

---

**Examination of Proposed Supplementary Guidance: Developer  
Obligations and Infrastructure Delivery  
Response by Taylor Wimpey**

---

On behalf of

**Taylor  
Wimpey**

May 2019

---

Prepared by:



The Quadrant  
17 Bernard Street  
Leith  
Edinburgh  
EH6 6PW

[t] 0131 553 3639

[e] [info@geddesconsulting.com](mailto:info@geddesconsulting.com)

[w] [www.geddesconsulting.com](http://www.geddesconsulting.com)

## Document Control and Approval

Revision	Status	Prepared	Approved	Date
V1	Draft for Comment	Bob Salter	Andrew Marshall	6 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
V2	Final	Bob Salter	Alastair Bledowski	7 <sup>th</sup> May 2019

---

## Contents

---

<b>1.0 Examination of the Draft Supplementary Guidance</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction	1
<b>2.0 Issue 1 – The Use of Developer Contributions</b>	<b>2</b>
Question 1. In Relation to the use of Developer Contributions	2
Complying with both LDP Policy Del 1 and tests in Circular 3/2012	2
<b>3.0 Issue 2 – Connection with Adopted Local Development Plan (LDP)</b>	<b>6</b>
Question 2. In Relation to Education Infrastructure	6
Question 3. In Relation to Healthcare Contribution Zones	9
Question 4. In Relation to Transport Infrastructure	11
<b>4.0 Issue 3 – Further Information Required</b>	<b>12</b>
Question 5a. In Relation to Education Infrastructure	12
Council’s explanation of its impact assessment approach	12
Clarifying the Council’s Response	14
Council’s impact assessment methodology adopts cumulative approach	18
Appraisal of the Impact Assessment for LG-1 Sub Area	19
Question 5b. In Relation to Contingency	21
Question 5c. In Relation to Transport Contribution Zones	22
Question 5d. In Relation to Transport Contributions	22
Question 5e. In Relation to Healthcare Contribution Zones	23

---

## 1.0 Examination of the Draft Supplementary Guidance

---

### **Introduction**

- 1.1 Taylor Wimpey wishes to respond to the information provided by the City of Edinburgh Council (the Council) to the questions raised by Scottish Government regarding Draft Supplementary Guidance: *Planning Obligations and Infrastructure Delivery* (the Draft SG).
- 1.2 In making this response, Taylor Wimpey is concerned that the Council fails to clearly demonstrate that the various methodologies (explained in its Draft SG or other supporting reports) adopted to assess the impact of development accord with the tests of Circular 3/2012 or are lawful under the terms of Section 75 of *The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997* (the Act).
- 1.3 As a consequence, the resultant planning obligations and financial contributions sought through the Draft SG, presented as charging rates related to new housing, should not be relied upon as the measure of impacts on existing infrastructure from new housing developments.
- 1.4 This Response is particularly concerned about the impact assessments undertaken by the Council for education and healthcare.
- 1.5 In terms of education, the Council has not used its school roll projections to undertake its impact assessment. Instead, it relies on a cumulative assessment unrelated to the outcomes of its school roll projections. The Council's impact assessment calculates a requirement for mitigation which is around twice that predicted by the school roll projections.
- 1.6 The Council has responded to question on education matters with reference to a particular Education Contribution Zone – the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone*. Accordingly, this Response has focused on using this Zone to make comments on the matters explained by the Council. These specific comments are considered to be equally applicable to all of the other Education Contribution Zones in the Draft SG.
- 1.7 No comments are made about the Council's response to the questions about transport matters.
- 1.8 This Response is structured in terms of the Questions posed to the Council for Issues 1, 2 and 3.

## 2.0 Issue 1 – The Use of Developer Contributions

### Question 1. In Relation to the use of Developer Contributions

#### Question 1:

Section 4 (page 14) of the supplementary guidance states that: *‘Whilst contributions may be required towards the delivery of a number of actions within a Zone, the Council may apportion money received from a particular development site to the delivery of infrastructure actions that have been prioritised in order to support early phases of development. Remaining or future monies received will then be used for the delivery of other actions set out within the Action Programme.’*

The Council is asked to clarify the intention of this statement, in light of the requirement that planning obligations should clearly specifying the purpose for which any contribution is required, including the infrastructure to be provided (Circular 3/2012).

Source: *City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery, City of Edinburgh Council*

#### Complying with both LDP Policy Del 1 and tests in Circular 3/2012

- 2.1 The Council’s position appears to be that the Draft SG is in accord with LDP Policy Del 1 and that Circular 3/2012 is only a material consideration which needs to be taken into account. The Council also goes on to state in its final paragraph that *...if Scottish Government consider this issue within the SG does not fully confirm with the Circular, it is the Council’s submission that greater weight should be given in the planning balance to the fact that the Council’s approach to this issue is to fulfil the terms and address the consequences of LDP Policy Del1 as imposed by Scottish Government Reporters following the LDP examination process.*
- 2.2 Fundamentally, the LDP Examination Reporters, like many of the consultee responses to the LDP Examination process, were concerned about the Council’s own proposals for LDP Policy Del 1 did not reflect the requirements in Circular 3/2012 and meet all of its tests.
- 2.3 The Council’s commentary in relation to the modifications imposed by the Reporter at LDP Examination fail to recognise that such modifications were imposed to ensure that the LDP accorded with the requirements of Circular 3/2012.
- 2.4 It is accepted that LDP Policy Del 1 is the policy link to the existing Draft SG but it is also necessary that the requirements and the tests set out in Circular 3/2012 need to be fully met. Any planning obligations resulting from the imposition of the Draft SG also must be lawful under Section 75 of the Act. The questions posed by Scottish Government provides the opportunity for the Council to demonstrate compliance with this requirement.
- 2.5 While LDP Policy Del 1 establishes the basis for the use of a contribution zone, that does not mean that any further details presented through a supplementary guidance are automatically taken to be appropriate or lawful. The Council is still required to justify how the various contribution zones are established and used in assessing impacts, demonstrating why upgrades to infrastructure are required.
- 2.6 However, for the reasons set out in this Representation, the Council has failed to demonstrate that its Contribution Zones and the way they are utilised is lawful and in accord with the tests of Circular 3/2012.

- 2.7 Concerns continue to be raised about the compliance of the Draft SG with the tests in Circular 3/2012. This is evident through the conclusions of Reporters on recent appeal decisions in Edinburgh.
- 2.8 *Appeal Notice of Intention (PPA-230-2201) - Ocean Drive, Edinburgh* (September 2017) highlights the determining factors in the Draft SG complying the tests in Circular 3/2012 (paragraphs 32 to 63). The need to make financial contributions for transport; education and healthcare infrastructure was dismissed by the reporter because of the lack of evidence to demonstrate compliance with the tests in Circular 3/2012. This was also evident in another *Appeal Notice of Intention (PPA-230-2207) – Turnhouse Road, Edinburgh*.
- 2.9 The Council has not been able to defend the operation of its Draft SG when applied and tested through the consideration of planning applications at appeal by the DPEA.
- 2.10 The Council states that some infrastructure works may be ...*Allocated to the delivery of next action based on timetable set out in the Action Programme*. What is evident from the Council's response is that financial contributions are collected in a contribution zone through a range of charging mechanisms (each depending on the topic under consideration) which are then used to fund planning obligations.
- 2.11 If payments made are not used to fund infrastructure for which the payment is required and does not relate to the direct and cumulative impacts arising from development, then the planning obligation fails the test of Circular 3/2012 as it does not relate to **scale and kind**.
- 2.12 It is the Council's position that the pace of housing development within any of its defined areas or zones can proceed without any restriction to the delivery of the infrastructure as long as the agreed schedule of financial contributions are made. The Council describes this as a mechanism for front funding the ongoing expenditure on its proposed mitigation measures.
- 2.13 This method of front funding education infrastructure is not properly explained in the Draft SG and continues to add to the confusion as to the principle – what is the relationship between a proposal and its impact (directly and cumulatively) on the infrastructure which needs to be provided as the planning obligation.
- 2.14 Despite the Council's Response (Page 6), it is not clear whether from the Council's comments that there is the necessary direct link between the development and the funding of the necessary infrastructure, contrary to the requirements in the **relationship** test in Circular 3/2012 (paragraph 17).
- 2.15 Continuing to use the Council's example of the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone*, Scottish Government will be aware that the charging mechanism for education does not specifically identify the financial contributions to be spent on each of the mitigation measures set on the Action Programme. The Council only sets out the financial contributions for education mitigation, categorised as *Primary School and Full Contribution* (Draft SG page 27).
- 2.16 These do not relate to the various individual mitigation measures identified in Annex 1 of the Draft SG Pages 16 to 18). These mitigation requirements are detailed for this Contribution Zone in the Council's *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (August 2018) and set out in the Summary Table (page 3). Five primary school mitigation measures are required in the Contribution Zone along with the potential for mitigation measures at two non-denominational secondary schools (yet to be determined by the Council).

- 2.17 The Council's current approach to its charging mechanism in the Draft SG prevents any applicant ever knowing what financial contributions paid have actually been used for. This is contrary to the **reasonableness** and **relationship** tests in Circular 3/2012.
- 2.18 These concerns with compliance with the tests in Circular 3/2012 relating to the reasonableness and clear linkage of the planning obligations ultimately lead back to the Council's explanation of the purpose of its Draft SG as set out in the diagram on page 4. Fundamentally, it is the Council's premise that its impact appraisals are setting out the ...*impact of growth on infrastructure* (presented in Box 1) and that this infrastructure needs to be funded through the process described in the next seven stages (Boxes 2 to 8).
- 2.19 If the methodology and calculation of the mitigation arising from this impact assessment is incorrect or challengeable then the planning obligations being sought and the resultant financial contribution, are subsequently incorrect. This then wholly undermines the charging mechanisms set out in the Draft SG.
- 2.20 In terms of education, Scottish Government should be aware that the Council's impact assessment for education mitigation is not based on its school roll projections. The Council simply measures the scale of impact as the number of pupils from new housing within an Education Contribution Zone by the application of its Child per House Ratios (CHRs) to the number of new homes proposed.
- 2.21 The Council then assumes that all of these pupils require new accommodation without taking into account a range of necessary and relevant factors such as:
- Existing spare capacity at the schools in the zone or its sub-area,
  - Pupil transition – the distribution of pupils from new housing across the year groups and transition of pupils from P1 to P7 and S1 to S6 annually;
  - The number of pupils expected to arise annually from the agreed programming of completions over the zone's development period – not all pupils will be in attendance in the catchment schools at the same time; and
  - The potential for extensions at existing schools to add capacity without the need for new schools.
- 2.22 There are also concerns about the Council's use of the underlying data to inform its assumptions. This includes using working capacity and not planning capacity to measure school capacity as part of its impact assessment, contrary to Scottish Government's guidance – *Determining Primary School Capacity* (2014).
- 2.23 The Council's approach is also undermined by its reliance on its *Housing Land Study* (June 2014). Attached with this submission is a detailed assessment of the 2014 document *City Housing Strategy 2018 - Urban Capacity Study* (February 2019). This document highlights that the Council's 2014 document significantly overestimates future development on windfall sites, many of which have yet to be developed for housing and/or are actively being used for other uses. By relying on the 2014 Housing Land Study the Council is over-estimating the anticipated number of pupils requiring accommodation.
- 2.24 Accordingly, the Council's impact assessment methodology grossly over-estimates the number of pupils requiring to be accommodated in additional school accommodation. This is fully explained in Section 4 of this Representation.

