

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 16 A5

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 A5

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 B

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 16 C

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E1

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E2

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 16 E3

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E4

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E5

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: Response Ref:

Name

Response Type

On behalf of:

Supporting Info

Email

Choice 16 E6

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E7

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 E8

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

Short Response

Explanation

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

Supporting Info
Email

Choice 16 EX

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 F

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

Short Response

Explanation

Choice 16 G

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

Short Response

Explanation

Customer Ref: 01272 Response Ref: ANON-KU2U-GP8G-W

Name: Paul Bekkers

Response Type: Agent / Consultant

On behalf of: Arcadis

Supporting Info:

Email: paul.bekkers@arcadis.com

Choice 16 H

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

Short Response: Not Answered

Explanation: Not Answered