

The City of Edinburgh Council

Finalised Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan 2003

Statement of Decisions on the Inquiry Reporters' Recommendations

A report recommending responses to objections to the Finalised Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan 2003 was approved by the Council's Planning Committee on 3 November 2005. The Planning Committee agreed to approve the Council's Statement of Decisions on the Inquiry Reporters' recommendations and the List of Proposed Modifications (which are included in a separate document). It was further agreed that the Head of Planning and Strategy be permitted to make any minor editorial changes as may be required to the Statement of Decisions and the List of Modifications.

A copy of the above report together with the Council's Statement of Decisions on the Inquiry Reporters' recommendations is included in this document.

The deposit period for the Proposed Modifications is 18 November to 13 January 2006 in accordance with the Planning Regulations.

November 2005

Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan – Decisions on Inquiry Report and Proposed Modifications

Planning Committee
3 November 2005

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform members of progress on the Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan following receipt of the Inquiry Reporters' recommendations, and to seek Committee approval for a Statement of Decisions with regard to those recommendations and a List of Modifications to the Local Plan in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Structure and Local Plans) (Scotland) Regulations 1983.

2 Summary

- 2.1 A Public Local Inquiry was held into objections to the proposed Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan between November 2004 and April 2005. The Inquiry Report has been received, and largely supports the Council's proposed development strategy for Rural West Edinburgh. The Report recommends a number of further modifications to the Plan, most of which are considered acceptable to the Council. There are a limited number of issues where it is considered that the Council should not accept the reporters' findings, or where the findings should only be accepted in part. These are itemised in the report and appendices. A set of Modifications to the Plan is proposed reflecting the Council's decisions on the matters raised in the Inquiry Report.

3 Main report

- 3.1 The receipt of the Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan (RWELP) Inquiry Report, and its principal findings, were reported to the Committee on 29 September 2005.

3.2 The Reporters, Mr Hickman and Mr Maslin, have considered over 500 objections to the finalised RWELP from around 130 objectors. It is to their credit that they have managed to assess the large amount of written and oral evidence produced and issue their report within around four months of the inquiry closing. Members can take comfort that the main elements of the Council's land-use strategy for Rural West Edinburgh have been supported by the reporters. In particular:

- € Any proposals for significant housing or business development outside the identified core development area of Newbridge/ Kirkliston/ Ratho have been resisted;
- € The major housing allocation north of Kirkliston was supported (subject to a small decrease in capacity); and
- € The Council's proposal to incorporate the implications of the emerging Airport Masterplan and the possible relocation of the Royal Highland Showground into a later local plan alteration, once the situation is clearer and the West Edinburgh Planning Framework has been reviewed, was concluded to be necessary.

3.3 The Report contains around 180 recommendations, most of which are for no change to be made to the finalised plan. The reporters do, however, make a number of recommendations for modifications to the Plan, as set out in the Appendix 1 to this report. In the main, these represent improvements to the usefulness and clarity of the Plan, and are worthy of support. Some recommendations are of more concern and these are discussed below. There are, however, only twelve recommendations where the Committee is advised not to accept the reporters' findings. It is now incumbent on the Council to consider all the recommendations, and make a decision as to whether to incorporate any suggested changes into the Local Plan. If approved by Committee, Appendix 1 will constitute the Council's formal Statement of its Decisions with regard to the Report, as required by the Planning Regulations. Appendix 2 will constitute the formal list of Proposed Modifications to the Plan (and incorporates the pre-inquiry modifications agreed by the Committee in February and June 2004, where these were not objected to or were supported by the reporters).

3.4 The most significant issues discussed by the reporters are discussed below. Where it is considered that the reporters' recommendations should not be accepted, this is highlighted in **bold**.

Strategic Housing Allocations

3.5 The reporters' support for the proposed allocations at North Kirkliston (their para 21.28), subject to a reduced capacity of 610 units (previously 650) to account for the impact of the Edinburgh Airport Rail Link on the site, and at Hillwood Road, Ratho Station (21.46), subject to the 50 capacity being described as a maximum, is welcome.

- 3.6 The most significant recommendations for change in the housing land allocation are the suggested deletion of the Council's proposed sites at Harvest Road (HSP6) (21.54) and Harvest Road East (HSP7) (21.58), Ratho Station (combined capacity 65 units), and the allocation of an additional site at Freelands Road, Ratho for approximately 100 units (21.78).
- 3.7 The advantages of the sites at Harvest Road and Harvest Road East were their proximity to economic development opportunities at Newbridge, and to a proposed tram stop. However, it is accepted that the disadvantages of these locations outweigh the benefits. In particular, they extend the built-up area of Ratho Station south of the railway line, which has up to now formed a strong southern boundary to the settlement. The reporters were also concerned about the access to HSP6, the green belt location of HSP7, and the detrimental effect of its development on the buildings associated with Norton House.
- 3.8 The Council had opposed the development of land at Freelands Road, Ratho for several reasons, including the value of the land to the green belt, and the relatively poor public transport services available in Ratho. However, it is accepted that the site rounds off the existing village form while providing land suitable for a development of high quality executive homes that would add to the range and choice of new housing available in the city. In addition, the reporters have also recommended that any development of this site is tied to the provision of a marina. This proposal is supported by British Waterways Scotland and would result in a valuable new recreational resource for the village and the City. It is therefore recommended that the Council accepts these recommendations.

Business Land at Newbridge

- 3.9 The availability of business land at Newbridge is a core part of the local plan strategy, a principal justification behind the structure plan's identification of a core development area in Newbridge/ Kirkliston/ Ratho, and is strongly supported by the West Edinburgh Planning Framework. The reporters made three significant recommendations affecting this area. Firstly, they recommended pulling the boundary of the ECON8 site (formerly Continental Tyres) back further east to avoid any conflict with the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation along the River Almond (9.165). The Council had never envisaged this area being subject to built development and so this change is acceptable.
- 3.10 The reporters also rejected the idea of any residential component within ECON 8 (21.38) due to loss of employment opportunities, conflict with the structure plan, unacceptable noise exposure to future residents (from aircraft), and problems with the accessibility of schools and school capacity. This recommendation reflects the Council's position.
- 3.11 Finally, the reporters propose allocating additional business land to the south of the existing industrial estate around Claylands Farm (9.178). They saw such an allocation as rounding off the urban allocations at Newbridge by bringing

development as far south as the M8, and they considered the land had little intrinsic value as countryside. There is logic in this position and the area concerned already contains a significant scrap yard operation. It is therefore recommended that the Council accepts this recommendation. However, any development of this land will need to be carefully planned in order to provide adequate landscaping and protect the amenity of the residential properties that exist in this area. The reporters recommend the Council considers preparing a development brief for the site, which would be a suitable vehicle to address these issues.

- 3.12 The Council has separately commissioned consultants to address environmental improvements, maximising investment, economic development opportunities, and improving links and opportunities for local communities in Newbridge. That study's conclusions will be reported to the Council in due course and will form an input (along with a revised West Edinburgh Planning Framework) to the forthcoming local plan alteration.

Tram

- 3.13 RWELP introduces a safeguard for the route of tram line 2 to the Airport and Newbridge. It also states that housing in the strategic greenfield sites at Kirkliston and Ratho Station should not be occupied until funding for the tram to Newbridge is committed. The reporters have recommended (10.37) qualifying this statement to specify December 2006 as the deadline for such a commitment, failing which, preparation of alternative transport options may begin. Though the Council has accepted that there may be circumstances in which alternatives to the tram could be contemplated, the approach suggested by the reporters is **not accepted**. There is no basis in the structure plan for specifying a deadline, and it is not currently possible to set a precise date when it will be clear whether the tram to Newbridge is definitely proceeding. The Council and Transport Initiatives Edinburgh (tie) remain committed to delivering the tram to Newbridge, but tie's evidence to the recent parliamentary committee considering the tram bills was that contracts for the tram would not be awarded until the end of June 2007. Also, the reporters' considerations were partly based upon a timetable for delivering housing completions by 2009. There is no basis for this in the structure plan, which only requires allocations by 2015. It is considered preferable to retain the approach put forward by the Council in a pre-inquiry change to the plan, the effect of which was to accept that at some point alternatives to the tram could be considered, but not setting any arbitrary deadline for this.

- 3.14 A related recommendation (10.37) is to change the plan to imply that some development of the strategic greenfield housing sites can proceed in advance of any public transport improvements up to the level that can be supported within existing infrastructure capacity. This is also **not accepted** because it is incompatible with Policy HOU5 of the Structure Plan which requires all the relevant infrastructure set out in the structure plan action plan to be provided or committed, before planning permission is granted for housing development.

- 3.15 Another recommendation (10.50) is to state that housing in the strategic greenfield sites may be occupied once there is a final commitment to the tram's construction. This differs from the wording in the finalised plan and the definition of committed infrastructure in the structure plan, both of which link commitment to the agreement of funding. It is therefore recommended that this recommendation is **not accepted**.

Flooding

- 3.16 A number of objections related to land south of the Hilton Hotel at Edinburgh Airport. The reporters did not support releasing this site for development, or removing it from the green belt, and these conclusions are welcomed. However, the reporters did recommend (7.34) removing this site's designation as part of an area of importance for flood control. This is **not accepted**. The Council remains convinced that this site does form a part of the 'functional flood plain', and is required to store flood waters to protect the Airport in the event of a 1 in 200 year flood event. There is also an apparent contradiction in the reporters' conclusions that the site is not a part of the functional flood plain and yet would flood in a 1 in 200 year event.

Affordable Housing

- 3.17 While supporting the principle of including an affordable housing policy in the plan, the reporters have made quite a radical suggestion to amend the policy to seek an affordable housing contribution, in the form of the payment of a commuted sum, from developments of between 5 and 39 units (22.57). This would be inconsistent with the Council's city-wide policy which generally exempts developments of this size. However, there is some logic in extending the requirement to smaller sites, particularly in the rural west area where there are relatively few larger developments to generate affordable housing contributions. It would also assist in implementing affordable housing on proposed site HSP5 at Ratho Station, which addresses a recognised local housing need.
- 3.18 A review of the city-wide affordable housing policy is currently underway. Nevertheless, it is considered that these recommendations can be supported in the particular circumstances of the Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan. The outcome of the city-wide affordable housing policy review can be brought into the local plan at a later alteration.

Tree Preservation Orders

- 3.19 The reporters recommended (2.43(h)) that the TPO at Bavelaw Steadings be reviewed to enable the adjacent steading (a scheduled ancient monument) to be maintained. However, the relevant legislation allows the Council to permit works to trees covered by a TPO where necessary, for instance, to maintain or protect an ancient monument. This recommendation is therefore **not accepted**.

Archaeological Sites

3.20 The reporters recommended (2.43(j)) that a list of sites of archaeological significance be included in the plan and identified on the Proposals Map. This is considered to be impractical due to the sheer number of such sites. There is also the implication in highlighting known sites, that other sites have no value. However, there will be many sites whose archaeological significance is not yet known. This recommendation is therefore **not accepted**.

Areas of Outstanding Landscape Quality (AOLQs)

3.21 The reporters recommended that all AOLQs should be redesignated as Areas of Great Landscape Value (the existing designation covering the Pentland Hills) (4.78(a)). Though this recommendation has the attraction of simplifying the plan, it is important to maintain the distinction between the designations as they were identified through separate methodologies and have different meanings. This recommendation is therefore **not accepted**.

Retail Frontages

3.22 The Council agreed a pre-inquiry modification to the plan to add additional flexibility by allowing class 4 business uses within retail frontages. The reporters recommended extending this to allow residential uses where premises had been unsuccessfully marketed for 18 months (12.42). This approach is **not accepted**. Introducing residential uses into frontages would threaten the vitality and viability of shopping centres, the units affected would be unlikely to ever return to a retail or business use, and this approach would limit the supply of premises for small artisan businesses. The potential value of residential use could act as an incentive to abandon viable retail or business concerns.

3.23 There are a number of other instances where the reporters have suggested the benefits of carrying out further work to inform local plan policy. In most cases this view is accepted, but it has often not proved possible to complete this work within the timescale for reporting to this Committee and timeously adopting the local plan. These policy reviews will therefore be carried out in due course, and will inform any future alteration or replacement of the local plan.

3.24 The other Modifications set out in Appendix 2 have either previously been advertised as Pre- inquiry Modifications, follow the wording recommended by the Reporter, or relate to minor matters.

4 Financial Implications

4.1 No significant costs are expected to arise.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 This report has inevitably focussed on some points of potential disagreement between the Council and the inquiry reporters. However, this should not detract from the positive response that members can make to the bulk of the reporters' findings. The local plan strategy has emerged from the inquiry largely intact, and most of the reporters' recommendations for change can be welcomed as improvements to the clarity and usefulness of the plan.
- 5.2 If agreed, the Modifications set out in Appendix 2 will be advertised and placed on deposit for a six week period to allow formal objections. If no objections are received, the Council may proceed towards the adoption of the local plan. If objections are received, the Council need only afford objectors the opportunity of appearing at a further Public Local Inquiry if their objections relate to new matters not previously considered at a local inquiry. Since all the proposed modifications arise out of issues already discussed, it is not anticipated that any objection need give rise to a new inquiry.
- 5.3 Following the deposit period, regulations require a number of further procedures to be gone through. However, it is anticipated that the Plan remains on course to be adopted in mid-2006.