**Conclusion**

- 2.25 While LDP Policy Del 1 sets out the basis for the preparation of the Draft SG and the use of Contribution Zones, the Council is still required to demonstrate that any planning obligations imposed by the Draft SG are lawful and in accord with the tests of Circular 3/2012. Any modifications imposed by the Reporter at LDP Examination were made to ensure compliance with the relevant statutory and policy requirements, including Circular 3/2012.
- 2.26 The Council is attempting to pursue a policy for developer contributions that is not in accord with all tests in Circular 3/2012. This is not a matter of planning balance. LDP Policy Del 1 was modified by Scottish Ministers to comply with the tests of Circular 3/2012 and thus the Draft SG must reflect that.
- 2.27 Having reviewed the Council's response to this Issue, it is concluded that the Council has adopted a funding approach which does not necessarily relate the expenditure of the financial contributions collected to the infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of the development proposed.
- 2.28 Scottish Government should also be aware that the financial contributions derived by the Council's impact assessment methodology for education are substantially in excess of that necessary to mitigate the impact of pupils from new housing. This is explained further in Section 4.

## 3.0 Issue 2 – Connection with Adopted Local Development Plan (LDP)

### Question 2. In Relation to Education Infrastructure

#### Question 2:

The Council is asked to specify which education interventions (for which contributions are sought within the supplementary guidance) / cumulative education contribution zones have a basis in the adopted LDP. This is with reference to section 27(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008.

Source: *City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery*, City of Edinburgh Council

- 3.1 The Council has provided an explanation of its approach based on the *Liberton Gracemount Cumulative Contribution Zone*. As the Council has acknowledged, different approaches apply in different zones for example, the North Edinburgh Transport Zone. Providing an explanation in respect of only one zone appears of limited value.
- 3.2 Moreover, when providing its information, the Council has omitted reference to the following proposals in the LDP which are situated within this Contribution Zone:
- *Extension to Gilmerton (ND) primary school, Gracemount (ND) primary school and Liberton and Craighour Park if required due to catchment changes (LDP, page 66)*
- 3.3 The Council adds this reference as a bullet point following the tabled information, clarifying the extensions to Gilmerton and Gracemount Primary Schools have been superseded by ... *alternative and more efficient approaches to delivering infrastructure within the contributions zones, or in the case of the Liberton Gilmerton Education Contribution Zone, by the statutory education consultation to demine the new school catchment for Broomhills Primary School*.
- 3.4 The Council state that these actions which are not included in the current Action Programme of Draft SG have been ...*superseded by subsequent Education Appraisals establishing alternative and more efficient approaches...*
- 3.5 No further explanation has been provided by the Council since the LDP was adopted in November 2016 which has resulted in these identified actions now being superseded and why other means of delivering infrastructure were more ...*efficient*. It is also not clear what the Council means by ...*efficient*. What is clear is that the delivery of a new school is not as cost effective as building extensions to existing schools to deliver a similar scale of additional accommodation.
- 3.6 For information, this statutory consultation to amend the school catchment areas in this Zone was carried out in 2017 and the catchment changes approved in June 2017. Given the concerns expressed in this Response about the scale of impact assessed by the Council, Scottish Government should be aware that this catchment review did not increase the overall number of primary school pupils within this Zone from existing housing beyond the boundary of the Zone.
- 3.7 The Council highlights that the geographical area defined by the zones ...*relates to the type and nature of the action* in relation to education (final sentence of first paragraph on page 13).
- 3.8 This means that the Council has determined the extent of its education contribution zones with reference to the actions or mitigation measures expected. It is normal practice in any impact

assessment to define the relevant area and then assess the capacity of the existing infrastructure. The Council's approach is unusual as the mitigating actions will only be known once the impact assessment is carried out rather than being pre-determined. This presents a conundrum for the Council as the choice of area has a direct effect on the outcome of the impact assessment.

- 3.9 The Council claims that the education contribution zones are based on school catchment areas for one or more secondary schools. The *Liberton Gracemount Education Infrastructure Zone* has been investigated to understand its school catchment areas. For reference, the school catchment areas in this Contribution Zone are provided in the Council's Response (diagram on page 19) and can be compared with the Zone with its Sub-Areas (diagram on page 22).
- 3.10 Scottish Government will note that the boundary of this Zone does not follow the boundaries of the two secondary schools – Liberton and Gracemount High.
- 3.11 The following facts have been established.
- 3.12 The *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone* encompasses the following catchment areas:
- (i) the entirety of the Gracemount High catchment area;
  - (ii) the majority (but not whole) of the Liberton High catchment area, and
  - (iii) an area currently associated with Castlebrae High (but not formally within any catchment area)
- 3.13 Prestonfield Primary School's catchment area is not included within the Zone. Prestonfield Primary School is a dual feeder primary school, into both Liberton and Castlebrae High Schools.
- 3.14 An area to the west of the Wisp is incorporated into the Zone. This includes an area from which pupils currently attend Castlevew Primary School and Castlebrae High School (Council's *Online Atlas Mapping*). This area is not formally within either Castlevew Primary or Castlebrae High Schools' catchment areas.
- 3.15 It is apparent that the Council's boundaries for its zones do not necessarily follow school catchment area boundaries. No other explanation has been provided by the Council for the geographical definition of this Contribution Zone. The Council has not published or undertaken any catchment area reviews to align this Contribution Zone with existing school catchment areas.
- 3.16 There was no explanation for the extent and definition of these education contribution zones during the limited consultation for the Draft SG.
- 3.17 Scottish Government will be aware that the Council dismissed the use of individual health care General Practice boundaries to define its Healthcare Contribution Zones (Council's Response page 37; fourth paragraph). This was because:
- Practice boundaries have no statutory status;
  - Are inconsistent;
  - Overlap with each other; and
  - Their extent is subject to change at any time.

- 3.18 Based on the examination of the boundary of the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone*, the following conclusions can also be reached;
- The boundary of this Zone has no statutory status;
  - The boundary is inconsistent with the catchment boundaries of Liberton and Gracemount Secondary Schools;
  - It is possible that zone boundaries could overlap with each other; and
  - Zone boundaries are subject to change through Council review as stated in the Draft SG (page 4 paragraph C II) and can happen at any time.
- 3.19 This highlights that the definition of the zones and their sub-areas would be better understood if it was based on existing school catchment areas, thereby providing a sound basis for any impact assessment.
- 3.20 Scottish Government will also note that a comparison of the Contribution Zone's school catchment areas and the Contribution Zone's Sub-Areas demonstrates that the three Sub-Areas are not wholly based on the catchment boundaries of the feeder primary schools for both secondary schools. The definition of the Sub-Areas within this Zone is also arbitrary as the boundaries do not follow the statutory boundary of school catchment areas.
- 3.21 Again, this makes the relationship between the mitigation proposed in a Contribution Zone's Sub-Area difficult to reconcile with the mitigation proposed at specific schools.
- 3.22 As an example, the Council determined that one of its preferred mitigation measures is the construction of a new two stream school at Broomhills with a working capacity of 420 pupils.
- 3.23 The Council has ignored the potential to extend both of the local primary schools – Gilmerton and Gracemount Primary Schools in this Sub-Area. Modest extensions at both schools would have increase their working capacity by an additional 154 pupils - opportunities not adopted but still available to the Council.
- 3.24 According to the Council, the outcome of the school catchment review is that Broomhills Primary School, with a working capacity for 420 pupils, will now be occupied by 243 pupils from existing housing areas with only the balance from new housing. This is explained in the Council's Consultation Paper (December 2016) about the proposed school catchment review (transfer of two existing housing areas explained in Appendix 6 (A -74 pupils and B – 169 pupils)) (*Proposal to Establish a New Non-Denominational Primary School and Implement Catchment Changes to Address School Capacity and Accommodation Pressures in South East Edinburgh*).
- 3.25 Scottish Government will note that the Council requires the allocated housing sites in the LG-1 Sub-Area to fully fund the total cost of this new school through its financial contributions in the Draft SG.
- 3.26 This mitigation solution can only be valid and wholly funded by new housing within this LG-1 Sub-Area of the Zone if the impact assessment justifies that new accommodation for an additional 420 pupils is required from new housing. The Council's latest school roll projections (2018) does support this scale of accommodation, as explained in Section 4.
- Conclusion**
- 3.27 The Council has not adopted the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone* as an area to undertake its impact assessment based on statutory school catchment areas. The Council has not

explained the deviation from its position that these zones consist of one or more secondary school catchment areas.

- 3.28 The Council's position is that the extent and boundaries of contribution zones have been informed by the proposed infrastructure requirements, rather than confirming the boundaries of the zones before undertaking individual or cumulative impacts (Council Response; page 13; last sentence - first paragraph).
- 3.29 The evidence provided by the Council is that the education interventions within this Contribution Zone and its Sub-Areas (as set out in the Draft SG) have been amended since the adoption of the LDP. The Council has decided not to extend Gilmerton and Gracemount Primary Schools at this time.
- 3.30 The reasons given by the Council are the more efficient delivery of the mitigation measures and the outcome of the need to establish the catchment for the first of the new primary school at Broomhills. However, it is not known what is meant by more ...*efficient*. For example, this could relate to timescales for delivery and/or costs.
- 3.31 However, according to the Council, nearly 60% of its pupils are expected to be from existing housing. If the Council has overstated the number of pupils from new housing from its impact assessment, then the outcome will be a significant increase in the under-occupancy of the existing schools or even under-occupancy at the new school.
- 3.32 Scottish Government will note that the modifications sought by the Council to its mitigation measures since the LDP was adopted has had the impact of significantly increasing the cost of the final mitigation measures chosen by the Council in this Contribution Zone, solely at the cost of development.

**Question 3. In Relation to Healthcare Contribution Zones**

**Question 3:**

The Council is asked to specify the basis upon which healthcare contribution zones are contained within the supplementary guidance. This is with reference to section 27(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008.

*Source: City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery, City of Edinburgh Council*

- 3.33 The Council's approach in the Draft SG for Healthcare Contribution Zones is to raise funds from new housing for refurbishments or extensions to existing medical practices or to fund the delivery of new practices.
- 3.34 Scottish Government will be aware that healthcare as a topic was removed from the Council's proposed Policy Del 1 following the LDP Examination (page 764, paragraphs 44 – 47) with a recommendation that these should be carried out on a case by case basis.
- 3.35 In making its response, the Council refers to Policy HOU 10 as the policy linkage. However, Policy HOU 10 refers to a much wider range of facilities – local doctor and dental surgeries, local shops community halls and meeting rooms are part of the healthcare and community facilities listed in Policy Hou 10. There is no reference to the preparation of supplementary guidance on this matter.
- 3.36 If it was the Council's intention to deliver the intentions in Policy HOU 10 through the Draft SG then its response is only partial in that it only refers to healthcare facilities. The Council has not explained its restricted response to the mitigation required in Policy HOU 10. The Council's reliance on Policy

HOU 10 is at odds with its justifications in the Draft SG in its current form which is based exclusively on Policy Del 1.

- 3.37 The Council also makes reference to the *Local Development Plan Primary Care Appraisal* (published in April 2017 and revised December 2017 – page 36, fifth paragraph) as the core justification for its impact assessment approach in the Draft SG for the provision of healthcare premises.
- 3.38 The LDP was adopted in November 2016 and *Local Development Plan Primary Care Appraisal* published after the LDP was adopted. Scottish Government will note that this was not subject to public consultation as part of the emerging LDP consultation process – unlike the other topics referred to in Policy Del 1.
- 3.39 It should be noted that Policy Del 1 specifically identifies the following infrastructure – transport; education; green space and public realm, as subject to the payment of financial contributions. Healthcare and other community facilities, as stated in Policy Hou 10, are not included in Policy Del 1. This is another attempt by the Council to include healthcare as matter for inclusion in the Draft SG in spite of the modifications made following the LDP Examination.
- 3.40 The Council was invited to specify the basis upon which these healthcare contribution zones are contained within the supplementary guidance. This is with reference to *Section 27(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008*.
- 3.41 Section 27(2) of the *Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008* states that:

*Supplementary guidance adopted and issued under section 22(1) of the Act in connection with a particular strategic development plan or local development plan may only deal with the provision of further information or detail in respect of the policies or proposals set out in that plan and then only provided that those are matters which are expressly identified in a statement contained in the plan as matters which are to be dealt with in supplementary guidance.*

- 3.42 The *Development Planning Regulations* (2008) are clear that supplementary guidance should not introduce new requirements, such as planning obligations, for matters which are not *expressly identified* in the adopted development plan.
- 3.43 The basis for the use of planning obligation is expressly set out in Policy Del 1 *Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery* of the adopted LDP. Policy Del 1 makes no mention of planning obligations being required for healthcare and community facilities. There is no statement which requires supplementary guidance to be required on this matter.
- 3.44 It is, therefore, considered that any requirement to make a financial contribution towards healthcare based in the Draft SG would not comply with the policy requirements of the adopted LDP. As such, there is no policy basis for the proposed contributions for healthcare facilities set out in the Draft SG.
- 3.45 The adopted LDP clearly states that if financial contributions towards healthcare and community facilities were to be sought, these would be done on a case by case basis if considered in accord with the tests of Circular 3/2012.

*The Council recognises that the scale of proposed development may also impact on other infrastructure including health and community facilities. Policy Hou 1 is relevant in this respect. However, there is a current lack of information on the scale of such requirements and how they should be addressed. Whilst it may be appropriate to seek contributions for such provision any*

*requirement would need to be considered on a case by case basis where a clear justification can be provided in the context of Circular 3/2012. The feasibility of including such additional contributions and the impact on development viability would also have to be assessed (paragraph 145 of LDP)*

**Conclusion**

- 3.46 There is no mention of supplementary guidance being prepared on this matter. Irrespective of the above statement in LDP paragraph 145, which does not refer to supplementary guidance, it is considered that there is no policy basis for seeking financial contributions for healthcare facilities in the Draft SG.
- 3.47 Accordingly, all sections referring to healthcare facilities and the contribution zones should be deleted from the Draft SG.

**Question 4. In Relation to Transport Infrastructure**

**Question 4:**

The Council's is asked to specify which transport interventions (for which contributions are sought within the supplementary guidance) have a basis in the adopted LDP. This is with reference to section 27(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008.

*Source: City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery, City of Edinburgh Council*

- 3.48 No comment

## 4.0 Issue 3 – Further Information Required

### Question 5a. In Relation to Education Infrastructure

#### Question 5a:

The Council is asked to provide further information on the following aspects of the supplementary guidance:

The approach taken to identify the impacts on school roll projections resulting from new development associated with the adopted LDP and the resultant contributions sought. This is with reference to planning obligations relating to the development being proposed and contributions sought being in scale and kind to the proposed development.

Source: *City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery*, City of Edinburgh Council

- 4.1 The Council explains that its *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (August 2018) has set out its approach to assessing the actions, costs and financial contributions as adopted in the LDP and Draft SG.
- 4.2 The Council has not explained its approach in each zone but has used, as an illustrative example, work undertaken to assess impacts within the cumulative assessment area in the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone*.

- 4.3 Scottish Government should note that the Council's impact assessment methodology is explained in the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (August 2018) (paragraph 4.7). This states:

*Where these school roll projections indicate that there is insufficient spare capacity to accommodate the increase in school pupils expected to be generated by new housing development, education infrastructure actions have been identified that relate to the number of pupils expected to be generated. Some schools will also require additional accommodation throughout the period of the LDP as a result of rising primary school rolls in the area. These will be determined separately and are not reflected in the actions identified within this Appraisal.*

- 4.4 This implies that the Council's impact assessment will be made with reference to the school roll projections to measure the pupils generated but excluding any increase in pupils from demographic trends (i.e. rising rolls from existing housing) in the school roll.
- 4.5 It also indicates a binary approach by the Council. Either additional accommodation is needed as a result of pupils from new housing, as identified in the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* or because of more pupils from existing housing. The Council's explanation does not consider the likely scenario where additional accommodation may be needed as a result of new and existing housing.
- 4.6 Given the findings from its school roll projections, there must be a significant quantum of pupils from existing housing still requiring new accommodation, which has not been explained by the Council.

#### **Council's explanation of its impact assessment approach**

- 4.7 The Council explains in *Step 1* how its school roll projections are used to indicate whether there is sufficient capacity in schools to accommodate pupils or whether new accommodation is required.
- 4.8 The Council explains in *Step 2* that it adopts a cumulative approach based on the catchment area of one or more secondary schools. Referring to the Zone defined for the *Liberton Gracemount*

*Education Contribution Zone*, this should be the catchment areas for Liberton and Gracemount High Schools.

- 4.9 In *Step 3*, the Council explains how the school roll projections are considered and actions identified to resolve problems where insufficient capacity arises. This explains that the Council's assessment meets the scale of new accommodation required from pupils in new housing only and not pupil growth in general.
- 4.10 In response to this explanation, the Council is correctly acknowledging that it is responsible for funding any accommodation requirements arising from demographic growth within its schools.
- 4.11 In considering the mitigation required, the Council highlights (Page 21 of its Response) that a series of protocols are followed to determine its preferred choice of mitigation such as:
- reconfiguring existing school accommodation;
  - extending the existing school; and finally
  - provision of a new school.
- 4.12 The Council explains in *Step 4* that a Contribution Zone may be disaggregated into sub-areas, determining which school will or will not benefit from a particular mitigation measure and the developments which should be included in this sub-area. The Council highlights that the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone* has three sub-areas.
- 4.13 However, the Council fails to explain how these sub-areas have been formed. These Sub-Areas do not necessarily accord with the primary school catchment areas – as explained in Issue 2. The Council has inferred that its definition of zones and sub-areas are in response to the need to define areas to support the mitigation required (final sentence of first paragraph, page 13).
- 4.14 *Step 5* explains how the Council calculated its financial contributions. This is done by reference to the total number of homes in a sub-area or zone. Presumably, the estimated budget costs of the agreed actions highlighted in *Step 3* are used to derive these financial contributions (budget costs divided by houses and flats, taking into account their respective pupils derived by the CHRs).
- 4.15 However, given that there are three sub-areas in the Zone with significantly different levels of financial contributions to fund, the basis for the allocation of specific housing sites to these sub-areas is still not explained by the Council. This highlights the ongoing issue in determining the relationship between various housing developments and the Council's defined mitigation measures, required by Circular 3/2012.
- 4.16 The Council concludes that by adopting this approach, the Council will exclude pupil growth from its assessment, thus demonstrating that the financial contributions sought relate only to pupils from new housing.
- 4.17 It is not known how the Council is able to make this statement about the separation of mitigation required to accommodate pupils from new housing and existing pupils. There is a lack of evidence to support the Council's statement. The evidence can be sourced from its school roll projections, by adopting a modelling scenario where the projected house completions are excluded. The resultant outcome would assess the impact of pupils from existing housing and ongoing demographic trends, excluding pupils from further new housing.
- 4.18 The Council makes reference in its Response to the catchment area review which was undertaken to define the Broomhills Primary School (page 12). The Council's position is that, as a consequence

of this comprehensive catchment review, nearly 60% of the pupils attending this new school will be from pupils already accommodated in existing primary schools and not just pupils from new housing. This is set out in the Council's Report on the Catchment Area Review 2017.

- 4.19 This raises a key issue – are these existing pupils only the consequence of the catchment review (as claimed by the Council), or will these existing pupils transferring to Broomhills Primary School simply lead to an overall reduction in school occupancy across the two other primary schools to free capacity for ongoing demographic issues. Critically, this will depend on the validity of the Council's impact assessment.

### **Clarifying the Council's Response**

- 4.20 Careful consideration has been given to the Council's explanation of its impact assessment methodology as set out in the published *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (August 2018) and in its Response.
- 4.21 Based on an appraisal of what has been undertaken, it is concluded that **this information is not an accurate presentation or interpretation of the Council's impact assessment methodology.**
- 4.22 Set out below is a review of the Council's impact assessment methodology with reference to the impact assessment methodology prepared for the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone*. The relevant section for reference is Section 7 of the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal*.
- 4.23 Whilst this review relates to the impact assessment for the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone* (being the only detailed explanation offered by the Council), it is assumed that the conclusions from the Council's that it relies on this approach for its other contribution zones. As such, the conclusions from this appraisal will also be equally applicable to the impact assessment approach adopted by the Council in its other Contribution Zones.
- 4.24 Scottish Government should note that the Council does not use its school roll projections to undertake its impact assessment. These are not part of the impact assessment's methodology or calculation carried out by the Council.
- 4.25 The Council has adopted a cumulative approach for its impact assessment. This is the term used to explain a methodology which assumes the total number of pupils from several housing developments, all require to be accommodated at the same time in the catchment schools.
- 4.26 This cumulative approach is a highly simplistic methodology to adopt for an impact assessment for the following reasons. It ignores the following mitigating factors which over time will reduce the number of pupils and the overall scale of impact requiring new accommodation:
- I. It does not take into account the existing pupil capacity available in the schools within the Contribution Zone or its Sub Area;
  - II. It does not take into account the progression of pupils through a school (either P1 – P7 or S1 – S6). This means it measures all its projected pupils from new housing as being in school together, ignoring that pupils always leave a school annually. In any given development period, pupils from new housing will attend and then depending on a pupil's age, will leave the school.

The Council's approach does not progress pupils through the school (unlike its school roll projections) and is actually retaining pupils which have already left school. For example, the development period in this Zone is 10 years and no allowance has been taken into account for the capacity freed up by this transition of pupils through the school years.

- III. It ignores the annual number of pupils originating from the programming of completed new homes. This varies annually depending on the agreed rate of house building. The total number of new homes to be built is over a significant period – 10 years or more. This should be taken into account in the impact on the scale of new school accommodation necessary to accommodate all new pupils at the peak years; and
- IV. It does not take into account historic patterns of attendance at a school, for example: Stage Migration Rates within the Contribution Zone between schools, P7 – S1 Transfer Rates or Out of Catchment Placing Requests which will affect the scale of impact.

4.27 If the Council had applied its school roll projections, all of these factor would have been taken into account.

**Council’s School Roll Projections as Impact Assessment**

4.28 For completeness, the following impact assessment is presented using the Council’s school roll projections to assess impacts in LG-1 Sub-Area of this Contribution Zone. There are two non-denominational primary schools in this Sub-Area – Gilmerton Primary and Gracemount Primary

4.29 Using the school projections for Gilmerton and Gracemount Primary Schools presented in this Response (page 20) up to 2025 and the Council’s published 2018 school projections to 2028, Scottish Government will note the overall scale of impact for the LG-1 Sub-Area is as follows:

	Capacity	Classes	2018 Roll	Projected Roll 2028	Shortfall
Gilmerton Primary	546	19	458	803	257
Gracemount Primary	560	20	502	665	105
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,106</b>		<b>960</b>	<b>1,468</b>	<b>362</b>

Source: Council Response to Scottish Government (page 20) and Council’s 2018 School Roll Projections

4.30 Since these projections take into account future new housing (as explained in *Step 1*), then a total of an **additional 362 pupils** would need to be accommodated. As mentioned, the Council’s projections also incorporate any ongoing demographic trends in these schools as well as pupils from new housing.

4.31 Scottish Government will note that Table 7B in the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* identifies a requirement to accommodate **691 pupils** in this Sub-Area. This is roughly double the scale of mitigation assessed using the Council’s impact assessment when compared to the latest school roll projections.

4.32 The Council in its Response now refers to a total of 599 non-denominational pupils (page 21) when compared to the information available in Section 7 of the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal (August 2018)*.