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 It is recommended that the Committee:
 - a. approves Appendix 1 as the Council's Statement of Decisions on the Inquiry Reporter's recommendations;
 - b. approves Appendix 2 as a List of Proposed Modifications, to be placed on public deposit as required by the Planning Regulations; and
 - c. authorises the Head of Planning and Strategy to make any minor editorial changes as may be required to the Statement of Decisions and the List of Modifications.

Andrew M Holmes
Director of City Development

Appendices	Appendix 1: Statement of Decisions on the Inquiry Reporter's Recommendations
	Appendix 2: List of Proposed Modifications
Contact/tel	Stephen Hall: (0131) 469 3598
Wards affected	1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 23, 41, 42
Background Papers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Finalised Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan (2003) 2 Report on Objections to the Finalised Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan

APPENDIX 1

RURAL WEST EDINBURGH LOCAL PLAN
STATEMENT OF DECISIONS ON INQUIRY
REPORTERS' RECOMMENDATIONS

November 2005

The City of Edinburgh Council

RURAL WEST EDINBURGH LOCAL PLAN

STATEMENT OF DECISIONS ON INQUIRY REPORTER'S RECOMMENDATIONS

TO BE AGREED BY THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE 3 NOVEMBER 2005

Plan Reference	Objectors (objection number)	Reporters' Recommendation	Council's Decision	Reason
CHAPTER 1: PLAN-WIDE ISSUES				
Length of Plan	Homes for Scotland 05/01	1.7 No change to local plan	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Prematurity of local plan	Atis Real Weatheralls 100/02	1.12 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Sustainability, context & strategy, especially housing strategy: chapters 1 & 2	Mr & Mrs D Cumming 095/01 Friends of Edinburgh Green Belt 032/01 032/03 & 032/06 Mr A Stewart & Miss E Burnett 107/01	1.26 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Structure plan context: local plan paragraph 3.11	Friends of the Edinburgh Green Belt 032/07	1.32 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Air quality management areas:	SEPA 106/cw02	1.38 Incorporate proposed pre-inquiry modification 3.	Accept Recommendation – See Modification	The Reporters concluded that the clarification of para 3.15 proposed in the Council's Pre-Inquiry Modification

para 3.15 (Policy E2)				2	is both helpful and relevant. Their recommendation therefore supports the Council's position.
Sustainable Development: para 3.16 & Policy E1	SEPA 106cw/01	1.44 Incorporate proposed modification 2.	pre-inquiry	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 3	The Reporters concluded that the amendments to para 3.16 put forward by the Council as a Pre-Inquiry Modification are helpful and relevant. Their recommendation therefore supports the Council's position.
Sustainable development: Policy E1; paragraph 3.13	Friends of Edinburgh Green Belt 032/08 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd & Miller Homes Ltd 077/03	1.54 No change to local plan.		Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Retailing Background: para 8.3 of written statement	Currie Community Council 062/34	1.61 No change to local plan.		Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Development plan departures (para 1.15)	Balerno Community Council 088/15	1.66 No change to local plan.		Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
CHAPTER 2: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND VARIOUS COUNTRYSIDE POLICIES					
Environmental impact: para 3.17 & Policy E4	Balerno Community Council 088/03	2.5 In paragraph 3.17, reference should be made by name to the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999.		Accept Recommendation – See Modification 4	The Reporters felt that para 3.17 would benefit from a more precise reference to the 1999 Act. The Council accepts with this view.
Development in the countryside: Policies	Clifton Hall School 028/03	2.10 No change to local plan.		Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

<p>E5 & E6</p> <p>Various environmental policies and designations including their effect on farming at Easter Bavelaw and Redford: Policies E4, E5, E6, E8, E16, E17, E18, E19, E20, E21, E29 & E30</p>	<p>K Shade 046/01 to 046/06 Daltons & Kinleith Industrial Estates Ltd 072/05</p>	<p>2.43</p> <p>(a) In Policy E4, the second sentence should be deleted.</p> <p>(b) In paragraph 3.17, reference should be made by name to the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999.</p> <p>(c) Further consideration should be given to the wording of Policies E5 and E6, to ensure that it is sufficiently clear in its meaning. Supplementary guidance should be prepared to define or illustrate the meaning of “<i>minor extensions</i>” and “<i>alterations</i>”, “<i>materially adverse effect</i>”, “<i>reasonable prospect</i>”, “<i>valuable element in the landscape</i>” and “<i>domestic scale</i>”. There should be a single definition that would make clear the meaning of “<i>substantially intact</i>”, “<i>no significant demolition</i>” and “<i>substantial rebuilding</i>”. The policies should refer the reader to the supplementary guidance.</p> <p>(d) The wording of Policy E6 should be adjusted to make clear how far the requirement for “<i>high standards of design</i>” is fulfilled by</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation - See Modification 5</p> <p>Accept Recommendation - See Modification 4</p> <p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 6</p> <p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 6</p>	<p>The Reporters concluded that the second sentence of Policy E4 is a statement of fact rather than of policy. They propose instead that para 3.17 be amended (see also Recommendation 2.5) to make direct reference to the EIA legislation by name. Both this and recommendation 2.43 b) are acceptable to the Council as the former clarifies Policy E4 while the latter makes reference to the relevant legislation in the main part of the text.</p> <p>The Council accepts that that some clarification of Policies E5 and E6 would be beneficial. In accordance with the Reporters’ recommendations, it proposes that supplementary guidance on Development in the Green Belt and Countryside be prepared. Reference to this should be made at the end of paragraph 3.23.</p> <p>The Council agrees with the Reporters’ recommendation that the rewording of Policy E6 would be improved by relating the criteria listed</p>
---	--	---	---	--

		<p>compliance with the listed criteria.</p> <p>(e) Further consideration should be given to Policy E6 (j), with a view to some relaxation of the complete prohibition on extensions and ancillary new buildings. Further explanation of such relaxation could be included in supplementary guidance.</p> <p>(f) In Policy E6 (k) the words “<i>to the satisfaction of the Council</i>” should be deleted.</p> <p>(g) The tree preservation order at Bavelaw steadings should be reviewed to remove any conflict with Policy E29.</p> <p>(h) At Threipmuir reservoir the wildlife value of the main body of water and its adjacent land</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 6</p> <p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 6</p> <p>Not Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan</p> <p>Accept Recommendation –The Council will</p>	<p>to the goal of achieving high standards of design. It is proposed that the first sentence of Policy E6 be re-worded accordingly.</p> <p>The Council agrees with the Reporters’ assessment of Policy E6 (j). It proposes that the word ‘extensions’ be deleted from the bullet point as they are already referred to in Policy E5 (c). Further clarification in relation to extensions in the Green Belt and Countryside will be provided in the Council’s proposed supplementary guidance referred to in Recommendation 2.43 (c).</p> <p>The Council agrees with the Reporters that criterion E6 (k) will be improved by this deletion.</p> <p>The Reporters suggested that the TPO at Bavelaw should be reviewed to enable the adjacent steading (a scheduled ancient monument) to be maintained. However, the relevant legislation allows the Council to permit works to trees covered by a TPO where necessary, for instance to maintain or protect an ancient monument.</p> <p>The Reporters concluded that both the Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation at Threipmuir and</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>margins should be reviewed. If shown to be justified by the review, this area should be designated as a site of importance for nature conservation.</p> <p>(i) Designation of land around Bavelaw steadings and of a strip on the south side of Redford Wood as parts of a site of importance for nature conservation should be reviewed. If the designation is to remain, justification for so doing should be provided.</p> <p>(j) Should contain a list of the <i>Sites of Archaeological Significance</i> to which reference is made in paragraph 3.55. These sites should also be identified on the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>amend as part of the Alteration if survey work complete</p> <p>Accept Recommendation –The Council will amend as part of the Alteration if survey work complete</p> <p>Not Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan</p>	<p>Bavelaw should be reviewed. The Council is already committed to reassessing both these sites as part of its review of local conservation designations. This is being carried out in accordance with the Local Nature Conservation Guidance (COSLA/SNH) which will result in their being re- designated Local Biodiversity Sites. The SINC's will be reviewed in 2006.</p> <p>The Council considers the Reporters' recommendation 2.43 (j) to be impractical. The Council Archaeologist is of the view that there are many sites with potential interest which may never come to light. It would not, therefore, be possible to list or identify these on the Proposals Map. Also in identifying some sites in the plan, this would imply that others are less important, which is not the case. Known sites would, if drawn on the Proposals Map, also cause legibility problems because of their number. In any case, as Policy E30 makes clear, any proposal affecting a site of potential archaeological significance would require consultation with the Council's Archaeologist so no site would ever be at risk.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

	(k) So that its boundary may be defined, further information about the <i>site of archaeological importance</i> at Easter Bavelaw Rig should be sought.	<p>Partly Accept Recommendation- No Change to Plan</p>	<p>While of note, the site of Archaeological Importance at Easter Bavelaw Rigg is not of national interest and therefore worthy of the special attention implied by the Reporters. In any case the relevant body is the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historic Monuments rather than Historic Scotland. While the Council would encourage the undertaking of such a survey by the landowner or other groups or individuals, it does not at present have the resources to carry out the work itself. Given the Council's decision on Recommendation 2.43(j), there is no immediate need to define the site boundary.</p>
<p>Need for review of green belt: Chapter 2</p>	<p>2.54 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>
<p>Article 4 directions in the green belt: omission from Chapter 3</p>	<p>2.58 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>

Rural estate management in the green belt: Policy E5	Danzan Trust 078/02	2.68	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Need for reference to war games: Policy E5	Balerno Community Council 088/04	2.73	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
CHAPTER 3: LOCATION SPECIFIC GREEN BELT MATTERS					
Land south of Queensferry: green belt designation: Policy E5	AWG Residential 070/01	3.9	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
The Dark Entries, South Queensferry: green belt designation: Policy E5	Lord Rosebery 086/01 & 086/08 Earl of Rosebery 043/01	3.20	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Policy TRA8: Transport Proposal T9: Land at Scotstoun, South Queensferry	George Wimpey East Scotland 051/02	3.34	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

Designation of Land of north of Kirkliston as green belt: Policy E5	Danzan Trust 078/01 Hopetoun Estates 079/01	3.44	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Green Belt Boundary: West Craigs Maybury: Policy E5	Scottish Agricultural Science Agency 015/02	3.52	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Gogarbank: Green Belt Policy E5	Derek Anderson 039/01	3.60	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Local Treatment of SASA site at Gogarbank	Scottish Agricultural Agency 015/01	3.66	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Green Belt Boundary at Dalmahoy Mains: Policy E5	C McManus 055/03 Residents against Green Belt Encroachment 061/01	3.77	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Green Belt Boundary at Harlaw Reservoir: Policy E5	C McManus 055/16 Residents against Green Belt Encroachment 061/03	3.87	No change to the local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

Green belt boundary at Marchbank: Policy E5	P Banfill 017/01 C McManus 055/02 Residents against green belt encroachment 061/02	3.97 On the Proposals Map, the green belt to the south of Balerno should be extended to the Rigg Road so that it includes all of the land shown as a proposed green belt extension on the Proposals Map contained in the <i>Green Belt Review of Boundaries 1988</i> .	Accept Recommendation 98 – See Modification 98	The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that the green belt at Marchbank should be extended in the manner envisaged in the 1988 review.
CHAPTER 4: LANDSCAPE AND AGRICULTURAL LAND SAFEGUARDS				
Design in the Green Belt and Countryside: Policy E6	Balerno Community Council 088/05	4.11 (a) Paragraph 3.24 should highlight the existence of the Council's <i>Quality of Landscaping in Developments</i> . This could be done by inserting the following after ".....preferred to new planting". :- Further detailed guidance regarding landscaping is provided by <i>Quality of Landscaping in Developments</i> , which is part of the Council's Development Quality Handbook. The Council will have regard to this guidance in determining applications for planning permission.	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 7	The Reporters concluded that the Council should make reference to its DQ Guideline on landscaping when referring to tree related issues which concern the Green Belt and Countryside as in para 3.24. The Council agrees with this addition which clarifies its policy position.
		(b) In Policy E6, the following should be inserted between (a) and (b):- “() <i>the character and scale of the proposed development should be in keeping with any nearby traditional buildings and should facilitate integration of the development into the rural landscape.</i> ”	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 7	The Council agrees with the Reporters that adding a new criterion to Policy E6 is appropriate. This will address the issue of scale as an important aspect of good design in accordance with the advice contained in SPP1.

		(c)	In policy E6, insert at the end of (b):- “and that accords with the guidance Quality of Landscaping in Developments:”		Accept Recommendation- See Modification 7	The Reporters' proposed amendment to E6 (b) is also acceptable to the Council. It seems logical that the policy should refer directly to the relevant DQ guideline.
Application of Design & Amenity Criteria to development within rural estates: Policy E6	Danzan Trust per Sir Jack Stewart Clark 078/03	4.20	No change to local plan.		Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Protection of prime agricultural land: Policy E7	Taylor Woodrow Developments & Miller Homes Ltd 077/04	4.24	No change to the finalised local plan.		Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Protection of prime agricultural land: paragraph 3.25 and Policy E7	Balerno Community Council 088/06	4.32	No change to the finalised local plan.		Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Need for a review of the area of great landscape value: para 3.26 & Policy E8	Atis Real Weatheralls 100/06 Taylor Woodrow & Miller Homes 077/05	4.38	No change to the finalised local plan.		Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

Wording of Policy for the AGLV and AOLQ's: Policy E8	Hopetoun Estates 079/06	4.47 The second sentence in Policy E8 should be deleted and replaced by the following:- <i>"When determining applications for planning permission for development within these areas a major consideration will be the impact of the proposed development on those landscape features which contribute to the quality of the landscape."</i>	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 8	The Council accepts the reporters' conclusion that landscape impact should be referred to as a "major" rather than "overriding" consideration.
Braehead Farm: designation as part of an area of outstanding landscape quality: Policy E8	Mrs Gladys Dales Daughters' Trust 037/01	4.53 No change to the local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Inclusion of land west of Baird Road, Ratho in an area of outstanding landscape quality: Policy E8 and Proposals Map	Tarmac Northern 034/05 Brewster Bros 048/05 A Allison 125/01	4.78 (a) References to areas of outstanding landscape quality should be replaced by references to areas of great landscape value. (b) On the Proposals Map, the boundary of the area of outstanding landscape quality at Ratho should be amended to exclude from designation the larger objection site and the field to the west.	Partly accept recommendation Accept Recommendation – See Modification 93	The Council does not accept that Areas of Outstanding Landscape Quality (AOLQs) should be renamed as Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLVs). These areas were identified through different methodologies and the term AGLV has a particular meaning that will not apply to all AOLQs. Emerging guidance from Scottish Natural Heritage will provide a single consistent methodology that will be applied when RWELP is altered or replaced. The Council accepts that part of the

<p>Designed Landscapes – lack of clarity in policy: Policy E14</p>	<p>Homes for Scotland 050/03</p>	<p>4.88 (a) Paragraph 3.37 should include text that gives a description of the non-inventory resource that is to be safeguarded as part of Policy E14, and reasons why protection is necessary.</p> <p>(b) The third paragraph of Policy E14 should read as follows:- <i>“Where proposed development would adversely affect other designed landscape features that are worthy of retention, including non-inventory historic gardens, surviving features of designed landscapes and mature public parks, the development will only be permitted if the adverse effect has been minimised and is outweighed by public benefits arising from the development.”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 9</p> <p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 10</p>	<p>land west of Baird Road, Ratho does not justify inclusion in the AOLQ.</p> <p>The Council accepts that para 3.37 could usefully include such further text to explain and justify the policy.</p> <p>The Council accepts that Policy E14 could be improved by clarifying that it is mature parks to which this policy is referring.</p>
--	----------------------------------	---	--	---

CHAPTER 5 : TREES, NATURE CONSERVATION AND COUNTRYSIDE RECREATION

<p>Protection of Trees and Woodland: Policy E16</p>	<p>Cala Homes East Ltd 077/06</p>	<p>5.6 (a) Add the following new paragraph after paragraph 3.39: <i>“Landowners and developers proposing any action that might affect the continued well-being of any trees are encouraged to refer to the Council’s Development Quality Handbook. This contains advice and guidance regarding tree protection and urban forestry. These parts of the Handbook will be taken into account by the Council in applying the following two policies.”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 11</p>	<p>The Council accepts that reference to the relevant development quality guideline would be useful.</p>
		<p>(b) Add the following to the last sentence of the first paragraph of Policy E16: <i>“... unless it can be demonstrated by way of an arboricultural report that no harm to the tree(s) would result during construction, or afterwards, including potential concerns from future occupiers regarding matters such as building and personal safety, daylight, sunlight, or any other perceived risk related to the presence of the tree(s).”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 12</p>	<p>The Council accepts that a reference to this possible exception to the normal safeguarding distances from trees would reflect reality.</p>

Protection of trees and woodland: Policy E16	Danzan Trust per Sir Jack Stewart Clark 078/04	<p>5.17 Policy E16 should be changed in the following ways:-</p> <p>(a) Add to the last sentence of the first paragraph: “....., unless it can demonstrated by way of an arboricultural report that no harm to the tree(s) would result during construction, or afterwards, including potential concerns from future occupiers regarding matters such as building and personal safety, daylight, sunlight, or any other perceived risk related to the presence of the tree(s).”</p> <p>(b) The first sentence of the second paragraph to read: “The Council shall promote, encourage and support additional woodland planting in appropriate areas through its Urban Forestry Strategy, Private Woodland Management Schemes and in accordance with the Forestry Commission’s identified area of interest.”</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 12</p>	The Council accepts that a reference to this possible exception to the normal safeguarding distances from trees would reflect reality.
Preservation of trees in the Water of Leith valley: Policy E16 & Appendix C	Friends of the Edinburgh Green Belt 032/26	5.21 No change to the finalised local plan.	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 13</p>	The Council accepts that a reference to private woodland management schemes would recognise the importance of private woodlands and planting.
SINC boundary at Dundas Estate: Proposals Map & Policy E18	Danzan Trust per Sir Jack Stewart Clark 078/05	5.36 On the Proposals Map, the boundary of the Dundas Estate SINC should be revised so that the SINC does not include the golf course, land between the golf course and the A8000 and land to the south-west of the AOLQ.	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 92</p>	This recommendation supports the Council’s decision.
				The Council accepts that the land to be removed from the site of importance for nature conservation (SINC) is of less clear importance.

<p>Article 4 directions for nature conservation : Policy E21</p>	<p>Danzan Trust per Sir Jack Stewart Clark 078/06</p>	<p>5.44 (a) Policy E21 should read as follows:- <i>“This policy applies to all the categories of sites of natural heritage interest that are mentioned in Policies E17 and E18. Where the Council has good reason to believe that the natural heritage interest of one or more of these sites may be damaged by implementation of works that are permitted in terms of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992, it will promote a direction in terms of article 4 of the order so that the works in question may no longer be exempt from planning control.”</i></p> <p>(b) Paragraph 3.46 should sequentially be amended as follows:- Delete sentence 4 (which begins “The Council is of.....”) and insert:- <i>“Where the Council has good reason to believe that a site of natural heritage interest may be damaged by implementation of works that are permitted, it will promote a direction.”</i></p> <p>In sentence 5 (which begins “Such a Direction.....”) delete the words: “described by Policy E21.”</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 15</p>	<p>It is no longer the Council's intention to remove permitted development rights from all sites of nature conservation value.</p>
		<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 15</p>		

<p>Countryside Recreation: Policy E23</p>	<p>Danzan Trust per Sir Jack Stewart Clark 078/07</p>	<p>5.55 Policy E23 should be worded as follows. <i>“In the Green Belt and Countryside policy areas, development, improvement or extension of outdoor recreational and sporting facilities will be permitted in support of rural diversification if:</i> <i>(a) it is well-integrated into the rural landscape;</i> <i>(b) it reflects the character and quality of place of the landscape;</i> <i>(c) it does not result in a significant loss of prime quality agricultural land; and</i> <i>(d) any additional infrastructure that is required is provided.”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 16</p>	<p>The Council accepts that the recommended wording more closely reflects structure plan Policy ENV3.</p>
<p>Caravan and Camping Development: Policy E24</p>	<p>Danzan Trust per Sir Jackie Stewart Clark 078/08</p>	<p>5.65 Policy E24 should be changed in the following ways:- (a) the word “only” should be removed from the second line; and (b) two new criteria should be added to (a) to (f):- (i) <i>“the proposal would not result in a significant loss of prime quality agricultural land; and</i> (ii) <i>any additional infrastructure that is required shall be provided by the developer.”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 17</p>	<p>The Reporters felt that Policy E24 should be amended to bring it into line with Policy ENV3 of the Edinburgh and the Lothians Structure Plan 2015 in addressing the issue of rural diversification in countryside areas. The Council agrees with the form of wording proposed.</p>
<p>Golf Courses and Driving Ranges: Policy E25</p>	<p>Danzan Trust per Jack Stewart Clark 078/09</p>	<p>5.75 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>

Golf Course Redevelopment Proposals: Policy E25	Turnhouse Golf Course 064/01 & 064/02	5.85 In the last sentence of Policy E25 after the word "will" insert "normally". After the end of the sentence add the following: "Driving ranges, including the design of associated buildings and the provision of car parking, fencing and lighting, must not have an adverse effect on the rural character of the locality."	Accept Recommendation See Modification 18	The Reporters concluded that the wording of Policy E25 in relation to the location of driving ranges was overly stringent. The Council accepts this view and the proposed amendments to the policy. This would allow such developments outwith urban areas provided they do not have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area.
Union Canal Towpath: para 3.52, Policy E26 & Appendix F	British Waterways Scotland 042/02	5.92 In paragraph 3.52, before the last sentence, insert:- "Some routes may be suitable for horse-riding, but this will not be promoted on routes such as the Union Canal towpath where riding could be hazardous."	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 19	The Reporters agreed with the objector that the Union Canal would not be suitable for horse-riding. The Council understands that there are safety reasons for excluding such activities from this location and is willing to amend para 3.52 accordingly.
Union Canal Towpath: para 3.52, Policy E26 & Appendix F	British Waterways Scotland 042/02	5.93 Regarding deletion of the Union Canal towpath from Appendix F, further consideration should be given to the status of this route.	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 90	Following the Reporters' recommendation, the Council has given further consideration to the issue of the Union Canal's status. However, it remains of the view that the canal's exclusion from Appendix F is justified on the basis that it is not a right of way
CHAPTER 6: BUILT HERITAGE AND OPEN SPACE				
Evaluation of Non-Scheduled Archaeological Remains Paras 3.55 & 3.56 & Policy E30	Flowpearl Ltd 071/01	6.20 (a) In Policy E30, the requirement for an archaeological evaluation of sites expected to be of potential archaeological interest should be revised, to require instead implementation of a scheme of investigation prior to commencement of development. It should also be made clear that an archaeological evaluation means an investigation involving on-site work. The policy	Accept Recommendation - See Modification 20	The Reporters concluded that it was unreasonable to ask the developer to provide an on-site evaluation where a site only has potential archaeological interest. The Council accepts the proposed changes.

Listed buildings: Policy E32	Danzan Trust per Sir Jack Stewart Clark 078/10	<p>(b) To make the meaning of the policy clear, the text of paragraph 3.56 should be amended so that it includes a definition of <i>archaeological field evaluation</i>. The definition should be based on that given in paragraph 20 of PAN 42.</p> <p>6.28 (a) In paragraph 3.58, the following should be inserted before the first sentence:-</p> <p><i>“In considering whether to grant listed building consent, the Council will have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historical interest which it possesses. This is a statutory requirement, laid down in section 14(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.”</i></p> <p>(b) To reflect the statutory requirement, the supporting text and the issue of community benefit, Policy E32 should be reworded. One possible wording is as follows:-</p> <p><i>“In considering a proposal that affects a listed building or its setting, regard will be had to its effect on the architectural character of the building and its features of historic interest and, if appropriate, its care and restoration. Retention or restoration of architectural character and features of historic interest will be the most important considerations but the extent to which the proposal would bring benefits to the community will also be taken into account.”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 20</p>	<p>The Reporters' suggestion that para 3.56 should include a definition of 'archaeological field evaluation' as set out in PAN 20 is acceptable to the Council for purposes of clarification. The text will be amended accordingly.</p>
			<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 21</p>	<p>The Council accepts that a reference in the supporting text to the statutory requirement with regard to listed buildings would assist users of the plan.</p> <p>The Council accepts that a reference to community benefit would be appropriate within the policy, and that the effect on architectural character will not necessarily be the “overriding” consideration with regard to listed buildings: “most important” is a more appropriate phrase.</p>
			<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 21</p>	

New Developments in Villa Areas: Policy E44	Taylor Woodrow Developments & Miller Homes Ltd 077/07	<p><i>"Alterations, extension or changes of use....."</i> [continue with the existing last sentence of the policy, but delete the final "or " and replace with "and"]</p> <p>6.35 Word Policy E44 as follows:-</p> <p><i>"New development in the garden ground of detached or semi-detached houses of a traditional, usually stone-built, character will not be permitted where it would lead to a loss of character or amenity. Development must be in accordance with the guideline Villa Areas & the Grounds of Villas in the Council's Development Quality Handbook."</i></p> <p>6.54 (a) The Open Space part of the plan should incorporate the results of the Council's current work on the open space framework and levels of provision.</p> <p>(b) If (a) is not possible at the present time, the first sentence of paragraph 3.91 should be altered as follows:</p> <p>delete:- <i>"The Council.....assessment of"</i></p> <p>insert:- <i>"The Council will assess..."</i></p> <p>(c) In Policy E51, the word 'or' at the end of criterion (a) should be deleted.</p> <p>(d) In the text in support of Policy E51, reference should be made to the Policy H5 requirement for provision of open space.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 22</p>	<p>The Reporters concluded that the wording of Policy E44 is at present unclear. The Council agrees that the inclusion of a direct reference to the relevant DQ guideline in the policy would be more helpful.</p>
Need for open space audit and standards for provision: paras 3.86 to 3.93 & Policies E51 & E52	Friends of Edinburgh GB 032/12 Homes for Scotland 050/04 Currie Community Council 062/07 Taylor Woodrow/ Miller Homes 077/08 Atis Real Weatheralls Ltd 100/01	<p>Since the Council's open space framework has not yet been published, recommendation 6.54 (a) cannot be accepted. However, the Council may make reference to it in para 3.91 as enabled by the Reporters' recommendation 6.54 (b) although the Council's rewording of paragraph 3.91 is different to that proposed by the Reporters.</p> <p>The Council also agree with the Reporters' recommendations in relation to Policy E51 and paragraph 3.92 which it proposes to amend accordingly.</p>	<p>Partly Accept Recommendation- See Modification 30</p>	