4.33 The Council also highlights that these 599 additional non-denominational pupils will need to be accommodated in Gilmerton Primary School (322 pupils) and Gracemount Primary School (277 pupils). This differs from the evidence on the Council’s 2018 School Roll Projections as summarised in the following table:

	Capacity	School Projection Shortfall	Impact Assessment Shortfall	Difference in Outcomes
Gilmerton Primary	546	257	322	65
Gracemount Primary	560	105	277	172
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,106</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>237</b>

Source: Council Response to Scottish Government (page 20) and Council’s 2018 School Roll Projections

- 4.34 This table highlights that the Council’s impact assessment requires additional accommodation for 237 pupils compared to school roll projections. This is equivalent to a new single stream primary school.
- 4.35 All of the above raises concerns about the approach to impact assessment used by the Council in the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (August 2018). This has implications for the mitigation measures in the Draft SG.
- 4.36 As the Council explains, it applies a cascade approach to the choice of mitigation requirements. Looking first at whether additional pupils can be accommodated in the existing schools’ accommodation through reconfigurations or extensions. Only when these options have been discounted, should new schools be considered.
- 4.37 The Council has identified that both Gilmerton and Gracemount Primary Schools can be extended as explained in the adopted LDP (page 66). However, the Council has subsequently pursued an alternative mitigation.
- 4.38 If both Schools were extended to a full three stream school (following the Council’s cascade approach and preference for a three stream model), then using the working capacity outlined in Appendix 2 of the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* for a three stream (21 class) school, the scale of further accommodation required could be reduced as follows:

	Classes	2018 Roll	Projected Roll 2028	Proposed Extension (classes)	New Capacity	Shortfall requiring accommodation
Gilmerton Primary	19	458	803	21 (+ 2)	630	173
Gracemount Primary	20	502	665	21 (+ 1)	630	35
Total		960	1,468		1,260	208

- 4.39 What this demonstrates is that use of the Council’s school roll projections to undertake an impact assessment identifies a requirement to provide mitigation for up to 362 pupils. Consistent with the Council’s stated methodology of extending existing schools, extending the two existing primary schools to three stream further reduces the scale of new accommodation needed further to around 208 pupils.
- 4.40 The remaining **208 pupils** need to be accommodated through further agreed mitigation measures. This could be carried out through a catchment area review and these pupils potentially accommodated in adjacent primary schools. Alternatively, a case for a single stream school could be made.
- 4.41 However, the Council’s proposed mitigation is two new primary schools at Broomhills (two stream) and Gilmerton Station Road (single Stream). This is a working capacity of 420 and 210 pupils respectively – 630 pupils in total. The Council’s latest school projections do not make the case for this scale of mitigation.
- 4.42 There is no evidence from the Council to explain why it has decided on new schools, contrary to the position in the adopted LDP and the approach it claims to follow in its Response. As the above illustrates, modest extensions at existing schools could have addressed most if not all of the impact. The Council has failed to evidence that two new schools is *the only realistic option* (Council’s Response page 21).
- 4.43 This impact assessment derived from the Council’s school roll projections, is substantially lower (by half) than the 691 pupils shown in Table 7B of its *Education Infrastructure Appraisal*. This is because

the school roll projections model the availability of existing capacity at the schools; take account of the transition of pupils over time; and the other factors mentioned in paragraph 4.26.

- 4.44 The much larger pupil requirement derived from the Council's impact assessment methodology only measures total pupil product from new housing and ignores these essential matters to derive the necessary mitigation.

**Planning Capacity not Working Capacity**

- 4.45 Scottish Government should note that the Council's *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* has been carried out on the basis of adopting working capacity to measure school capacity.
- 4.46 Scottish Government guidance (*Determining Primary School Capacity 2014*) is explicit that the measurement of planning capacity and not working capacity should be adopted for the purposes of estate management planning and calculating financial contributions (Section 1.3).
- 4.47 Planning capacity provides a higher estimate of school capacity as measures the capacity of available accommodation to accommodate pupils in a school. For a single stream primary school, planning capacity is 217 pupils, compared to the Council's working capacity of 210 pupils. The Council's approach therefore will overestimate the scale of mitigation required and thus increase the cost of the financial contributions.

**Appraisal of the Council's impact assessment methodology**

- 4.48 The outcome of the Council's impact assessment methodology is shown in Section 7 (Table 7B) of the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* for the *Liberton/Gracemount Education Contribution Zone*. It does not involve the outcomes from the Council's school roll projections.
- 4.49 The Council's approach is based on the application of the Council's Child Per House Ratios (CHRs) for primary and secondary schooling but without reference to the split between non-denominational and denominational sectors. It is not known what pupils from new housing in this Zone and its Sub-Areas will attend non-denominational schools.
- 4.50 Scottish Government will note that the Draft SG requires financial contributions for the local denominational primary school as well as the two new primary schools. Therefore, the Council considers that denominational pupils from new housing will impact on the denominational schools. The Draft SG however fails to explain how the financial contributions for denominational schooling are assessed.
- 4.51 The Council applies the following CHRs for houses and flats:

School	Primary		Secondary	
	House	Flat	House	Flat
Total	0.3	0.07	0.2	0.03
Non-denominational	0.26	0.06	0.17	0.026
Denominational	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.004

Source: City of Edinburgh Council, Table 1 of the *LDP Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (August 2018)

- 4.52 Applied to all new housing in the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone* (Table 7B), the pupils determined by applying the Council's CHRs for non-denominational and denominational pupils is as follows:

	Primary	Secondary
All Pupils	803	522
Non-denominational Pupils	695	444
Denominational Pupils	103	78

- 4.53 At both primary and secondary level, the Council's impact assessment does not clarify what pupils will attend non-denominational and denominational schooling. The Council's approach has the potential to overstate the number of pupils that require to be accommodated in non-denominational school by 103 pupils (15%) in the non-denominational primary, and 78 pupils (18%) in the non-denominational secondary sector in this Contribution Zone.
- 4.54 As the Council appears to base its education mitigation requirements on the total number of pupils (Table 7B of the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal*) rather than the specific number of non-denominational and denominational pupils, its mitigation measures can therefore be substantially overstated.
- 4.55 This has not been highlighted or explained by the Council in its response to Scottish Government.

### **Council's impact assessment methodology adopts cumulative approach**

- 4.56 In this context, the cumulative approach is the term used to explain a methodology which assumes the total number of pupils from several housing developments, all require to be accommodated at the same time in the catchment schools.
- 4.57 By assuming that all school pupils arising from new housing will always need to be accommodated at the same time in new accommodation, the Council's impact assessment significantly overstates the direct and cumulative impact of pupils from new housing. As demonstrated above, the Council's approach to mitigation in this Sub-Area is **approximately double** that required when compared to the Council's school roll projections.
- 4.58 It should also be noted that the Council's approach fails to reconcile the outcomes from its cumulative impact assessment with the outcomes from its school roll projections. If it had carried out this sense check, it would have realised that its cumulative approach methodology was flawed.
- 4.59 Table 7C in the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (2018) sets out the mitigation measures required by the Council for primary schooling across the Zone, based on this cumulative approach. The following table illustrates how these pupils from new housing translate into the Council's proposed education mitigation solutions for primary schooling:

Homes (A)	CHR (non-denominational and denominational) (B)	Pupils Expected (non-denominational and denominational) (A x B)	Council's Mitigation Requirements	Capacity of Mitigation Requirements
2,496 Homes	0.3	749	4 RC Primary School Classes (St John Vianney or St Catherine's RC PS)	100 (4 x 25 pupils) <sup>1</sup>
771 Flats	0.07	54	2 Primary School Classes (Craigour Park)	50 (2 x 25 pupils) <sup>1</sup>
			2 Stream School (Broomhills)	420
			1 Stream School (Gilmerton Station Road)	210
<b>Total</b>		<b>803</b>		<b>780</b>

Note 1 – the capacity of a classroom can vary from 25 to 33 pupils, depending on circumstances. The overall working capacity could increase by a further 42 pupils – this increases the capacity up to a maximum of 812 pupils.

- 4.60 This confirms that the Council's requirement for additional pupil places in new accommodation (scale of mitigation) is equivalent to the total number of pupils (non-denominational and denominational) it expects from all housing developments within the *Liberton Gracemount Education Contribution Zone*.
- 4.61 Effectively, the Council is seeking financial contributions to provide additional infrastructure to accommodate all pupils expected from new homes at one time, ignoring the fact that the construction

of these 3,267 new homes will take at least 10 years to deliver, benefiting from other measures over time such as the transitioning of pupils out of school.

- 4.62 As set out in the Draft SG, the Council expects all new housing developments to fully fund these mitigation measures. No proportionate payment from the Council is proposed.

### **Appraisal of the Impact Assessment for LG-1 Sub Area**

- 4.63 An appraisal has been carried out of the cumulative approach methodology undertaken by the Council and presented in the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* and updated in the Council's response.

- 4.64 The Council's impact assessment requires accommodation for 691 primary pupils in the LG-1 Sub Area (Table 7B in Section 7 of the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal*). To help understand the actual number of pupils requiring new accommodation in the non-denominational primary school sector, the following adjustments are highlighted:

#### *I. Adjust for denominational pupils*

If the CHRs for non-denominational primary is applied to the 2,151 homes and 658 flats in *LG-1 Sub-Area*, then the total number of non-denominational primary school pupils is reduced to **599** pupils – not 691 pupils. This is a reduction of 92 pupils or 13%.

599 pupils is the number of non-denominational pupils referred to in the Council's Response (page 21) with 322 pupils at Gilmerton Primary and 277 pupils at Gracemount Primary. This information is not provided in the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (Table 7B).

In addition to 599 pupils for non-denominational primary schooling, the remaining 92 denominational pupils require to be accommodated in the local denominational schools.

#### *II. Adjust for the primary schools' seven year transition period*

Assuming that the homes in Table 7B are built out equally over a 10 year period on an annual average build basis, the maximum number of pupils in the primary school at any one time are those attending over a seven year period. At most, this would only be 70% of the total pupil product, as a minimum of 30% of new homes over this 10 year period would still to be built.

The actual number of pupils transitioning out of primary education would be much higher as pupils from new housing will be distributed evenly across all year groups if modelled using school roll projections. For example, in the first year of new housing, pupils will be evenly distributed across all year groups and those in Primary 7 will leave for secondary schooling the following year.

Applying this factor of 70%, the total number of non-denominational pupils expected to be accommodated in schools at the same time in *LG-1 Sub-Area* (599 pupils) is decreased to **419** pupils or less.

#### *III. Adjust for existing and potential capacity at existing schools*

It is notable that the Council in promoting its new school mitigation proposals has not provided any explanation as to why it is no longer considering extending both Gracemount and Gilmerton Primary Schools to full three stream capacity. This is contrary to both the Council's stated position in the adopted LDP and its response to consider its cascade

approach to consider the use of existing infrastructure first – school extensions before building new schools.

A single class extension at Gracemount Primary and two classroom extension at Gilmerton Primary will increase both Schools to three streams of accommodation. This delivers further capacity for 300 additional pupil places at these two schools for pupils from new housing, as demonstrated in the following table:

School	2018/19 School Roll	Working Capacity	Available Capacity <sup>1</sup>	Working Capacity as 3 Stream School <sup>2</sup>	Available Capacity as 3 Stream School <sup>3</sup>
Gilmerton	458	546	88	630	172
Gracemount	502	560	58	630	128
Total	960	1,106	146	1,260	300

Note 1: Difference between Working Capacity and School Roll

Note 2: Appendix 2 of the Education Infrastructure Appraisal

Note 3: Difference between Working Capacity of extended 3 stream school and School Roll

If mitigation is required for 419 non-denominational primary pupils (based on the simple adjustments as shown above), then modest extensions to the two existing schools (defined as mitigation in the adopted LDP) creates a further 300 pupil capacity.

This would reduce the requirement for more accommodation from 419 to around only **119** pupil places.

This is equivalent to extensions for circa four or five classrooms across the Zone's *Sub-Area LG-1* schools with the potential for school catchment area reviews.

This could also be interpreted as a need for a single stream school with a working capacity of 210 pupils with the Council funding a proportionate share of the accommodation as the mitigation solution is greater than the scale of accommodation requires.