CHAPTER 7: FLOODING, SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE, ADVERTISEMENTS, TELECOMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENTS, MASTS AND BURIAL GROUNDS

Flood Prevention Schemes: Pages 47-48	Balerno Community Council 105/01	7.9 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Flooding: Policy E45	SEPA 106/04	7.15 Amend Policy E45, paragraph 1 to read as , follows: Second sentence and a new third sentence: <i>“As a general principle, all new residential and business development should be designed to avoid or manage any threat to susceptible properties from a 200 year return period flood. An appropriate freeboard should be provided and an allowance may be made for climate change.”</i>	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 24	The Reporters agreed that the proposed clarification of Policy E45 is both helpful and relevant. The Council supports this view.
SUDS and surface water runoff: para 3.82, Policy E45 & Policy E46	SEPA 106/cw03 &106/cw05	7.21 Paragraph 3.82 and Policy E 46 should be changed to incorporate pre-inquiry modifications 5 and 6.	Accept Recommendations See Modifications 23 & 25	The Reporters concluded that the changes proposed by the Council to para 3.82 and Policy E46 in the Pre-Inquiry Modifications are both helpful and relevant.
Area of Importance for Flood Control: Eastfield Road: Policy E45	FSH (Edinburgh) Services Ltd 068/03	7.34 The designation of the 068/03 objection site as part of the area of importance for flood control under policy E 45 should be deleted.	Not Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan	The Council has carefully considered the Reporters' recommendation in 7.34. However, it maintains its view that the Eastfield Road site is part of the 'Functional Flood Plain'. This, with other sites in the airport area, should be viewed as agricultural land providing significant flood storage capacity. The designation is a small but significant component of the Council's flood prevention scheme

<p>Area of Importance for Flood Control: Eastfield Road: Policy E45</p>	<p>FSH (Edinburgh) Services 068/03</p>	<p>7.35 The Council should consider whether policy E45 and the supporting text require revision in the light of revised Scottish Executive guidance on planning and flooding published during 2004.</p>	<p>Part Accept Recommendation-Amend Policy E45 through Alteration/Review</p>	<p>which is designed to give 1:200 year protection primarily to Edinburgh Airport. There is also an apparent contradiction in the Reporter's conclusions that the site is not part of the functional flood plain and would flood in a 1 in 200 year event. The Reporters concluded that Policy E45 (Flooding) requires revision in the light of more recently published executive policy and advice on planning for flooding. The Council has begun the process of reviewing its Development Quality Guideline on Planning and Flooding to bring it into line with SPP7: 'Planning and Flooding'. However, as this is not yet available any amendments to E45 will have to be made through the local plan alteration or review at a later date.</p>
<p>Control of advertisements: para 3.83 & Policy E47</p>	<p>Outdoor Advertising Association 011/01 & 011/02</p>	<p>7.42 (a) Paragraph 3.83 should be reworded to ensure that it accords with the regulations and government policy. One possible wording is suggested below:- "Advertisements are controlled in terms of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (Scotland) Regulations 1984 (as amended). The regulations stipulate that control of advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Government policy regarding advertisement control is contained in Scottish Development Department Circular 10/1984. This says that advertisements are an integral part of modern commercial life and their presence in many street scenes will enhance</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 26</p>	<p>The Reporters, recognising the Council's intention to accept this objection, proposed an alternative form of wording to para 3.83 which fully reflects the requirements of the advertisement regulations and government policy. This is fully supported by the Council.</p>

<p>Telecom- munications development : para 3.84 & Policy E48</p>	<p>Mono Consultants 044/01 & 044/02</p>	<p><i>the environment by adding colour and interest. The circular also points out that stricter control of advertisements may be appropriate in certain areas, for example certain predominantly rural areas or areas with important architectural, archaeological, historical or visual characteristics. All applications for approval of advertisements in the area covered by the local plan will be carefully assessed in relation to the form, size and means of illumination (if any) of the proposed display. Control will be exercised to ensure that advertisements do not detract from the character of conservation areas nor from the appearance of the main approaches to the city.</i></p> <p>(b) The text of Policy E47 should be deleted and replaced by that in pre-inquiry modification 7.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification- 27</p>	<p>The Reporters agreed with the Council that the reworded Policy E47 as proposed by the Council in Pre-Inquiry Modification 7 more closely reflects the requirements of the advertisement regulations.</p>
		<p>7.52 (a) In paragraph 3.84: delete the sentence: "There may be will not be acceptable." insert in place of the deleted sentence: "Telecommunications installations proposed in environmentally sensitive areas must be designed so that they are unobtrusive. Impact on important natural resources such as landscape and wildlife should be avoided but where this is not possible impact must be minimised by appropriate design."</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation - See Modification 28</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that this modification is necessary to ensure that the plan is in accordance with national guidance.</p>

Pylons and masts: paras 3.30 & 3.84 & Policies E48 & E49		(b) in Policy E48: in criterion (a), delete “adversely” and put in its place “cause an unacceptable” and add a new line after criterion (c): “When assessing the location of proposed telecommunications development regard shall be had to the technical and operational requirements of the network.”	Accept Recommendation -See Modification 29	The Council accepts the reporters’ assessment that this modification is necessary to ensure that the plan is in accordance with national guidance.
Friends of Edinburgh Green Belt 032/09 & 032/11 Currie Community Council 062/03	7.64	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council’s decision.
Failure to include policies or proposals for burial grounds	F Marr 074/01	7.74 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council’s decision.
CHAPTER 8: MINERAL WORKING AND WASTE DISPOSAL				
Mineral Working: protection of environment; waste management : proper control and	Residents Against Green Belt Encroachment 061/08, 061/09, 061/10, 0611, 061/12, 061/13, 061/14 &	8.36 (a) In Policy M10 (c) the reference to a distance of 250m should be deleted unless proper justification for it can be provided. (b) In policy M10 (f), “by the operator” should be replaced by “at the operator’s expense”.	Accept Recommendation -See Modification 42 Accept Recommendation	The Council accepts the reporters’ assessment that recommendation (a) is necessary to ensure the plan is in accordance with national guidance. The Council accepts the reporters’ assessment that recommendation (b) is necessary to ensure clarity.

<p>health risks: Policies M2, M3, M4, M8, M9, M10 & M11</p>	<p>061/15</p>	<p>and "would" should be replaced by "will".</p> <p>(c) Policy M11 should be amended to reflect the distinction that may be made between former waste disposal sites (where 250m is an accepted safety distance) and currently operational sites (where justification for a 250m distance has not been provided). The second sentence of Policy M11 should be altered to make its meaning clear. A suggested rewording of Policy M11 is as follows:-</p> <p><i>"A development proposal shall be accompanied by a detailed ground condition survey if:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. the site of the proposed development is within 250 metres of a former waste disposal site; or</i> <i>b. the site of the proposed development is likely to be adversely affected by surface movement, contamination, landfill gas, leachate or atmospheric pollution from any former or currently operational waste disposal site.</i> <p><i>Development proposals to which this policy applies will be approved only where the Council is fully satisfied that no adverse effect on any person's health and no adverse effect on the environment would arise as a result of the relationship between the proposals and any waste disposal site."</i></p>	<p>-See Modification 42</p> <p>Accept Recommendation -See Modification 43</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that recommendation (c) is necessary to ensure that the plan is in accordance with national guidance.</p>
---	---------------	---	---	--

<p>Sustainable disposal of waste, safety distance around waste disposal sites, role of landfill, monitoring of sites, balance of effects, health effects and separation distance: Policy M2, para 4.28, Policy M10, para 4.6, Policy M3 & Policy M11</p>	<p>C McManus 055/01, 055/05, 055/06, 055/08, 055/10, 055/11, 055/12, 055/14, 055/15 & 055/20</p>	<p>8.77 (a) In Policy M2 C the phrase “where the <i>damaging impact is considered acceptable</i>” should be replaced by a phrase that reflects the more rigorous standard (“<i>the objectives and overall integrity of the designated area will not be compromised</i>”) contained in Policy ENV 1 D of the approved structure plan.</p> <p>(b) In Policy M2 C the protection afforded listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and historic and designed landscapes should be no less than that required in Policy ENV 1 C of the approved structure plan. This could be achieved by removing these three categories from section C of Policy M2 and creating a new section of M2 with text along the following lines:-</p> <p>“<i>Development which would harm the character, appearance or setting of the following designated built or cultural heritage sites or the specific features which justify their designation will be resisted.</i></p> <p><i>Listed buildings</i> <i>Scheduled ancient monuments</i> <i>Sites listed in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes.”</i></p> <p>(c) Paragraph 4.28 should mention the position of landfill and landraise in the waste disposal hierarchy. It should mention that the proportion of waste consigned to landfill is to be reduced radically. It should not suggest</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 35</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that recommendations (a) and (b) are necessary to ensure the plan is in accordance with the approved Structure Plan.</p>
---	---	--	--	---

		<p>that landfill itself makes a positive contribution to the quality of the environment. These points would be met if the paragraph were reworded along the following lines:-</p> <p><i>“The Lothians and Borders Area Waste Plan states that, of the total waste arising in Lothian and the Borders in 2001, 94% was landfilled. The Area Waste Plan intends to reduce this to 23% by 2020. This reflects the fact that landfill occupies a place at the bottom of the waste hierarchy - in other words it is the least desirable waste management option. Progress has been made in waste reduction and recycling initiatives but the continued demand for waste disposal capacity is likely to be significant over the plan period. Waste disposal operations, including landfilling and landraising, give rise to particular concerns which need to be addressed in the determination of planning applications. Landfill involves disposal of material in voids left by previous excavation work and can be of assistance in proposals to restore derelict land. Landraising involves depositing material on and above existing ground level and is only likely to be acceptable where it would lead to the enhancement of an area of derelict or degraded land.”</i></p> <p>(d) In Policy M10 (c), the reference to a distance of 250m should be deleted unless proper justification for it can be provided.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- see Modification 40</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that recommendation (c) is necessary to ensure that the plan states clearly the role of landfill and landraise in the waste hierarchy.</p>
			<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 42</p>	

		<p>(e) Policy M11 should be amended to reflect the distinction that may be made between former waste disposal sites (where 250m is an accepted safety distance) and operational sites (where justification for a 250m distance has not been provided). The following new wording for the whole of this policy is suggested in the recommendation arising from objection 061/15:-</p> <p><i>“A development proposal shall be accompanied by a detailed ground condition survey if:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>the site of the proposed development is within 250 metres of a former waste disposal site; or</i></p> <p>(b) <i>the site of the proposed development is likely to be adversely affected by surface movement, contamination, landfill gas, leachate or atmospheric pollution from any former or currently operational waste disposal site.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals to which this policy applies will be approved only where the Council is fully satisfied that no adverse effect on any person’s health and no adverse effect on the environment would arise as a result of the relationship between the proposals and any waste disposal site.”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 43</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters’ assessment that recommendations (d) and (e) are necessary to ensure the plan is in accordance with national guidance.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>Craigiehill Quarry: Policy M4, Policy E18 & Proposals Map</p>	<p>Earl of Rosebery 043/06 Lord Rosebery 086/06 Johnson Poole and Bloomer 109/01</p>	<p>8.93 The boundary of the Craigie Hill SINC should be amended so that it does not include the area shown on the plan accompanying objection 109/01.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 97</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that modification is justified as it has not been demonstrated that the area identified in objection 109/01 has special wildlife value that justifies designation.</p>
<p>Recycling – paras 4.25 to 4.30</p>	<p>Daltons & Kinleith Industrial Estates Ltd 072/03</p>	<p>8.103 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>
<p>Provision for disposal of waste & omission of site for integrated waste management facility: Policies M8 & M10 & Proposals Map</p>	<p>WRG Scotland Ltd 101/01 & 101/02</p>	<p>8.117 (a) Instead of the text proposed in Pre-inquiry Modification 11, the following should be inserted after the first sentence of Policy M8: <i>“Applications for planning permission for waste management facilities will be determined in accordance with the Lothian and Borders Area Waste Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. There will be a presumption against permitting development that would conflict with the Area Waste Plan.”</i></p> <p>(b) In Policy M10, add the following to criterion (a): <i>“ , or, if they involve land raise, it has been demonstrated that there is no suitable alternative.”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 38</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that modification is necessary to ensure that the plan is in accordance with the approved Structure Plan.</p>
			<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modification 41</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that modification is necessary to ensure that the plan is in accordance with National Guidance.</p>

Area Waste Plan & waste management : para 4.26 & Policy M8	SEPA 106/cw06 & 106 cw08	8.125 (a) The second sentence in paragraph 4.26 should be deleted and there is no need for any replacement text. (b) Policy M8 should be changed in accordance with the recommendation relating to objections 101/01 and 101/02.	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 37 Accept Recommendation – See Modification 38	The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that modification is necessary to ensure that the plan is in accordance with the approved Structure Plan.
Queensferry Waste Water Treatment Plant: Policy M12	Scottish Water 027/01	8.131 Insert a new sentence before the last sentence of paragraph 4.31: " <i>A site for this plant has been identified in the rural area to the west of Queensferry, and planning permission was granted in April 2005.</i> "	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 44	The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that modification is necessary to reflect latest developments.
West Edinburgh Planning Framework: green belt releases (para 6.11)	Currie Community Council 062/24 Friends of the Edinburgh Green Belt 032/17	9.7 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Green Belt Land Releases and new allocations for business and industry: Policy E5 and par 6.21	Cala Homes East Ltd 084/02, p15, p17 Mactaggart & Mickel 083/01	9.18 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

Site to the west of City bypass, south of Gogar roundabout: Policy ED1	Premier Property Group 076/09	9.27	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Site on Gogar Station Road : Policy ED1	Premier Property Group 076/10	9.36	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Green Belt releases: Gogarburn: Policy ED1, proposal ECON 9 and paragraph 6.22	Friends of Edinburgh Green Belt 032/18 & 19	9.43	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Treatment of Gogarburn site: Paragraph 6.21 and economic development proposal ECON 9	Cala Homes East 084/p15 & p19	9.51	No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Planning context for airport/show ground area	International Business Gateway 093/01- 06 & p07	9.58	Incorporate proposed pre-inquiry modification 21.	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 67	This recommendation reflects a pre-inquiry modification put forward by the Council, and therefore reflects the Council's position.

Royal Highland Centre, Ingliston: Policy ED 6	Royal Highland and Agricultural Society for Scotland 094/01 & 094/02	9.72 Pre-inquiry Modification 17 should be accepted, but it should be clarified to define clearly the major established green belt uses and identified economic development proposals to which it applies.	Accept Recommendation - See Modification 66	This recommendation supports the Council's position and the benefits of this further clarification are recognised.
Airport Hotels: Policy ED5 & para 6.31	V Stewart 020/01	9.80 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Economic Development sites at Eastfield Road: Policies E5, ED5 & ED6	Premier Property Group 076/05 & 076/06	9.101 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Airport Related development at Eastfield Road: Policies E5, ED5 & ED6	FSH Edinburgh Services Ltd 068/01 & 068/02	9.136 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

<p>Newbridge West: Economic development proposals ECON 8</p>	<p>Ediston Properties Ltd 130/p01 130/p02 & 130/p03 Edinburgh Gate Development Ltd 049/01, cw02 & cw/03</p>	<p>9.165 Change the plan in accordance with pre-inquiry modification 20. Position of settlement boundary to remain as shown on Proposals Map Inset Map 3; pre-inquiry modification 19 (map 1) not to be incorporated; extent of ECON 8 site shown on Proposals Map Inset 3 to be reduced on west side to exclude land outwith the settlement boundary as shown on the same map; site boundary shown on the development brief to be amended to correspond with the settlement boundary. No change to content of development brief.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – see Modification 75 Accept Recommendation – see Modification 71</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's position. The Council accept that this modification resolves an inconsistency between the site boundary as previously shown and a site of importance for nature conservation.</p>
<p>Claylands Farm, Newbridge Sites for Business and Industry: Policy ED 1</p>	<p>Alex Brewster & sons 104/01 Tarmac Northern 034/06</p>	<p>9.178 [Claylands Farm] Extend the Newbridge settlement boundary and the ECON 5 notation to include both objection sites, as far as the motorway boundary, but omitting the westmost field and adjacent tree belt which should remain in the Countryside Policy Area. Consider preparation of an additional development brief to guide the layout, access, and structural landscaping arrangements for the site.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – No change to plan Accept Recommendation – see Modifications 68 and 69</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision. The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that modification is necessary as it addresses a fragmented piece of land between an industrial estate and a motorway. The Council accepts the request that they consider the preparation of an additional development brief.</p>

<p>Ferrymuir, South Queensferry: Policy ED1 & Proposal ECON 2</p>	<p>FR Evans Ltd 112/01 Tesco Stores Ltd 113/01 Queensferry Community Council 085/01 & 085/02</p>	<p>9.190 The southern part of the Ferrymuir site should remain as proposal ECON 2. € After the second sentence of Policy ED 1 add the sentence: “<i>Specific proposals for such uses must be compatible with the character of the site and surrounding area in terms of the nature of the proposal, its siting, layout and design, and traffic and environmental impact.</i>” € The entry for Ferrymuir in the Schedule of Economic Development Proposals on page 108 of the local plan should include the words “<i>excluding any industrial process</i>” after “<i>Class 4</i>” in the last column. € The northern and central part of the site should remain allocated as an Existing Business Area, covered by Policy ED1, as modified. € The Policy R 1 designation should not be extended to cover the Tesco store at Ferrymuir.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation - See modification 70</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council’s position and adds further clarification.</p>
<p>Royal Elizabeth Yard, South Queensferry: Policies E5, ED5-7 Green Belt/settlement boundary; economic development</p>	<p>FR Evans (Leeds) Ltd 112/02 & 112/03</p>	<p>9.204 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council’s decision.</p>

Sites west of City Bypass & east of Hermiston Village: Policy ED1	Premier Property Group 076/02 & 076/03	9.213 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Site west of Hermiston Village: Policy ED1	Premier Property Group 076/04	9.222 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Site east of Riccarton Campus: Policy ED1, Sites for Business and Industry	Premier Property Group 076/01	9.232 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Tram related issues, planning agreements and developers' contributions	A Allison & Family 099/p05 R Allison 038/02 Atis Real Weatheralls 100/05 & 100/09 Cala Homes East Ltd 052/06 Cala Homes East 084/p13, p16, P18, p20, p21 & p25, Currie Community Council 062/31, Danzan Trust	10.37 € Paragraph 5.19, as modified by Modification 35, and Policy H 2, should specify December 2006 as the deadline for the commitment to the tramline (ie a contract let), failing which preparation of alternative transport options will be begun. € The phrase "except to the extent that existing infrastructure capacity exists" should be added to the footnote in local plan policy H 2, to bring the local plan into line	Not Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan.	The Council does not accept there is any basis in the Structure Plan for specifying December 2006 as a deadline for a commitment to the tramline. The suggested modification is inconsistent with the approved Structure Plan development strategy and structure plan wording, in particular the definition of committed infrastructure, and is also inconsistent with Council policy to progress the tram to Newbridge. The Council does not accept the suggested modification. This modification is based on Structure Plan Policy HOU 5 and is taken out of context. This change fails to take into account the following; the second part

	<p>078/11,p14 & p15 Homes for Scotland 050/12 Hopetoun Estates 079/02,03,p08,p09,p10 Councillor Longstaff 131/p01 Meadowfield Developments Ltd 059/01 & 02 Sir Robert E Usher Executry 115/p02 Tarmac Northern Ltd 034/04 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd & Miller Homes Ltd 077/10, 11 & 13 Walker Group 129/p01, p02 & P03</p>	<p>with the structure plan but without prejudicing the Council's position.</p> <p>€ Pre-inquiry modification 36, which relates to the major development site at North Kirkliston, should be adjusted to state that the contribution "will be negotiated in line with the Council's development quality and guideline on tram contributions, and will be subject to the provisions contained within the guideline."</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 77</p>	<p>of Policy HOU5 which prevents planning permission from being granted until all necessary infrastructure set out in the Action Plan/Local Plan is provided, paragraph 3.20 of the Structure Plan which states the development strategy is wholly conditional on the necessary infrastructure being provided, and the Implementation section of the plan.</p> <p>The Council accepts the reporters' modification on the grounds that it will provide additional clarity to the text and accurately reflects the Council's intentions.</p>
<p>Newbridge & Ratho Station:Tran sport & economic development proposals:</p>	<p>D & M Curming 09/01, 04 & 05 Currie Community Council 062/16 Friends of the</p>	<p>10.50 Amend the bullet point forming the last component of policy H 2 to read "...to Newbridge is operational or there is a final commitment to construction"</p>	<p>Not Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan</p>	<p>The Council does not accept the suggested modification. This modification would result in Policy H2 being inconsistent with pre-inquiry modification 35 and the definition of Committed Infrastructure set out in the glossary of the approved</p>

Policies H2, ED1 & TRA8	Edinburgh Green Belt 032/14 A Stewart & E Burnett 107/03,04 & 05	Insert after the first sentence in Policy TRA5: <i>"In these areas through traffic will be discouraged. Developers must give emphasis to traffic calming and road safety."</i>	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 80	Structure Plan which states that committed infrastructure is where "expenditure on infrastructure has been agreed as part of a future funding programme". The Council accepts the reporters' assessment that modification is necessary to ensure the policy fully reflects the supporting text.
Transport impacts: Policies TRA2, TRA3 & TRA5 and pre-inquiry modifications 23 & 26	Atis Real Weatheralls 100/10 Currie Community Council 062/cw27, Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd & Miller Homes Ltd 077/12 Royal Mail Property Holdings plc 089/01 Cala Homes East 084/p17 Homes for Scotland 050/cw11	10.63 Incorporate the relevant proposed pre-inquiry modifications (23, 24, and 36).	Accept Recommendation- See Modifications 77, 78 and 53	This recommendation reflects pre-inquiry modifications put forward by the Council, and therefore supports the Council's position.
Safeguarding routes for return to rail use: Policy TRA 6	Friends of the Edinburgh Green Belt Trust 032/21	10.68 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

<p>Airport Access proposals: Chapter 7</p>	<p>Friends of the Edinburgh Green Belt 032/04,05, 23 & 24 Currie Community Council 062/01,02 & 31</p>	<p>10.77 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>
<p>Union Canal: Canalside Development: Policy E28, Canalside cycle and pedestrian routes: Policy TRA6 Pre-inquiry modification 26: National Cycle Network</p>	<p>British Waterways Scotland 042/01 042/03 042/p05 Brewster Bros 048/03</p>	<p>10.95 In policy E 28: € Add a new subsection "(e): support the sustainable regeneration of the Union Canal as an economic asset by the provision in suitable locations of appropriate canalside canal related development, consistent with other local plan policies." € Delete the last sentence of the policy (3 lines). € In paragraph 7.28, terminate the second sentence after the word "routes" by deleting "including the route forming part of the Millennium Canal Link."</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modifications 81 & 102</p>	<p>The Council agrees with the Reporters' proposed amendment to Policy E28 which favours canal related development. The amended policy will provide the context for the new housing proposal at Freeland Road, Ratho which the Council is also supporting (see Recommendation 21.78.) The Council accepts the reporters assessment that a modification to para 7.28 is necessary to remove a reference to a cycle route outwith the LP area.</p>
<p>Edinburgh Airport: Paras 6.35, 6.38 & 6.39</p>	<p>BAA Edinburgh 069/01</p>	<p>10.102 Paragraph 6.35: Change "Civil Aviation Authority" to "Department of Transport". Paragraph 6.38: Delete CAA from line 1. Paragraph 6.39: No Change</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- See Modifications 73 & 74</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment which is in line with the Councils position.</p>

CHAPTER 11: OBJECTIONS TO TRANSPORT PROPOSALS

Transport: TRA 8: Park & ride proposal at Maybury Road	Cala Homes East 084/06 & 084/p22 Mactaggart & Mickel 083/05 & 083/09	11.11 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Park & Ride at Hermiston: Policy TRA 8 & Transport Proposal T2	Friends of the Edinburgh Green Belt 032/22 Residents against Green Belt Encroachment 061/07	11.21 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Safeguardin g land for Improvement of A71: Policy TRA8 & Transport & Transport proposal T8	Heriot Watt University 047/01	11.29 No change to plan in relation to safeguarding of land to accommodate an upgrade of the A71 West of junction with Riccarton Mains Road.	Accept Recommendation no change to plan.	The Council accepts the reporters' assessment which is in line with the Councils position.