Scottish Government will note that this mitigation is substantially different to the proposed mitigation and Actions in the Draft SG requiring two new schools with a working capacity of 630 pupils.

- 4.65 Based on the information presented by the Council, and taking into account the above adjustments and calculations, the Council's conclusion that the mitigation requirements are two new schools, is shown to be well in excess (119 pupils compared to 691) of that required to mitigate the direct and cumulative impact of pupils from new housing in this LG-1 Sub-Area.
- 4.66 The Council's submissions do not demonstrate or justify a need for the proposed mitigation of two new primary schools with joint working capacity of 630 pupils. There is a lack of evidence from the Council to meet its own *realistic option* test for new schools as set out in their Response (page 21).
- 4.67 The Council as Education Authority can choose to build two new schools. However, the full cost of this infrastructure should not be wholly financed by developer contributions when it is not needed to address the impacts of new development. Accordingly, the mitigation detailed in the Draft SG does not meet the tests in Circular 3/2012.

### Conclusion

- 4.68 The Council's impact assessment approach does not use its school roll projections to assess impacts nor check the reliability of the impacts derived from its alternative cumulative approach.

- 4.69 The Council's Response now explains that its cumulative approach derives a requirement to accommodate 599 non-denominational primary school pupils from new housing. The mitigation for this number of pupils is two new primary schools capable of accommodating 630 pupils (defined by working capacity).
- 4.70 As demonstrated in this appraisal, the cumulative approach grossly overstates the scale of mitigation required. An examination of the cumulative approach suggests that the scale of further mitigation, with known extensions to two local schools taken into account, would be around 119 pupils.
- 4.71 As demonstrated by the comparison with its own school roll projections (refer to paragraphs 4.23 to 4.36), and adopting these for impact assessment purposes, suggests further mitigation for around 202 pupils, equivalent to a single stream of accommodation, taking into account known extensions to local schools.
- 4.72 Accordingly, the planning obligations defined in the *Education Infrastructure Appraisal* (2018) do not meet all five tests of Circular 3/2012, namely:
- The financial contributions for the capacity created by new schools do not **relate in scale and kind** to the impact of pupils from new housing (either individually or cumulatively) within the sub-area of this Zone;
  - The consequence is that the financial contributions seek payments to secure benefits not directly related to new housing, and therefore fail to have the necessary **relationship to the proposed development**; and
  - The financial contributions required from new housing go beyond what is necessary as a consequence of, or in connection with, the proposed housing in the LG-1 Sub Area of the Zone. The Council has not offered to fund its proportionate share for excess mitigation. The size of the financial contribution required therefore fails the **Reasonable Test**.
- 4.73 This type of analysis can be applied to the other zones in the Draft SG.
- 4.74 Given the fundamental deficiencies in the Council's assessment approach, the proposed mitigation and resultant financial contributions in the Draft SG fail to meet the tests in Circular 3/2012.

### Question 5b. In Relation to Contingency

#### Question 5b:

The Council is asked to provide further information on the following aspects of the supplementary guidance:

The origin and purpose of applying a 7.5% contingency cost to the estimated costs of new education infrastructure as set out in the Education Appraisal (January 2018). This is with reference to setting out how standard charges have been calculated and the need for planning obligations being related in scale and kind to the proposed development.

Source: *City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery*, City of Edinburgh Council

- 4.75 The Council's position is that contingency costs are acceptable in terms of forward planning budget costs for projects to be included as actions and factored into the Draft SG.
- 4.76 The key consideration is how then should these be used by the Council in determining financial contributions to be paid

- 4.77 Inevitably, the budget costs for longer term Actions need to be indicative but in addition to this contingency sum, the Council applies BCIS indexing to the financial contributions agreed in the Section 75 Agreement.
- 4.78 The Council will continue to apply this indexing until such time as its scheduled final payment is made.
- 4.79 Given the Council's clarification that it is front funding the construction of its education mitigation measures, indexing will continue to apply even after the Council has an agreed and final cost for its implemented project.
- 4.80 There is a disconnect between the Council's budget cost for the Action (including contingency) to provide financial comfort to the Council and the ongoing indexing of its financial contributions after its final outturn cost is known.
- 4.81 The combination of contingency at 7.5% along with Council's method of front financing its Action programme and using indexing after a project is completed, derives costs which are potentially too high.

**Conclusion**

- 4.82 On the basis that the Council makes its case for the retention of the 7.5% contingency sum, then it is recommended that the Council clarifies that BCIS indexing will not be applied once the project has been completed. This should be added to the Section 2a. *Education Infrastructure* in the Draft SG as a new paragraph H.

**Question 5c. In Relation to Transport Contribution Zones**

**Question 5c:**

The Council is asked to provide further information on the following aspects of the supplementary guidance:

The evidence base which informed the transport contribution zones set out in the supplementary guidance, including, specifically the basis upon which contributions are sought from development for particular interventions and the extent of contribution zones. This is with reference to planning obligations relating to the development proposed.

Source: *City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery*, City of Edinburgh Council

- 4.83 No comment

**Question 5d. In Relation to Transport Contributions**

**Question 5d:**

The Council is asked to provide further information on the following aspects of the supplementary guidance:

The basis for setting the level of transport contributions for developments within contribution zones and the extent to which an assessment of impact has been taken into account. This is with reference to planning obligations relating in scale and kind to the proposed development.

Source: *City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery*, City of Edinburgh Council

- 4.84 No comment

## Question 5e. In Relation to Healthcare Contribution Zones

### Question 5e:

The Council is asked to provide further information on the following aspects of the supplementary guidance:

The basis for both setting the extent of the healthcare contribution zones and the level of healthcare contributions required. This is with reference to the need for planning obligations to relate to the development being proposed and to be in scale and kind to the proposed development.

Source: *City of Edinburgh Council Response to Scottish Government (letter dated 7 March 2019) in respect of Supplementary Guidance: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery*, City of Edinburgh Council

- 4.85 The Council's approach in the Draft SG for Healthcare Contribution Zones is to raise funds from new housing for refurbishments or extensions to existing medical practices or to fund the delivery of new practices.
- 4.86 This funding activity, as explained in the Council's response, is already carried out by NHS Lothian through its statutory function. Financial and contractual relationships are entered into between private GP practices through the Independent Contractor Model to deliver the practice facilities required by that medical practice. These contractual and service arrangements are business models for each medical practice to adopt. This results in significant differences between the number of patients served by medical practices. It highlights the divergence and lack of standardisation in the business model for delivering expanding or new medical practices.
- 4.87 The willingness for a practice to adapt to the population demands in the area it serves – both overall demand from additional housing growth as well as demographic trends affecting the patients its serves, is its choice. An existing medical practice cannot be forced to expand its practice to accommodate additional patients. Nor can a new medical practice be required by the Council to grow to a specified size such as 10,000 patients.
- 4.88 A medical practice can only exist if there are medical practitioners who wish to set up in business and adopt a business model to comply with NHS Lothian's requirements.
- 4.89 Scottish Government is already committed to supporting medical practices through generous loans (up to £30M by 2021) as part of the *Code of NHS General Practice Premises* (2017). This Code assists in reducing financial risks to medical practices through ownership or tenancy of premises. It states...*that no GP contractor will need to enter a lease with a private landlord. Health Boards will, over the course of the next fifteen years, take on the responsibility for negotiating and entering into leases with private landlords and the subsequent obligations for maintaining the premises from GP contractors who no longer want to lease privately* (paragraph 3 of this Code).
- 4.90 This Code confirms that medical practices can lease premises in the full knowledge that the lease costs will be met in full by NHS Lothian, fully funded by Scottish Government. This funding commitment is not referred to in the work undertaken by the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership.
- 4.91 This action by Scottish Government confirms that there is no capital or leasing costs to be incurred in operating an existing or new medical practice in Edinburgh. It is therefore not understood what the purpose of the financial contribution is if medical practices will not be responsible for the costs of providing premises.

- 4.92 15 Healthcare Contribution Zones are defined by the Council and include considerable areas of existing housing in all Contribution Zones. Some of these Contribution Zones are already served by existing medical practices – some by several existing practices.
- 4.93 The Council has made simple assumptions about the number of patients which would be registered from new housing within these 15 Healthcare Contribution Zones. Nine new medical practices are proposed to be set up.
- 4.94 Scottish Government will be aware, that unless there is a business response from medical practitioners to set up in business and be approved by NHS Lothian, then there is no commitment to the establishment of the new practice. The Council's approach does not therefore comply with the **relationship to proposed development test** as there is no known mitigation proposal to fund. But in any case, any funding will be a matter for NHS Lothian, fully funded by Scottish Government.
- 4.95 The size of a practice in any zone is pre-determined by the medical practice and its choice of business model. Its final size will be determined by its popularity where prospective patients will exercise choice. The business models for the size of a future practice promoted by the Council has no business justification. The Council is therefore seeking to extract financial contributions for obligations which do not meet the **scale and kind test**.
- 4.96 The promotion of Healthcare Contribution Zones within a Draft SG along with a list of intended actions is not a list of committed projects or set mitigation measures. There is no known commitment to their delivery from the medical practices which will commission or use these premises.
- 4.97 Accordingly, these actions and planning obligations are not necessary for the delivery of these homes.
- Conclusion**
- 4.98 As already clarified to Scottish Government, the Council's inclusion of this planning obligation in the Draft SG has no policy linkage with Policy Del 1.
- 4.99 The Council is seeking to extract financial contributions for obligations which do not meet the **scale and kind test**. The Council's approach does not comply with the **relationship to proposed development test** as there is no known mitigation proposal to fund.
- 4.100 This appraisal now confirms that the obligations for healthcare provision do not meet all of the tests in the Circular 3/2012.

---

## City Housing Strategy 2018 Urban Capacity Review

---

City of Edinburgh Council, along with its housing association partners, have agreed to commit investment to build 20,000 new affordable and low cost ownership homes over the next ten years as set out in the City Housing Strategy 2018. This amounts an average of 2,000 new affordable homes per year from 2018 to 2028.

The Strategic Housing Investment Plan (SHIP) 2018/19 – 22/23 sets out the investment required and identifies the sites that will be brought forward by the Council and housing association partners over a five year period. The current SHIP 2018/19 – 22/23 outlines a programme which would deliver nearly 8,000 homes over the next five years with over 5,000 of those homes forming part of the Scottish Government funded Affordable Housing Supply Programme.

The Council is working with partners, including Scottish Government, to bring forward development of sites currently identified for development beyond the SHIP period in order to deliver the Council's commitment of 10,000 homes in five years.

The Council led house building programme set out in the City Housing Strategy 2018 seeks to maximise delivery of homes on brownfield sites, reducing pressure on Edinburgh's green belt.

To inform the SHIP, the report Delivering Land for Affordable Housing identified a three-pronged strategy for the Council to accelerate sites that may be identified for housing development through:

- Engaging with owners to understand intentions and delays in sites being brought forward for housing development;
- Working with house builders and RSLs to find ways to unlock development; and/or
- Acquiring sites for housing development; including statutory intervention in cases where owners are unwilling to bring forward development.

In 2014, the Council prepared the Housing Land Study. This extensive report sought to identify the potential for new residential development within the existing built up area of Edinburgh. This evidence base focused on brownfield sites, i.e. areas of previously developed land or the conversion or redevelopment of buildings, including those that are listed.

The Housing Land Study identified sites with a potential capacity of 14,746 market and affordable homes. Each site was individually assessed to determine whether delivery was:

- High Probability – site is in the Scottish Vacant and Derelict Land Survey, buildings are derelict, known developer interest, or site confirmed for disposal as of February 2014.
- Medium Probability – part of the site is available, yet relocation of remaining site to be confirmed.
- Low Probability – site is occupied/privately owned and there is no information to suggest relocation.