<p>Transport: 8: TRA Curriehill Station and Currie Bypass</p>	<p>Cala Homes East 084/01, 06, 09, 10 & p22 Mactaggart & Mickel 083/08</p>	<p>11.46 No change to plan in relation to improvements at Curriehill Station. Change paragraph 7.37 to read : <i>“Proposals T7 and T8 relate to road construction and improvement schemes in Rural West Edinburgh which have been reviewed by consultants commissioned by the Council in the context of the Local Transport Strategy. The Local Plan will safeguard land for these proposals and show them on the Proposals Map until such time as they are implemented or a formal decision is taken to abandon them. A revised alignment is under consideration for the Currie bypass, which may omit the Balerno section, and terminate at Lanark Road West east of the junction of Bridge Road, Balerno, as shown on the Proposals Map for the Currie Balerno Local Plan 1983.”</i></p>	<p>Partially Accept Recommendation- See Modification 85</p>	<p>The Council accepts the reporters' assessment and suggested modification which is in line with the Council's current position.</p>
<p>Currie Bypass: Policy TRA 8: Transport Proposal T7</p>	<p>Balerno Community Council 088/13</p>	<p>11.51 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>
<p>Currie Bypass: Policy TRA8: Transport Proposal T7</p>	<p>K Robertson 108/01</p>	<p>11.61 The review of whether to proceed with or abandon this part of the Currie Balerno bypass should be completed as a matter of urgency, taking account of the compatibility of the proposal with wider structure and local plan objectives to reduce car travel, and to protect the amenity of residential areas, the green belt, and the countryside. The local plan should reflect the outcome of that review.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation – No Change to Plan</p>	<p>The Council takes on board the reporters' comments regarding the alignment of the road and will consider these as part of the review of the scheme. The outcome of the review will be included in the forthcoming replacement or altered local plan.</p>

Currie Bypass: Policy TRA8: Transport Proposal T7	K Robertson 108/01	11.62 If this part of the bypass is to be retained, consideration should be given to locating the route some 200m further north as it crosses Ravelrig Road, in the interests of residential amenity. However if the appraisal of alternative alignments would delay adoption of the local plan, the present indicative alignment could be retained, but with a clear statement that the alignment would be reviewed as part of the detailed design appraisal for the road, with a view to locating it considerably further away from the northern edge of Balerno.	Accept recommendation – See Modification 85	The Council takes on board the reporters' comments regarding the alignment of the road and will consider these as part of the review of the scheme.
Currie Bypass: Policy TRA8: Transport Proposal T7	Mr & Mrs Lobhan 022/01	11.72 No change to plan in response to this objection, but see also objection 108/01.	Accept recommendation – No Change to Plan	The Council takes on board the reporters' comments regarding the alignment of the road and will consider these as part of the review of the scheme.
Currie Bypass: Policy TRA8: Transport Proposal T7	Garden History Society in Scotland 026/01	11.80 If the western part of the bypass is to be retained, consideration should be given to locating the route further north, in order to minimise the potential impacts on the Northfield House designed landscape and listed building. However if the appraisal of alternative alignments would delay adoption of the local plan, the present indicative alignment could be retained, but with a clear statement that the alignment would be reviewed as part of the detailed design appraisal for the road, with a view to locating it considerably further away from the northern edge of Balerno.	Accept recommendation- See Modification 85	The Council takes on board the reporters' comments regarding the alignment of the road and will consider these as part of the review of the scheme.

CHAPTER 12 :SOUTH QUEENSFERRY & ENVIRONS

<p>The Fisheries Hopetoun, South Queensferry: Policies E5,E6,E12</p>	<p>MJ Baynam 092/1, 092/2 and 092/3</p>	<p>12.6 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>
<p>Green Belt Boundary at Linn Mill, South Queensferry: Policy E5</p>	<p>Lorimer & Company 081/01</p>	<p>12.11 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>
<p>South Queensferry: Housing Proposal HSG2 & Environmental Proposal ENV6 (Springfield)</p>	<p>Brown 036/01 Primrose 040/01 Clapperton 002/01 Hart 003/01 Newstead 005/01 Campbell 025/01 Gunn 029/01 MaTaggart & Mickel Ltd 083/07 Cala Homes East Ltd 084/08 & 084/P12 Robinson 119/01 & Harkin 118/01</p>	<p>12.28 No firm recommendation on objections, but suggest that the Council gives further consideration to whether it is appropriate to retain the specific housing and environmental designations for the Springfield area. If the housing designation is to be retained, then consideration should be given to relocating the settlement boundary to include this land.</p>	<p>Noted but no change to plan</p>	<p>The Council takes on board the reporters' comment in regard to considering the relocation of the settlement boundary and has decided to make no change to the Plan.</p>

<p>South Queensferry: Protected Retail Frontages: Policy R1</p>	<p>Queensferry & District Community Council 085/03</p>	<p>12.42 (a) Proposed pre-inquiry modification 40 should be incorporated into the local plan. The modification itself should be changed as follows:</p> <p>(b) The last sentence of revised paragraph 8.16 should be deleted and replaced by the following sentence: <i>“Changes of use to residential will not be acceptable unless it has been demonstrated that a sustained effort to market the property for retail or suitable business use has been unsuccessful.”</i></p> <p>(c) In the last sentence of revised Policy R1, delete the words <i>“housing or”</i>. Follow by a new sentence: <i>“Changes of use to residential will not be accepted unless it has been demonstrated that the property has been offered on the market in an appropriate manner to find a retail or suitable business user for a period of at least 18 months, without success, and that conversion to residential use would be in keeping with the appearance of the locality.”</i></p>	<p>Partly Accept Recommendation- See Modification 86</p>	<p>The Reporters agreed with much of the content of the Council's Pre-Inquiry Modification which was aimed primarily at addressing the problems of re-letting vacant units in Queensferry's retail frontages.</p> <p>However, the Council is reluctant to amend its policy to the extent of allowing residential uses in retail frontages as the Reporters are proposing. The Council considers its amendment through the Pre-Inquiry Modification to be sufficiently flexible in allowing other non-retail uses.</p> <p>Allowing further residential uses may threaten the vitality and viability of Queensferry and other retail centres in Rural West Edinburgh, and limit the availability of premises for small artisan businesses. As such changes of use are not supported through policies in any of the other local plans which cover the City of Edinburgh Council area, this would also create an inconsistency in Council policy.</p>
<p>Catherine Terrace, South Queensferry: Policies E52 & Environmental Proposal ENV 5</p>	<p>Earl of Rosebery 043/04</p>	<p>12.48 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's decision.</p>

South Queensferry Conservation Area: Policy E35	Earl of Rosebery 043/07 Lord Rosebery 086/04	12.54 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Dalmeny Conservation Area boundary: Policy E36	Earl of Rosebery 043/08 Lord Rosebery 086/03	12.58 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Green Belt Boundaries at Dalmeny: Policy E5	Earl of Rosebery 043/02 & 043/03 Lord Rosebery 086/02	12.68 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
CHAPTER 13: BALERNO CURRIE AND ENVIRONS				
Lanark Road West, Balerno :boundaries of green belt and AOLQ	Darling 033/01 Cowan 111/01 Maule 056/01 & 056/02 & Brady 053/01	13.12 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Green Belt at Pilmuir Farm Steading, Balerno: Policy E5	Residents against Green Belt Encroachment 061/05	13.18 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

Ravelrig, Lanark Road West, Balerno: Green belt, Area Outstanding Landscape Quality and Policy E51 (Protection of open space)	Cala Homes East 077/018	13.36 The Proposals Map inset for Balerno should be altered to exclude the objection site from the green belt and AOLQ. The settlement boundary should be repositioned to run along the south side of the objection site, and the whole site should be designated for protection under Policy E51 of the local plan.	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 94	The Council accepts that the case for retaining this site within the green belt and the area of outstanding landscape quality (AOLQ) was marginal. However the Council agrees that the site should be protected from development through designation under Policy E51.
Ravelrig, Lanark Road West, Balerno: Green belt, Area Outstanding Landscape Quality and Policy E51 (Protection of open space)	Cala Homes East 077/018	13.37 The green belt and AOLQ boundaries to the east of Ravelrig House should be repositioned slightly to the south to exclude the rear gardens of the new houses there.	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 95	The Council accepts that this minor adjustment to the green belt and AOLQ boundary will rectify an anomaly.
Defined Guest House area in Balerno: Policy ED12	Balerno Community Council 088/02	13.44 Delete the Guest House Area designation on Lanark Road West westwards from the Bridge Road junction, including the short stub westwards at the Hannahfield corner.	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 99	The Council accepts this adjustment to the Guest House Area designation to reflect the non-presence of such facilities in the area.

Bridge Road, Balerno: green belt boundary: Policy E5	A Moodie & D Chambers 04/01	13.50 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Malleny Park, Balerno: Policy E52:proposals I ENV1 & brief	C McManus 055/04 Balerno Community Council 088/01 & 088/14	13.64 Add new sentence at end of second paragraph of the text of the brief for environmental proposal ENV 1 (page 57): <i>“Special consideration shall be given to the safety of pedestrians using the access to the park from Bavelaw Road, in relation to the use of the driveway by vehicles going to and from the sports facilities, while preserving the character of this part of the conservation area and the designed landscape of Malleny House.”</i> Change first sentence of last paragraph to read : <i>“Any consideration of increasing the level of car parking at the park shall seek an appropriate balance between accommodating the regular (non peak) demand for parking spaces by park users, the safety of pedestrians sharing the access from Bavelaw Road, and the need to safeguard the character of the conservation area and the designed landscape.”</i>	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 32	The Reporters address objectors' concerns about road safety and parking through the proposed amendments to the brief. The changes, which also take account of the need to protect and enhance the environment are acceptable to the Council.
Malleny Croft, Balerno: Policy H2	Owners of Malleny Croft 091/02 & 091/02	13.75 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

Green Belt Boundary at Cockburn Crescent, Balerno: Policy E5	C MacManus 055/17 Residents against Green Belt Encroachment 061/04	13.81 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Kirkgate, Currie: Green Belt and Conservation Area boundaries (policies E5, E35 & H2)	Applecross Properties 080/01-03 Earl of Rosebery 043/10	13.96 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Kinleith paper mill, Currie: green belt, rehabilitation of brownfield land and SINC designation: policies E5 and E18	Messrs Dyer & Walker 072/s01, s02 & s04 (original objections by Daltons & Kinleith)	13.121 In Policy E 52 (page 54), extend the last sentence of policy by adding, " <i>and remedial treatment of derelict land</i> ". If the Council considers it necessary, a definition of derelict land could be included in the local plan glossary. Omit proposed housing site HSG 1 from the proposed SINC. Make no changes to the proposed boundaries of the green belt and the SINC in relation to site B and the Blinkbonny housing group.	Accept Recommendations See Modifications 31 & 100	The Reporters concluded that reference should be made to the rehabilitation of derelict land in the plan. While the Council supports the proposed amendment to Policy E52, it does not consider the issue to have sufficient relevance to the local plan area to merit a definition in the Glossary. The Council is agreeable to the SINC designation being removed from the HSG1. The designation will be retained to the north and south of the site forming part of the Water of Leith Corridor. The Council welcomes the Reporters' recommendation in relation to the green belt and SINC boundaries to the north of Blinkbonny.

Kinleith Mills, Currie: Housing proposal HSG1	Currie Community Council 062/22 & 062/25 C McManus 055/18 Residents against Green Belt Encroachment 061/06	13.130 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Green Belt Boundary at Blinkbonny, Currie: Policy E5	Earl of Rosebery 043/09 Lord Rosebery 086/05	13.146 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
7 Lanark Road West: Policy H 1: Housing site HSG 6	Currie Community Council 062/23 Friends of Edinburgh Green Belt 032/16	13.156 Extend green belt to include this site, with corresponding adjustment of the settlement boundary. Delete the site from the list of housing proposals.	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 62	Full planning permission on this site expires in Nov 2005. Therefore it's inclusion on the list of housing proposals to reflect an existing consent is unlikely to be required. The site's inclusion in the Green Belt should aid the separation of Currie and Juniper Green.
CHAPTER 14: HOUSING RELATED POLICY OBJECTIONS				
Use of green belt and greenfield land: Policy H2	Friends of Edinburgh Green Belt 032/13 Currie Community Council 06215	14.12 No change to the finalised local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

Core Development Areas and housing policy: para 5.8 & Policies H1 & H2	Balerno Community Council 088/08	14.23 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Availability of Infrastructure: chapters 4&5	A Stewart & E Burnett 107/08	14.33 In paragraph 4.31, references to the 1999 version of the finalised local plan should be deleted.	Accept Recommendation- See Modification 45	The Council accept the reporters' recommendation to correct this error.
Area of restraint: paragraph 5.13	Balerno Community Council 088/10	14.41 The second sentence of paragraph 5.13 should read as follows: <i>"Firstly, policies should reflect the continuing policy of development restraint applicable in the Rural West Edinburgh outwith the Newbridge/Kirkliston/Ratho core development area and focus on the needs of the existing population."</i>	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 46	The Council accepts this clarification to the meaning of the paragraph.
Omission of completed housing development sites: para 5.14	Balerno Community Council 088/09	14.46 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Housing land allocation at Kirkliston: Para 5.21	Currie Community Council 062/17	14.51 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Site at Harlaw Road, Balerno: Policy H1	Residents against Green Belt Encroachment 061/16	14.55 No change to the local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.

Clarity of Policy H1, constrained sites and related transportation considerations- Policies H1 & H2, para 7.20 & Policy TRA2	Atis Real Weatheralls 100/04 Homes for Scotland 050/06 Balerno Community Council 088/11 Taylor Woodrow & Miller Homes 077/09, 077/10 & 077/15	14.78 Policy H1 should be changed along the lines of pre-inquiry modification 13. The word "permitted" should be deleted and replaced by "supported."	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 47	The Council accepts that this modification improves the clarity of the plan. The reference to Schedule 1 reflects a pre-inquiry modification put forward by the Council, and therefore supports the Council's position.
Allocation of insufficient housing land: Policy H2	Homes for Scotland 05/05	14.90 No change to the finalised local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Use of brownfield sites: Policy H2	Currie Community Council 062/14	14.97 No change to the finalised local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Infill sites: Policy H3	Atis Real Weatheralls 100/07	14.104 Policy H3 should be changed as follows:- at the end of (b):- delete "and" at the end of (c):- delete full stop and put " ; and" and add at the end:- "(d) not be in conflict with any other provision of the local plan."	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 56	The Council accepts this recommendation to improve the clarity of policy H3.

<p>Open Space for new housing: Policy H5(d)</p>	<p>Homes for Scotland 050/08</p>	<p>14.115 (a) In paragraph 5.33, after Handbook, insert:- <i>“guideline entitled Open Space and Ancillary Facilities for New Housing Developments”.</i></p> <p>(b) Add to the end of paragraph 5.33:- <i>“The Council also recognises that housing developers should not be expected to make good existing deficiencies in open space provision and that requirements for open space should be related to the scale and nature of the development proposed. The Council is preparing an Open Space Framework which incorporates an audit of existing open space. When complete, this will provide further guidance in relation to the need for open space.”</i></p> <p>(c) In Policy H5, criterion (d) should read as follows:- <i>“provide open space in line with the Council’s guideline entitled Open Space and Ancillary Facilities for New Housing Developments and the Council’s Open Space Framework;”</i></p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 57</p>	<p>The Council accepts that recommendations (a) and (b) improve the clarity of the plan.</p> <p>Recommendation (c) reflects a pre-inquiry modification put forward by the Council, and therefore supports the Council’s position.</p>
<p>Proposed Calderwood new settlement-land west of Bonnington House: Chapter 5</p>	<p>Glenmorison Group 075/01</p>	<p>14.122 No change to the local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council’s decision.</p>

Sufficiency & location of housing land: Chapter 5	Clifton Hall School 028/01 & 02	14.130 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
Development in the Countryside: Policies E5 & E6	Clifton Hall School 028/03	14.135 No change to local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
CHAPTER 16 : STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AT KIRKLISTON				
Kirkliston Distillery: Policies H2 & ED1 (see also Chapter 21 Recommendation 21.35)	Scotmalt Ltd 082/01 & 02 Stewart Milne Holdings 058/03	21.35 Further consideration should be given to Kirkliston's need for new business and industry and to the availability of sites suitable to meet any need that is identified. In the light of this, it should be decided whether part of the objection site should be reserved for new business and industry. If it is decided that the whole of the site may be used for residential purposes, the present capacity figure should be increased.	Accept Recommendation – See Modifications 49 & 101	The Council on 20/7/05 decided that it was minded to grant planning consent, subject to a Section 75 agreement, for a residential development for 103 dwellings. Therefore, the Council has dropped its aspiration for mixed use development on this site and the local plan will be modified accordingly.
CHAPTER 21 : HOUSING SITES ASSESSMENT				
Proposed housing site at North Kirkliston: Policy H2 & site HSP1 (see also Chapter 16 page 16-1)	A Allison & Family 099/01 Cala Homes 052/02 Cllr J Longstaff 131/P01 W & H McDonald 057/01 Stewart Milne Holdings	21.28 The proposed housing site at North Kirkliston should be retained. Provisions of the plan in relation to this site should be altered as follows: a The capacity of the site should be reduced to 610. b The width of the open space and landscaping strip on the west side of the site should be increased, and landscaping,	Accept Recommendation – See Modifications 53 and 77	The Council accepts the reporters' conclusions as to the effect on site capacity of the Edinburgh Airport Rail Link. The Council acknowledges the benefits of increased open space and planting provision to the west of the site. This will be addressed through the forthcoming planning brief for the

	<p>058/02 L Reid 121/01 S McGeorge 122/01 A Rae 001/01</p>	<p>c especially tree-planting, should be extended on to the embankment of the M9 spur.</p> <p>In the implementation section of the planning brief on page 94 of the plan, the following should be inserted after the first sentence: <i>In preparing this brief, further consideration will be given to the proposed location of the new primary school. To avoid any confusion, the following sentence should then begin: When approved, this brief would have.....</i></p> <p>d Pre-inquiry modification 36, which refers to a contribution to development of the tram, should be adjusted to state that the contribution <i>“will be negotiated in line with the Council’s development quality guideline on tram contributions, and will be subject to the provisions contained within the guideline.”</i> (This recommendation is made in paragraph 10.37 of chapter 10, and is repeated here for ready reference.)</p> <p>e In the fifth paragraph on page 92 of the plan (commencing <i>“The basic route layout....”</i>), before the last sentence insert the following: <i>“Public transport improvement must include measures to ensure that there is a bus service between Kirkliston and the tram at Newbridge in which buses are timed to coordinate with the tram timetable and which permit purchase of a single ticket for journeys that combine use of the bus and tram.”</i></p> <p>f After the fifth paragraph mentioned above, insert the following new paragraph: <i>“If for any reason there is a delay in construction of the tram to Newbridge, construction of houses at North Kirkliston shall not begin</i></p>		<p>site.</p> <p>The Council accepts the benefits of looking again at the proposed location of the new school in the light of the evidence presented at the inquiry. This will be addressed through the forthcoming planning brief for the site.</p> <p>The Council accepts recommendation (d) on the grounds that it will provide additional clarity to the text and accurately reflects the Council’s intentions.</p> <p>The Council supports the requirement for a good bus link from Kirkliston to the tram, as described in recommendation (e).</p> <p>The Council agrees that in the unlikely event of the tram not being completed to Newbridge, improved bus services, as specified in recommendation (f) will be required.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>Open space south of former Drambuie Factory: Policies H2 & E51 (see also Chapter 16 page 16-17)</p>	<p>Hopetoun Estates 079/04 & 079/05</p>	<p>21.31 The site south of the former Drambuie factory should retain its open space designation.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's position.</p>
<p>Kirkliston Distillery: Policies H2 & ED1 (see also Chapter 16 Recommendation 16.128)</p>	<p>Scotmalt Ltd 082/01 & 02 Stewart Milne Holdings 058/03</p>	<p>21.35 Kirkliston Distillery should be retained as a housing site and, at present, its estimated capacity should remain at 60 dwellings.</p>	<p>Not Accept Recommendation – See Modifications 49 & 101</p>	<p>The Council on 20/7/05 decided that it was minded to grant planning consent, subject to a Section 75 agreement, for a residential development for 103 dwellings. Therefore, the Council has dropped its aspiration for mixed use development on this site and the local plan will be modified accordingly.</p>
<p>Newbridge West: Economic Development proposal ECON8 Site Newbridge (see also Chapter 17 page 17-1)</p>	<p>Ediston Properties Ltd 130/P01 & P03 Edinburgh Gate Development Ltd 049/01, cw02 & 03</p>	<p>21.39 The ECON8 site should not be used for residential development.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's position.</p>

<p>Proposed housing at Hillwood Road and football pitch south of A8 & omission of site at Hillwood Rise for special needs housing all at Ratho Station: HSP5 & ENV7 (see also Chapter 17 page 17-)</p>	<p>G Allan 063/01 Cala Homes East Ltd 052/03 R & E Hamilton 110/01 P Hunter 007/01 Elizabeth Lawson 133/p01 Ernest Lawson 132/p01 P & Y Ma 127/p01 F Marr 074/s04 D McKillop 012/01 E & J Meikle 087/01, 087/03 & 087/p04 H Meikle 016/01. 016/p02 & 016/p03 P & C Mulhern 126/p01 Ratho Station Residents Assc 123/01 & 123/p02 A Scott 023/01 A Stewart & E Burnett 107/06 Stewart Milne Holdings 058/04 J Thomson 019/01 B</p>	<p>21.46 The proposed housing site at Hillwood Road should be retained in the local plan. Provisions of the plan in relation to this site should be altered as follows:</p> <p>a Proposed pre-inquiry modifications 38 and 39 should be incorporated into the plan.</p> <p>b Modification 38 should be changed as follows:-</p> <p>€ the reference to a minimum of 50 new homes should be replaced by reference to a maximum of 50 new homes;</p> <p>€ in the paragraph beginning “The majority of the units....” the reference to three-storey flats should be deleted; and</p> <p>€ the following text should be added to the section headed Access: “It is Council policy that no more than 200 dwellings be served by a single general access road. In accordance with this, the housing developments will not proceed until arrangements have been made to construct a new access from the site to the wider road network to supplement the existing access along Hillwood Road.”</p> <p>c Environmental proposal ENV7 should be retained in the local plan, but should be altered as follows:</p> <p>€ the area of land covered by ENV7 should be increased to embrace all of the tree planting/landscaping shown on</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation - See Modifications 63 & 64</p>	<p>The Reporters concluded that the ‘mini-brief’ prepared for the Hillwood Road site at Ratho Station (Pre-Inquiry Modification 38) and the amendment to the green belt boundary (Pre-Inquiry Modification 39) proposed by the Council should be incorporated into the plan at the end of the Housing Chapter. This supports the Council’s position. However, a number of changes are proposed to the plan and to the Modifications to address residents’ concerns about the environment and amenity. These are all acceptable to the Council.</p>
--	---	--	---	--

	<p>Thomson 128/p01 S Underwood 018/01 & 018/02 C Watt 006/01 D & J Wehnert 035/01 D Witanga 008/01 & Young 024/01</p>	<p>Map 4 (part of proposed pre-inquiry modifications 38 and 39); the boundary on the Proposals Map should be extended accordingly; and on page 55 of the plan, add the following to the comments section for ENV7: <i>“ As well as being shown on the Proposals Map, this area is shown in more detail on the plan which is part of the planning brief for the HSP5 housing and landscaping. These are essential components for this green belt site.”</i></p>		
<p>Omission of housing site on land east of Ratho Station: Policy H2 & Proposals Map (see also Chapter 17 page 17-13)</p>	<p>A Allison & family 099/01 & 099/02 R Allison 038/01 Premier Property Group 076/07,076p12 & 076/p13</p>	<p>21.50 The East of Ratho Station site should not be identified for housing development.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's position</p>

<p>Proposed housing at Harvest Road, Ratho Station: Policy H2, site HSP6 (see also Chapter 18 page 18-1)</p>	<p>W & P Bain 021/01 Cala Homes East Ltd 052/04 D & M Cumming 095/03 A Stewart & E Burnett 107/07 Stewart Milne Holdings 058/05 Tarmac Northern Ltd 034/02 J Thomson 019/02 C Watt 006/02</p>	<p>21.54 The Harvest Road site should be deleted.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 54</p>	<p>The Council accepts that this site has a number of negative features including access from the inside of a bend where it is not certain that adequate visibility can be provided. It therefore accepts the reporters' recommendation that this site should be deleted from the local plan.</p>
--	---	---	---	---

<p>Proposed housing site at Harvest Road East, Ratho Station (see also Chapter 18 page 18-5)</p>	<p>Cala Homes East Ltd 05/02 D & M Cumming 095/02 E & J Meikle 087/02 Ratho & District Community Council 060/01 A Stewart & E Burnett 107/02 & 08 Stewart Milne Holdings 058/06 Tarmac Northern 034/01 J Thomson 019/03 C Watt 006/03 K Welsler 014/01</p>	<p>21.58 The Harvest Road East site should be deleted.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 55</p>	<p>The Council accepts that this site has a number of negative features including the site would extend Ratho Station beyond the existing southern boundary of the community, a boundary that is very clear, effective and logical and would not effectively integrate with the built up area. It therefore accepts the reporters' recommendation that this site should be deleted from the local plan.</p>
<p>Omission of housing sites and inappropriate green belt designation south-east of Ratho Station (see also Chapter 18 page 18-12)</p>	<p>A Allison & family 099/03 & 04</p>	<p>21.62 Housing should not be allocated to the South-east of Ratho Station sites.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council's position</p>

Meadowfield Farm: Policies E5 & H2 (see also Chapter 20 page 20-1)	Meadowfield Developments Ltd 059/01 & part of 059/02	21.65 Housing should not be allocated to the Meadowfield Farm site.	Accept Recommendation – No Change to Plan	This recommendation supports the Council's position
Omission from plan – for site housing or business development at Baird Road, Ratho: Policies H2, ED1 & Proposals Map (see also Chapter 19 page 19-1)	Brewster Bros 048/02 Tarmac Northern Ltd 034/03 A Allison 125/02	21.70 Housing should not be allocated to the Baird Road, Ratho, site, nor should part of the site be identified for economic development.	Accept recommendation - No Change to Plan	This recommendation supports the Council's position.
Omission from plan- for site housing development at Freelands Road Ratho: Policy H2 and Proposals Map (see also Chapter 19 page 19-6)	Cala Homes East Ltd 052/01	21.78 (a) Insert a new paragraph after paragraph 5.28 on page 79: <i>“The Freelands Road site is one that offers the prospect of a very high quality of residential environment. The site is partly within Ratho Conservation Area and adjoins part of the Union Canal, a scheduled ancient monument. Development on this site must therefore be of exceptional quality and sensitivity to its surroundings. There is an opportunity to create a new alignment for the westernmost part of Freelands Road, bringing it to a new junction with Baird Road in the vicinity of the public car</i>	Accept recommendation – See Modification 52	The Council accepts that this site has some advantages including its ability to offer an attractive environment for residential development, and the potential to secure a marina. It therefore accepts the reporters' recommendation that this site should be allocated for housing with part of the site set aside for a marina.