The Housing Land Study concluded that those sites identified as High Probability would be most likely to be built by 2024. This amounted to 5,200 market and affordable homes.

Wallace Land Investments has prepared this Urban Capacity Review to update the Housing Land Study and reassess the information presented based on the last 5 year period.

This information is based on the latest housing completions, the Housing Land Audit & Completions Programme 2018 and any new information in relation to planning consents or landowner intentions.

This review confirms the following regarding the potential sites 14,746 market and affordable homes:

- 1,348 market and affordable homes were completed by 2018 (Annex 1 *Completed Sites*);
- 1,978 homes are identified in the Housing Land Audit & Completions Programme 2018 with planning permission. Of these 1,978 homes, 1,312 are private homes and 666 are affordable homes (Annex 2 *Housing Land Audit Sites*).
- There remains capacity for 1,886 market and affordable homes from sites that are High Probability with development intention known or planning decision pending. Of these 1,886 homes, 1,351 are private homes and 535 are affordable homes (Annex 3 *High Probability Sites*).
- There remains capacity for 1,201 market and affordable homes from sites that can be classified as Medium Probability. These sites have either been refused by the Council, planning permission has lapsed or there is not relevant planning history. Of these 1,201 homes, 901 are private homes and 300 are affordable homes (Annex 4 *Medium Probability Sites*).
- However, there remains 8,271 market and affordable homes on sites identified in the Housing Land Study that have established non residential uses or have planning permission for alternative uses. These sites will not deliver any market or affordable homes within the timescale of the City Housing Strategy 2018 (Annex 5 *Alternative Uses*).

In terms of additional affordable homes to those already identified in the SHIP, only sites with capacity for 1,401 affordable (Annex 3 and Annex 4) will contribute beyond the 5 year period.

The Council's evidence suggests that the established and emerging sources of urban / brownfield land supply, as identified in the Housing Land Study, will require to be supplemented by further greenfield land releases for the City to deliver the 20,000 new affordable homes by 2020.

---

# Annex 1 Completed Sites

---

**Completed Sites**

Site Reference	Site Name	Hectares	Acres	Housing Land Study Capacity	Revised Assessed Capacity	Planning Status	Site in HLA	HLA Units	Ownership Status	General Constraint	Effective Yes/No
14	Baileyfield Road	3.24	8.01	210	177	14/03736 completed July 18 for mixed use including 177 units approx. Aldi/Cruden	No			Built out	Complete
26	Niddrie Mains	0.91	2.25	30	66	14/01820 approved for 66 units 2015, built out	No			Built out	Complete
30	Curriehill Road	0.73	1.80	52	48	14/02658/FUL granted 2015 for 48 units - Cruden	No				Complete
31	Broomhouse Crescent	2.28	5.63	68	96	13/00195 granted for 96 homes, now built out	No			Built out	Complete
47	Station Road	0.61	1.51	39	32	13/01606 permission built out for 32 units. Remainder of site had '14 permission for	No				Complete
82	Dalgety Road	0.28	0.69	33	51	14/03883/FUL App granted 2014 for 51 units. Completed in year 17-18	No			built out	Complete
105	Queensferry Road	0.2	0.49	40	32	13/02957 granted 2014 for 32 units and built out	No				Complete
149	Bellevue Road	0.23	0.57	22	19	12/04302/FUL 6 maisonettes/13 flats, granted 2013, built out	No			Built out	Complete
157	North Fort Street	0.05	0.12	11	1	15/02595 granted 2015 for a flat	No			built	Complete
176	Craigmount Brae	0.35	0.86	42	44	13/03817/FUL   Proposed conversion and extension of Craigievar House from office space to form residential accommodation consisting of 44 flats for Castle Rock Edinvar Housing Association Limited.   GF10 Craigievar House 77 Craigmount Brae Edinburgh EH12 8XF Application granted 14th March 2014	No			N/A	Complete
251	Balmwell Terrace	0.42	1.04	15	43	13/05171 grants 43 units here, built out. 75% affordable	No				Complete
262	Burdiehouse Road	0.24	0.59	5	28	09/03244 granted Dec 2013 for 28 flats, built out	No				Complete
287	Greenbank	0.46	1.14	12	9	12/04263/FUL   Demolition of existing building and mast and erection of residential development comprising 9 units, access, landscaping works and other associated development Granted 2013	No		Private		Complete
291	West Park Place	0.22	0.54	33	0	11/02165/FUL Redevelopment of site for purpose-built student housing + associated facilities including cycle-parking + landscaping (as amended). Granted 2012	No				Complete
292	Orwell Terrace	0.33	0.82	44	0	12/01928/FUL   Student residential development incorporating ancillary elements and associated amenity space. App Granted Nov 13	No				Complete
33	Broomhouse Place North	0.22	0.54	4	4	Apps for 4 total units granted, 14/05131/Ful (2 units first floor), 17/02544/ful (2 ground floor)	No		Few diff landowners	Old pub and other old resi buildings over total area of site	Complete
67	McLeod Street	0.23	0.57	33	25	Most of this has been built out for 25 flats. The rest is a social club which gained COU in 2013	No		1 owner of flats, 1 of social club		Complete
111	Brunswick Road	1.65	4.08	165	175	14/03940 granted 2015 for 175 resi/ 192 sqm comm. Cala	No			Site completed 17-18	Complete
131	Annandale Street	0.41	1.01	66	60	14/04044 granted for 60 flats in 2015	No			Built out	Complete
298	Bridge Street	0.54	1.33	73	73	09/00248/Ful approved 73 units in 2013 Kiln developments	No			Now built out	Complete
261	Harvesters Way	3	7.41	300	183	Permission issued 4/2014 for 183 units to "Places for People", 13/02640. Mix of affordable rent/mid-market rent/shared equity units	No			Completed in 17/18	Complete
283	Kinnear Road	0.47	1.16	15	13	12/01113/VAR2 Non-material variation to the consented planning permission Ref no 12/01113/FUL, to reduce the overall number of dwellings from 15no. to 13no and the car parking spaces from 26no to 20no.	No		Private		Complete
284	Malta Terrace	0.23	0.57	11	8	14/00852/FUL Amend the consented application from 9 residential units to 8, vary consented rear extensions to Malta House and vehicular access, vary fenestration treatment of 4 mews, remove existing outbuilding's rear wall and add low walls to private gardens.	No		Private		Complete
285	McDonald Place	0.43	1.06	67	67	12/03518/FUL Proposed residential development of flats and colony housing (25% affordable) Granted Jun 2013	No		Private		Complete
286	North Fort Street	1.66	4.10	110	94	12/04268/FUL Construction of 94 (all affordable) new-build residential units, communal external space and associated roads, footpaths and landscaping. Including works to category B-listed stone wall surrounding site. Approved April 13	No		City of Edinburgh Council		Complete
<b>Total</b>		<b>19.39</b>	<b>47.91</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>1348</b>						
<b>Private</b>					<b>874</b>						
<b>Affordable</b>					<b>383</b>						

---

# Annex 2 Housing Land Audit Sites

---

Housing Land Audit Sites

Site Reference	Site Name	Hectares	Acres	Housing Land Study Capacity	Revised Assessed Capacity	Planning Status	Site in HLA	HLA Units	Ownership Status	General Constraint	Effective Yes/No
139	Anderson Place	0.94	2.32	114	98	16/03138/FUL granted for 98 units in 2017 J Smart & Co	Yes	97			Yes
260	Lanark Road West	0.41	1.01	33	53	Permission issued to George Dunbar builders for 53 units June 17, 16/01353	Yes	53			Yes
8	Newhaven Road	5.6	13.84	364	441	East Part of site - 17/05742/PPP awaiting decision for 220 units. Officer recommends approval at imminent committee decision. Applicant John Lewis (their old depot). Central part of site - 15/05457/FUL granted 2016 for 201 units - Miller Homes. SW part of site - 14/05208/FUL granted 2017 for 40 units - Cornhill building serv.	Yes	241	Lots of different titles throughout the site.		Yes
18	Royston Mains Avenue	1.39	3.43	90	46	14/03377 approved for a care home, 16/06347 approved for 46 units. Robertson Partnership. 24 for social rent 22 mid-market	Yes	46		Care Home built, homes u/c	No
52	Alnwickhill Road	9.24	22.83	200	296	14/00557/AMC approved 2014 for 296 units Cala/David Wilson	Yes	298			Yes
73	Loaning Road	0.41	1.01	44	59	16/01415/Ful granted in 2016 for 59 affordable units. Hillcrest	Yes	59		Previously some old buildings	Yes
76	Duddingston Park South/Blackchapel Road	6.66	16.46	199	275	13/01378 granted for 91 units in 2014 & 14/00169 granted for 186 units in 2015 on separate part. All Barratt	Yes	44		Mostly built out	Yes, almost complete
83	Abbeyhill	1.29	3.19	129	139	16/00770/FUL granted 2016 for 139 apartments, Bellway	Yes	131			Yes
92	Horne Terrace	0.14	0.35	33	17	14/03752/FUL granted for 17 units	Yes	11			Yes
165	Assembly Street	0.39	0.96	22	25	14/02712/FUL   Proposed apartment building of 11 residential units with 7 off-street parking spaces and 2 on-street city car club spaces. The 4 storey building is accessed from a courtyard shared with 14 residential units, which is part of the same development. All affordable. Application Approved 2nd Aug 2017.	Yes	25	Places for People		Yes
172	Marionville Road	0.21	0.52	7	125	18/10499/FUL   Residential development of 125 units.   69 - 71 Marionville Road Edinburgh EH7 6AQ Applicant - Dandara 14/02089/FUL   Demolition of existing business unit (use class 4), erection of new residential development (use class 9) comprising 34 residential flats with associated landscaping and enabling works.   71 Marionville Road Edinburgh EH7 6AQ Application Granted 10 Nov 2015	Yes	34	Glendinning Assets Limited	No - Marketed by Scarlett Land and Development	Yes
194	Longstone Road (Roundabout)	6.33	15.64	189	157	15/03075/FUL   Residential development of 157 new build homes, a mixture of houses and flats and mixed tenures (as amended).   Land 100 Metres North Of 86 Longstone Road Edinburgh Application granted 10 Nov 2016	Yes	157	Castle Rock Edinvar Housing Association Ltd		Yes
236	Hailesland Place	0.39	0.96	33	32	16/05810 allowed for 11 mid-market and 21 for social rent	Yes	32		Being built out	Yes
242	Calder Estate (F)	0.66	1.63	55	37	16/02227/FUL granted for 37 units 8 Aug 16, Robertson Partnership Homes. 30% mid-market rent, 70% social rent	Yes	37	Previously owned by Council	Under construction	Yes for affordable
269	Crewe Road Gardens	0.2	0.49	22	26	16/04677/FUL   Residential development comprising up to 26 dwellings with associated car parking, access, open space, drainage infrastructure and other associated development. (As Amended).   27 - 30 Crewe Road Gardens Edinburgh EH5 2NN Application Granted 31st July 2017	Yes	26	Robertson Partnership Homes	No	Yes
270	Hailesland Road	2.06	5.09	133	49	16/06346/FUL   Residential Development (49 dwellings) with associated car parking, access, open space, drainage infrastructure and other associated development.   Site 71 Metres Northwest Of 40 Dumbryden Drive Edinburgh Application granted 9th May 2017 Applicant Robertson Partnership Homes 14/04672/FUL   Proposed new build two storey care home for the frail elderly.   Site 71 Metres Northwest Of 40 Dumbryden Drive Edinburgh Application granted 16th March 2015 Applicant City of Edinburgh Council	Yes	49	21st Century Homes / Edinburgh City Council	Remainder of site has consent for a care home.	Yes
278	Clermiston House	0.57	1.41	26	44	16/04722/FUL   Proposed residential development (44 dwellings) (100% affordable) with associated parking, access, open space, drainage infrastructure and other associated development	Yes	44	Robertson Partnership Homes		Yes
301	West Pilton Grove	0.45	1.11	44	29	16/02226/FUL   Residential development (29 dwellings) (100% affordable) with associated car parking, access, open space, drainage infrastructure and other associated development	Yes	29	CEC / Robertson Partnership Homes		Yes
263	Gilmerton Dykes Road	0.26	0.64	20	30	15/04287 granted 30 units 4/2017 to 'Lovell Partnerships'. Social rent	Yes	30		-	Yes
<b>Total</b>		<b>37.6</b>	<b>92.91</b>	<b>1757</b>	<b>1978</b>						
<b>Private</b>					<b>1312</b>						
<b>Affordable</b>					<b>666</b>						