		<p>park. Provision for public car parking must be maintained within the site. Part of the site must be set aside for a marina. The design of the marina and its associated buildings must complement and enhance the character of the canal and the conservation area. The marina must be an integral part of the residential development, and, to avoid unacceptable disturbance to future residents, it should be constructed before completion of any houses in the west half of the site. The design and construction of the marina must ensure that the integrity of the canal is maintained at all times. Use of the marina will be restricted to purposes connected with boat travel. Mooring of houseboats will not be permitted. Apart from the marina, built development must generally be separated from the canal by a zone of public open space. The east side of the site is not well-defined in landscape terms. A belt of planting somewhat more substantial than that which has recently been created on this boundary of the site will be required if the east side of the development is not designed to be outward-looking. The settlement boundary for Ratho includes a small area of agricultural land between the north-west boundary of the housing site and Freeland Road. The possibility that this area may be developed at some time in the future should be recognised in the layout design for the housing site. Developers will be expected to discuss with the Council provision of school places for children of secondary school age who will be living in the development. Provision of additional school accommodation may be needed, and, if so, developers will be expected to contribute to the cost of this."</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>Green Belt boundary & omission from plan – sites for housing development south-west and east of Ratho: Proposals Map & Policy H2 (see also Chapter 19 page 19-17)</p>		<p>(b) Insert a new entry in Policy H2: “HSPX Freeland Road, Ratho estimated capacity 100”</p> <p>(c) Amend the Proposals Map so that it shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i a new symbol in the Key to represent marina development, with the text “<i>Union Canal marina at Ratho</i>” and giving as the reference the new paragraph that is to be inserted after paragraph 5.28; ii the objection site as a housing site; iii the marina development symbol within the housing site; and iv the settlement boundary embracing the objection site and the small area of agricultural land to its north-west. 		
	<p>Stewart Milne Holdings 058/01 & 058/08</p>	<p>21.82 The South-west and East of Ratho sites should not be identified for housing development.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation – No Change to Plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council’s position.</p>

<p>Housing Developments at Craig Park Quarry Ratho: Policies M6, H2 and Proposals Map (see also Chapter 19 page 19-12)</p>	<p>Brewster Bros 048/01 & 048/04 Stewart Milne Holdings 058/07</p>	<p>21.91 In paragraph 4.23, delete the following words: <i>“it can be shown to be necessary to fund restoration of the quarry and”</i></p> <p>Delete (c) in Policy M6 and put: <i>“(c) the housing element supported in Policy H2 is limited to no more than 80 dwellings unless it is demonstrated that a larger number of dwellings is necessary to fund the minimum acceptable restoration of the quarry;”</i></p> <p>Delete the fourth sentence (“The Council considers.....”) in paragraph 5.28 and put: <i>“A housing development of 80 dwellings on approximately seven hectares of the overall site is considered acceptable as a component of a scheme to restore the quarry. A larger number of dwellings may be permitted if it is demonstrated that this is necessary to enable an acceptable restoration scheme. Developers will be expected to discuss with the Council provision of school places for children of secondary school age who will be living in these dwellings. Provision of additional school accommodation may be needed, and, if so, developers will be expected to contribute to the cost of this.”</i></p> <p>In Policy H2, show the estimated capacity of Craigpark Quarry, Ratho, as 80.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation – see modification 36</p> <p>Accept recommendation –see modification 51</p>	<p>The Council accepts this recommendation. Changing the estimated capacity to 80 reflects the likelihood that the capacity will be more than 60. The new wording still allows for additional capacity where it is demonstrated to be necessary.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Hermiston- Omission of Settlement Boundary and Housing Allocation – Proposals Map, Policy E6 & Chapter 5 (Housing) (see also Chapter 20 page 5)	Premier Property Group 076/11	21.95 Housing development should not be allocated to the Hermiston site.	Accept recommendation – No Change to Plan	This recommendation supports the Council's position
Omission of housing site Muirwood Road, Currie (see also Chapter 20 page 20-8)	George Wimpey East 051/01	21.98 Housing development should not be allocated to the Muirwood Road, Currie, site.	Accept recommendation – No Change to Plan	This recommendation supports the Council's position
Land South and West of Balerno: policy H2 (see also Chapter 20 page 20-10)	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd & Miller Homes Ltd 077/17	21.100 Housing development should not be allocated to land south and west of Balerno.	Accept recommendation – No Change to Plan	This recommendation supports the Council's position
CHAPTER 22: AFFORDABLE HOUSING, SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING, SITES FOR TRAVELLERS AND UTILITY SITES				
Affordable Housing: Policy H7 and Glossary	Atis Real Weatheralls Ltd 100/08 Taylor Woodrow Developments	22.57 (a) In paragraph 5.37, delete the last sentence and put: "A housing needs assessment, completed in	Accept Recommendation – See Modification 58	The Council accepts that a fuller reference to the information that informed the policy would be useful. The Council accepts that the

<p>Ltd & Miller Homes Ltd 07714 Scotmait 082/03 Danzan Trust 078/12 Hopetoun Estates 079/02 Homes for Scotland 050/09 & 10 Stewart Milne Holdings 058/09 MacTaggart & Mickel 083/06 Cala Homes East 084/07 Brewster Bros 048/06 Friends of the Edinburgh Green Belt 032/15 Currie Community Council 062/19 & 20 Balerno Community Council 088/12</p>	<p>2000, indicated a strong need to provide an increased amount of affordable housing across the Council's area. This assessment and other studies have been used to inform this part of the local plan. The Council has commissioned a new assessment, which will be available later in 2005."</p> <p>(b) Add the following sentence at the end of paragraph 5.39: "Land identified for affordable housing through Policy H7 should be as attractive for residential development as other land associated with the enabling development."</p> <p>(c) Policy H7 should read as follows. "A proportion of new residential development in the local plan area shall consist of affordable housing. Proposals for new residential development shall support affordable housing in the following proportions.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of dwellings</th> <th>Affordable proportion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5 to 39</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40 to 499</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>500 or more</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Where the number of dwellings is 5 to 39, support shall consist of a payment in lieu of making available part of the site for construction of the affordable proportion.</p>	Number of dwellings	Affordable proportion	5 to 39	15%	40 to 499	15%	500 or more	25%		<p>importance of site selection for affordable housing is such that a reference to this aspect in the supporting text is appropriate.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the improved clarity of the opening sentences of the revised Policy H7 in recommendation (c).</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the logic in lowering the policy threshold to five units, while accepting commuted sums from sites below 40 units. This differs from the city-wide approach, but this may be justified due to the typically smaller scale of housing proposals in Rural West Edinburgh. The city-wide policy is currently under review. It is unknown whether the outcome of the review will be a policy closer to the reporters' recommendations or to the policy in the finalised plan, so the review offers no reason not to accept the reporters' recommendation. The review will inform the policy in any altered or replacement plan.</p>
Number of dwellings	Affordable proportion										
5 to 39	15%										
40 to 499	15%										
500 or more	25%										

	<p>Where the number of dwellings is 40 or more, support shall consist of making available a part of the development site sufficient for construction of the affordable proportion. In some cases off-site provision of land or payment of a sum in lieu may be acceptable.</p> <p>The above levels of support may be varied if particular site circumstances indicate that a different proportion is appropriate.</p> <p>In every case regard will be had to supplementary guidance in the Council's Development Quality Handbook."</p>		
<p>Omission – special needs housing: Policies H8 & H9 & paras 5.41 & 5.42</p> <p>Lack of Provision for Sites for Travellers: Policy E24 & Chapter 5</p>	<p>Currie Community Council 062/21</p> <p>F Marr 074/02</p>	<p>22.66 There should be no change to local plan apart from clarifying the Policy H9 reference to areas defined on the Proposals Map as 'Housing and Compatible Uses'. This seems to be a reference to a notation that appeared on an earlier version of the Proposals Map but is not included on the present version.</p> <p>22.77 (a) In Chapter 5, text should be included which explains that there is a need for additional provision for travellers within the Council's area, that a search is underway for suitable sites and that it is possible that one or more sites might be identified in Rural West Edinburgh.</p> <p>(b) Chapter 5 should also include a policy which gives support to the development of travellers' sites at locations identified as</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 60</p> <p>Accept Recommendation – See Modification 59</p>
			<p>The reporters have highlighted an error in the finalised plan, which requires rectifying.</p> <p>The Reporters concluded that while it was not appropriate at this stage to identify one or more sites for gypsy travellers, the Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan area should not be excluded from searches for suitable sites. Some reference should, therefore, be made to the fact that the local plan area is being considered as a possible location. The Council, therefore, proposes including further references to this issue in the Plan, including a policy setting out the</p>

		being suitable for this purpose. The policy should state what criteria would have to be met before a site is given support.		criteria that will be applied in assessing future proposals.
Re-use of utility sites: omission of policy	BT plc 120/01	22.83 No change to the finalised local plan.	Accept Recommendation- no change to plan	This recommendation supports the Council's decision.
CHAPTER 23: IMPLEMENTATION, APPENDICES AND GLOSSARY				
Monitoring of the Plan: Housing Land & Policy IMP1	Atis Real Weatheralls 100/11 Taylor Woodrow & Miller Homes 0777/16	23.9 (a) The wording of Policy IMP1 should state that the Action Plan will be reviewed every two years. (b) Towards the end of the Housing and Community Facilities chapter there should be a new paragraph that refers to Policy HOU 10 of the approved structure plan, its monitoring process and the possibility that additional housing land might have to be brought forward.	Accept Recommendations – See Modifications 87 and 65	The Council accepts that a reference in the policy to the two year review would add to the clarity of the plan. It is accepted that it would be helpful to users of the plan to refer to the monitoring and review process laid down in the approved structure plan regarding the five-year housing land supply.

<p>Planning Agreement para 9.11 & Policy IMP2</p>	<p>ATIS Real Weatheralls 100/09 Homes for Scotland 50/12 Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd and Miller Homes 77/13 Cala Homes (East) 84/P13</p>	<p>23.23 (a) Paragraphs 5.44 and 5.45 and Policy H11 should be deleted. (b) The new paragraph 9.2a in proposed pre-inquiry modification 16 should be incorporated. The last sentence of the new paragraph should be deleted and replaced by the following:- <i>“Government policy with respect to the use of these agreements is set out in Scottish Office Circular 12/1996: Planning Agreements. Where possible, planning conditions should be used rather than a planning agreement. Agreements should serve a planning purpose, must relate in scale and in kind to the development being proposed and be reasonable in all respects.”</i> (c) Paragraph 9.11 should be changed as proposed in Pre-inquiry Modification 16. (d) In Policy IMP2, <i>“local planning authorities”</i> should be deleted and replaced by <i>“the Council.”</i> The wording of Policy IMP2 should also be revised to make clear whether (a) and (b) are alternative requirements or joint requirements.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation – See Modifications 61, 87 & 88</p>	<p>Recommendation (a) reflects a pre-inquiry modification put forward by the Council, and therefore supports the Council’s position. It is accepted that the amended wording in recommendation (b) provides a clearer summary of Circular 12/1996. Recommendation (c) reflects a pre-inquiry modification put forward by the Council, and therefore supports the Council’s position. It is accepted that the meaning of Policy IMP2 is unclear, and a modified policy wording is therefore appropriate.</p>
<p>Appendix A: Area Profile</p>	<p>Currie Community Council 062/37</p>	<p>23.28 No change to local plan.</p>	<p>Accept Recommendation- no change to plan</p>	<p>This recommendation supports the Council’s decision.</p>
<p>Asserted Rights Way: Appendix F</p>	<p>Earl of Rosebery (043/05) Currie</p>	<p>23.42 (a) Appendix F should contain a list of routes where the existence of a public right of way has been confirmed by court action.</p>	<p>Not Accept Recommendation- No Change to Plan</p>	<p>With reference to 23.42 (a) and (b), the Reporters’ view that two distinct categories of right of way be identified is not considered feasible within the</p>

	Community Council 062/05 & 062/40 F Marr 074/P03 Lord Rosebery 086/07	<p>(b) Other routes should be listed under the heading: <i>'Routes believed to be public rights of way.'</i></p> <p>c) The route from Blinkbonny Road to Lanark Road West should be shown as:- <i>"Blinkbonny Road via Poet's Burn and the west side of Kinleith Mill to Lanark Road West."</i></p>	<p align="center">Accept Recommendation - See Modification 90</p>	<p>current local plan timetable. However, the Council intend to revisit this and other issues through an alteration or replacement plan at a later date.</p> <p>The inclusion of the right of way in Appendix F as described by the Reporters is clear and accurate and is, therefore, acceptable to the Council.</p>
Definition of Brownfield Development: Glossary	Owners of Malleny Croft 091/cw03	23.47 In the Glossary section, the definition of <i>'brownfield'</i> should be changed in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Modification 32.	<p align="center">Accept Recommendation - See Modification 91</p>	<p>The Reporters concluded that it would be sensible to adopt the Glossary definition of <i>'brownfield'</i> proposed in the Council's Pre-Inquiry Modification 32. This is consistent with that used in the approved structure plan and SPP3.</p>