---

# Annex 3 High Probability Sites

---

**High Probability Sites**

Site Reference	Site Name	Hectares	Acres	Housing Land Study Capacity	Revised Assessed Capacity	Planning Status	Site in HLA	HLA Units	Ownership Status	General Constraint	Effective Yes/No
57	Balcarres Street	0.57	1.41	48	10	15/00193 granted for care home + resi 10 units, Rettie	No		Morningside Manor Ltd		Yes
72	Ferry Road	0.27	0.67	9	4	14/00592 COU for 4 units. No other history	No		1 main landowner	Rest of site in industrial use	Yes
3	Powderhall Road	0.71	1.75	66	180	16/06264/Ful granted for 180 Units in 2017 - Artisan Canonmills applicant	No		1 title		Yes
23	Boroughmuir High School	0.86	2.13	32	104	Application for 104 units accepted Aug 18 pending legal agreement	No				Yes
56	Royal Hosp for Sick Children	1.39	3.43	80	126	18/02719 App for 126 units, + 323 student acc units. TBD	No		1 title	Existing hospital.	Yes
71	Slateford Road	0.72	1.78	34	34	11/01669/FUL for resi (34 units), + mixed use, + student acc (220 units) Under construction	No				Yes
116	Clockmill Lane	0.43	1.06	44	30	17/03633 - Murascot Ltd - 30 flats - approved but for legal agreement	No			Car wash currently there.	Yes
205	Rosefield Avenue Lane	0.13	0.32	3	4	18/00866 grants 4 dwellings on site	No		Former church		Yes
234	Calton Road	0.07	0.17	11	24	17/04578/FUL for 24 flats, 1 office awaiting assessment	No		Square and Crescent Ltd	App in and only vacant building to clear. Effective in my opinion	Yes
247	Baileyfield Road	5.96	14.73	387	435	16/05898/FUL granted 20 Apr 2018 for 435 units as part of mixed use development. Applicant - Standard Life Assurances	No			Mostly to be developed. Remaining part a ford car dealership.	Yes
250	Gorgie Road	0.99	2.45	110	163	Spindlehawk Ltd - 17/00422/FUL for c/o/u to resi for 163 units, granted Aug 18	No				Yes
258	Corstorphine Hospital	1.07	2.64	69	76	App 17/04137/FUL for 76 units awaiting assessment - Jan 2019 update - application approved	No		Hospital		Yes
302	Royal Victoria Hospital	6.05	14.95	393	393	14/03299/PAN Application for planning permission in principle in respect of the masterplanning of the Royal Victoria Hospital site for part integrated health and social care purposes, including residential care accommodation (Class 8 and 10), and part residential development (Class 9 houses, and flats), open space, landscaping and new access together with various works including the demolitions	No		HNS	HNS has not yet marketed this site for development.	Yes
27	Oxgangs Green	1.43	3.53	92	85	18/01055/FUL approved pending legal agreement 85 affordable units. Hopefield Partnership	No			Vacant land	Yes
43	Stenhouse Road	3.57	8.82	232	33	App for 33 units on small part of site 18/01429, also student acc granted on other small part 16/04087/FUL, nothing much on rest	No		3 titles + some parts not in land reg	Many industrial buildings on site	Yes
45	Gorgie Road	0.55	1.36	40	23	App for 23 properties 17/00392. Also a gym permitted on part of site	No		2 titles	Some buildings on site	Yes
78	Peffer Bank	0.93	2.30	66	47	18/00391 TBD for 47 flatted units within small part of site. Nothing else	No		2 main owners	Lots substantial buildings, old brewery	Yes
134	South Fort Street	4.02	9.93	402	115	16/03128/FUL granted pending legal agreement for 115 units. Blake/BDW On other parts of site recent apps granted for a gym and a community use centre. Other historic apps 00/00806/OUT & 00/00090/OUT for resi not implemented	No		Several titles, much of site not in land reg.	Site has variety of old warehouses/offices	Yes
<b>Total</b>		<b>29.72</b>	<b>73.44</b>	<b>2118</b>	<b>1886</b>						
<b>Private</b>					<b>1351</b>						
<b>Affordable</b>					<b>535</b>						

---

# Annex 4 Medium Probability Sites

---

Medium Probabilty Sites

Site Reference	Site Name	Hectares	Acres	Housing Land Study Capacity	Revised Assessed Capacity	Planning Status	Site in HLA	HLA Units	Ownership Status	General Constraint	Effective Yes/No
187	Gilmerton Dykes Street	0.26	0.64	22	22	No relevant residential planning history	No		Edinburgh Council / Gilmerton Store Ltd	Site requires demolition / change of use / marketing	Potential
199	Murrayburn Drive	0.41	1.01	44	44	No relevant residential planning history	No		City of Edinburgh Council	Current use - overflow car park for Wester Hails Education Centre	Potential
267	Main Street. Kirkliston	0.15	0.37	6	6	No relevant residential planning history	No		City of Edinburgh Council	Kirkliston Crossroads at capacity	Potential
277	Silverlea	0.79	1.95	45	45	No relevant residential planning history	No		City of Edinburgh Council	Site has been demolished and cleared.	Potential
281	Turnhouse Road (SAICA)	6.27	15.49	627	475	No relevant residential planning history	No		SACIA Pack	Sacia would require re-location. Potential for re-development.	Potential
290	Balgreen	1	2.47	30	30	No relevant residential planning history	No		Edinburgh City Council	Subject to Council disposal / required for Tram work temp storage area?	Potential
294	Gorgie Road	0.46	1.14	55	55	Site not identifiable	No		Unknown	Site not identifiable	Potential
224	Lower Gilmore Place	0.36	0.89	44	20	17/04235/PPP awaiting assessment for resi-glencairn properties, however on other part of site 18/00722 refused and appeal dismissed July 2018 only on inappropriate scale	No		several different titles	Application in although loads of businesses around. They need to redo application	Potential
276	Oxgangs Path	0.12	0.30	4	4	No relevant residential planning history	No		Private	Closed surgery	Potential
1	Dumbryden Road	1.06	2.62	32	32	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Big old warehouse on site (appears unused)	Potential
21	Bath Street	0.06	0.15	4	20	16/06447/FUL app for 20 units refused, at appeal PPA-230-2226	No		Not in land registry	At appeal, old cinema building	Potential
41	Oxgangs Road North	0.98	2.42	24	24	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Just a Vacant Site. It's a covered reservoir.	Potential
62	Gorgie Road 2	3.36	8.30	336	336	only minor history, such as for car wash, temporary potrakabin	No		SP Distribution main owner + BT	Big vacant building, mostly clear though	Potential
79	Harewood Road	0.42	1.04	44	44	Formely part of withdrawn app for niddrie hosing growth area. Also former area for fairground folk	No		Not in land registry	Derelect site, shrubs.	Potential
128	Eyre Terrace	0.1	0.25	22	22	14/01177/PPP granted for M/U but legal ag never concluded, subsequent 16/05454/PPP for M/U withdrawn 08/18. Applicant both is RBS	No		1 title	vacant space	Potential
150	Huntly Street	0.06	0.15	9	9	14/02786 COU to retail/6 flats/3 town houses refused on conservation area impact - Mountlake the applicant	No		1 title		Potential
153	West Annandale Street	0.13	0.32	13	13	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Looks possible to redevelop	Potential
<b>Total</b>		<b>15.99</b>	<b>39.51</b>	<b>1361</b>	<b>1201</b>						
<b>Private</b>					<b>901</b>						
<b>Affordable</b>					<b>300</b>						

---

# Annex 5 Alternative Uses

---

Alternative Uses

Site Reference	Site Name	Hectares	Acres	Housing Land Study Capacity	Revised Assessed Capacity	Planning Status	Site in HLA	HLA Units	Ownership Status	General Constraint	Effective Yes/No
42	Robb's Loan	0.93	2.30	110	0	17/03675 granted to be Napier student accommodation	No		1 owner	Former govt buildings, to be student accom	No
44	Slateford Road	1.41	3.48	141	0	App for new Lidl granted. Built	No		1 main title	Jewson, plus new lidl	No
201	Oxgangs Road North	0.38	0.94	24	0	14/03807 grants permission for an Aldi	No		Aldi	Aldi just built out	No
4	Easter Road	0.39	0.96	44	0	The majority of this site has planning for a Lidl	No		2 landowners	To be a lidl	No
5	St Leonards Street (Homebase)	0.74	1.83	71	0	14/03643/FUL allowed on appeal for student acc/mixed use	No		One landowner	built out student acc	No
120	Bothwell Street	0.43	1.06	71	0	14/05255 granted 2015 for 240 bed student acc	No			Completed 2017	No
123	Calton Road	0.11	0.27	22	0	17/00861 granted 2017 for student acc	No			To be student acc. Foermly big old warehouse	No
143	Albert Street	0.52	1.28	55	0	Built Out student acc	No			Built out	No
90	48 Watson Crescent	0.09	0.22	11	0	2013 app to form changing rooms and showers	No		Not in land registry	Active Community club	No
225	Eastfield	0.63	1.56	21	0	No relevant residential planning history	No		1 title	Booker wholesale goos site.	No
6	Broomhouse Road	0.45	1.11	16	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Storage/industrial buildings that appear in good use	No
7	West Bowling Green Street	0.58	1.43	55	0	No relevant planning history	No		South Fort St Business park. 1 title.	Howdens joinery co and dulux decorator centre have businesses here	No
9	Bonnington Road	0.67	1.66	64	0	Only historic apps relating to industrial/retail uses	No		Esson properties and ATS euromaster among owners	5/6+ companies operating out of this site	No
10	Bangor Road	2.05	5.07	205	0	Only few apps for various offices on the site including a new gym, a new charity office, boxing club etc.	No		1 main title	Many business in use across site.	No
11	Commercial Street	0.59	1.46	88	0	16/01771 for a New Aldi granted by appeal PPA-230-2193. No history on warehouse on other part of site	No			Aldi being built + other warehouse in good use by 'Kinloch Anderson'	No
12	St Clair Street	2.66	6.57	266	0	No relevant planning history	No		DFW + Watwish Properties (run by Katherine and Nicola Wishart), + Speedy Asset Services.	Main owners, the Wisharts, not willing to sell	No
16	Duddingston Park South	0.46	1.14	18	0	10 and 14 apps related to industrial use	No		1 proprieor: Forth Sector	Industrial buildings in use	No
20	North Forth Street	1.29	3.19	129	0	12/02359 COU to office (nursery remains as existing). Applicant - Council	No		Council	Nursery and Office	No
24	Royal Blind School	1.42	3.51	70	0	09/03075 was approved to reduce school size and incorporate resi but doesn't seem to have been built out, no other history	No		Royal Blind School	School	No
25	Cameron House Avenue	0.18	0.44	22	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry, I guess the council	Part of school playground	No
29	Burdiehouse Crescent	2	4.94	130	0	18/02172/FUL awaiting decision for a new school	No		Not in land registry	Vacant land	No
34	Broomhouse Terrace	3.95	9.76	118	0	some apps from last few years relating to current business use	No		Not in land reg. Compnay - Mitie made one of the apps. Graham/Sibb agents	Saughton House Govt Offices	No
35	Murrayburn Gate	0.53	1.31	55	0	16 app for an equipment cabinet. No other planning history	No		Not in land registry	Some big buildings on part of site.	No
36	Glasgow Road	3.08	7.61	200	0	Only apps relating to hotel	No		1 main owner	It is a big hotel. Unsure why this is in the study	No
37	Murrayburn Road	3.06	7.56	198	0	No relevant planning history	No		Only small part has a title	Site has large main building appears to be in use	No
38	Dumbryden Drive	0.8	1.98	88	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Site is in industrial use.	No
40	Colinton Road	0.55	1.36	15	0	17 application for new school gates. Colinton Conservation Area	No		3+ owners lead proprietors BT and Assura Aspire	It's a surgery	No
49	Corstorphine Road	0.8	1.98	27	0	No relevant planning history	No		Proprietor - Scottish Ministers	Govt buildings	No
50	West Pilton Brae	0.63	1.56	61	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	It is a youth centre	No
54	Moreduvale Road	0.41	1.01	15	0	Section 50 certificate granted Sept 18 for alcohol licence - it's a pub.	No		Jolly Farmer	Jolly Farmer pub	No
55	Cameron Park	0.18	0.44	3	0	App granted in 2010 for 1 house although doesn't appear to have been built	No		2 titles	Some old centre for something	No
58	Gorgie Park Close	0.72	1.78	88	0	10/03584/FUL granted for music/arts centre, 13/00039/FUL granted for COU to educational	No		1 title	1 main building	No
60	Westfield Avenue	0.26	0.64	60	0	Only historic apps relating to industrial/retail uses	No		1 title	1 industrial building, Grant Westfield building interiors.	No
75	Duddingston Park South	0.22	0.54	4	0	Classed as open space in LDP. Only apps related to sports club use	No		Not in land registry	Car park for local sports club	No
80	Craigmillar Castle Avenue	0.39	0.96	33	0	13 app to form social club granted	No		Not in land registry	Early years centre in use	No
81	London Road (Meadowbank)	3.75	9.27	112	0	No relevant planning history other than Open space designation in LDP	No		1 title over stadium, reest not in land reg	a stadium and velodrome	No
84	Maxwell Street	0.18	0.44	22	0	No relevant planning history	No		Lead proprietor name: TELERREAL	Old telephone exchange building	No
85	Falcon Road West	0.19	0.47	22	0	No relevant planning history	No		Presumably Royal Mail, other part not in land reg	Sorting Office plus other industrial building	No
88	Temple Park Crescent	0.17	0.42	22	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Existing buildings appear to be doing fine	No
89	Watson Crescent	0.09	0.22	11	0	No relevant planning history	No		1 owner. Gavin Gray	Auto business est.1988	No
93	Viewforth Terrace	0.21	0.52	22	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Viewforth Early Years Centre	No
94	Gillespie Crescent	1.17	2.89	117	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Already flats here, unsure how this could be done	No
95	Crewe Road South	6.32	15.62	410	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	This is Fettes Avenue Police HQ + a playing field	No
99	Murieston Lane	0.41	1.01	44	0	No relevant planning history	No		Several diff titles and some not in land reg	Site full of old buildings	No
100	Dundee Terrace	0.18	0.44	22	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	Flooring business operating	No
106	Orchard Brae Avenue	0.93	2.30	110	0	Only office related apps	No		1 main title	Big old brutalist office building named Orchard brae House. Refurb underway http://www.obh-edinburgh.com/	No
107	Orchard Brae	0.83	2.05	88	0	No relevant planning history	No		1 main title	Large office building named Finance House and appears to be to do with Lloyds TSB	No
109	Glenogle Road	0.62	1.53	77	0	No relevant planning history	No		Standard Life lead proprietor	Office block	No
110	Inverleith Row	1.86	4.60	186	0	Only office related apps	No		Tanfield House	Tanfield House Offices	No
112	Albert Street	0.19	0.47	22	0	No relevant planning history	No		Proprietor: CITY PLUMBING SUPPLIES	Existing warehouse appears to be in use	No
113	Hawkhill Avenue	0.15	0.37	40	0	No planning history	No		Not in land registry	Some old small building	No
115	London Road	0.9	2.22	77	0	Only apps related to restaurant/business use	No		1 main title, rest not in land reg	McDonalds, Boots opticians, et al	No
125	Lutton Place	0.36	0.89	44	0	13/04278 approved 2014 for student accc	No			Being built	No
126	St Leonards Street (car park)	0.2	0.49	16	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	It's a car park	No
130	India Place	0.06	0.15	11	0	No relevant planning history	No		Not in land registry	This is Stockbridge Health Centre	No
135	North Junction Street	0.16	0.40	22	0	Only recent apps to replace/upgrade windows	No		1 title, many owners	Old building	No
136	Coburg Street	1.06	2.62	106	0	Ancient monument adjacent. 06/01851 withdrawn for resi/M.U., 10/00795 fore retail w/d. Applicant for both since passed away.	No		Few diff owners although 2 main ones	Several industrial buildings mostly in good use, MOT centre etc	No
137	Sandport Place	0.26	0.64	33	0	No planning history	No		Not in land registry	Office and warehouse, looks to be in use	No
138	Bangor Road	0.92	2.27	99	0	No relevant planning history	No		Racepool Ltd and Edinburgh Woollen Mill Ltd, + 1 other title	Clothes warehouse/shop and coach depot, both in good use	No
141	Albion Street	0.04	0.10	11	0	03/01372 app for 5 story resi withdrawn in 2003. Nothing since	No		Not in land registry	old buildings/storage containers on site.	No
142	Iona Street	0.54	1.33	55	0	No planning history	No		Not in land registry	Timber yard appears to be in use	No

144	McDonald Place	1.03	2.55	66	0	Only apps related to current retail use	No		1 main owner	It's a big shop called Batleys	No
146	Logie Green Road	0.5	1.24	26	0	No planning history	No		Not in land registry	Lady Haigs Poppy Factory - Poppy scotland have an office	No
147	McDonald Road	0.25	0.62	30	0	Just historical apps relating to offices	No		Housing Assc.	Hanover Scotland Housing Assc office	No
148	East Claremont Street	0.31	0.77	33	0	No relevant planning history	No		School	Broughton Primary School	No
151	Eyre Place	0.41	1.01	51	0	Only apps relating to industrial/business use	No		2 titles - Wolesley centre and Kinleith ind. Est. remainder of site not in land reg	Big Jewson builders yard	No
152	Canonmills	0.2	0.49	33	0	Only apps relating to petrol station	No		1 title	M&S petrol station	No
155	Gayfield Square	0.13	0.32	11	0	Only apps related to Police Station	No		Not in land registry	It's an active police station	No
156	Ferry Road	0.13	0.32	4	0	Petrol Station refurb refused 14/03724. Applicant Motor Fuel Group	No		1 owner. Likely 'Motor Fuel Group'	Petrol Station	No
158	Pitt Street	0.45	1.11	64	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	5 Owners comprise the site area.	Multiple businesses/leases in operation	No
161	Leith Walk Depot.	1.04	2.57	104	0	17/02612/FUL   Demolition of the old tram depot on Leith Walk. Multiple uses for the site are proposed following demolition: 1) west side of site to be utilised as a temporary social market hub 2) Remainder of site to be used for site laydown, office space and storage for the Edinburgh Tram extension from York Place to Newhaven. Application WITHDRAWN	No	0	Owned by Edinburgh City Council	Currently no mention of residential use proposed for the future of the site	No
164	Queen Charlotte Street	0.11	0.27	11	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0		Going concern - Headstart Nursery School	No
168	Bridge Road	0.11	0.27	3	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Unknown	Going concern - local businesses	No
171	Crewe Road North	0.3	0.74	33	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Unknown	Unknown site / perhaps demolition of existing affordable stock?	No
173	Inchview Terrace	0.43	1.06	4	0	14/04780/FUL   Development of 60 bed care home with ancillary facilities including a cafe, library, activity spaces and externally a new car park and access.   99 Inchview Terrace Edinburgh EH7 6TJ Application granted 7th Aug 2015	No	0	Careuk	Site developed as a care home	No
174	Piershill Terrace	0.19	0.47	22	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Salvation Army Trading Company Ltd	Ownership / change of use	No
175	Blinkbony Grove West	0.64	1.58	12	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0		Current going concern - Holiday Inn Hotel	No
177	Maybury Drive	0.3	0.74	9	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0		Site in use - Maybury telephone Exchange. New equipment installed in 2016/17.	No
179	Strathearn Road	0.21	0.52	6	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Royal Mail / Farmer Autocare	Ownership - Royal Mail Edinburgh South Delivery office and Farmer autocare - unwilling sellers.	No
181	Liberton Brae (South)	0.1	0.25	4	0	18/03617/FUL   Demolish existing office, garage and no's 224-234 Mayfield Road. Erect purpose built student accommodation comprising 158 self contained studios. rooms over 5 levels (83 studio rooms previously consented) with associated access and landscaping. Application pending assessment.	No	0		Site to be developed for student accommodation	No
182	Liberton Brae (North)	0.08	0.20	3	0	16/04158/FUL   Demolish existing public house/restaurant. Erect purpose built managed student accommodation comprising 89 self contained studio flats over 5 levels. Application granted 14th Feb 2017	No	0		Site to be developed for student accommodation	No
183	Double Hedges Road	0.4	0.99	9	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Scottish Fire Service	In use as Liberton Community fire station	No
185	Mount Vernon Street	0.26	0.64	7	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0		In use as a telephone exchange and Electrical sub station.	No
186	Ellen's Glen Road (Blood Transfusion Centre)	4.03	9.96	261	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	NHS	Subject to NHS disposal.	No
188	Rae's Crescent	0.84	2.08	24	0	07/02506/FUL   Change of use of the listed building to offices, erection of 159 1, 2 + 3 bedroom flats   41 Howden Hall Road Edinburgh EH16 6PG Application refused - Over development of site / affecting the setting of listed buildings / design. 08/03776/FUL   Change of use of the Balmwell from hotel/public house to offices, erection of 70, one and two bed flats and 29, 3/4 bed - townhouses and semi-detached houses   41 Howden Hall Road Edinburgh EH16 6PG Application Withdrawn	No	0	Edinburgh Council / Edenlaw West Ltd	Current overflow carpark/open space. No application has come forward since the refusal/withdrawal in 07/08. A revised lower capacity may not be viable, a higher capacity may not be achievable due to design, heritage and environmental concerns.	No
190	Alnwickhill Road	1.2	2.97	36	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Territorial Army	Used as a Military recruiting office no known intention to sell	No
191	Craiglockhart Avenue	0.23	0.57	22	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0		Current Use office space. No known intention to sell.	No
192	Inglis Green Road	0.51	1.26	12	0	13/05243/PPP   Erect 12 Flats comprising 4 x 2-bed flats and 8 x 1-bed flats on existing vacant brownfield site.   36 Inglis Green Road Edinburgh EH14 2ER Application withdrawn 16/05935/FUL   Change of use from office (class 4) to dance studio (class 11)   32 Inglis Green Road Edinburgh Application granted March 2014	No	0	Matthews Food (Scotland) Ltd	The site previously proposed for 12 units has been withdrawn and is leased and used as a dance studio and beautician.	No
193	Lanark Road	0.82	2.03	55	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Territorial Army	The site is used as the 32 Signal Regiment/51 Signal Squadron Barracks and Parachute Regiment Reserve centre. No known intention to sell.	No
195	Longstone Road	0.47	1.16	13	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Unknown	Used as a depot. Flooding concerns from Murray Burn. Access constraint to Longstone Road, width and visibility.	No
196	Dumbryden Drive	0.27	0.67	22	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Police Scotland	Current use as a police station - no known intention to sell.	No
197	Sighthill Loan	0.4	0.99	33	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Church of Scotland	Current use St. Nicholas Church of Scotland. No known intention to sell.	No
198	Sighthill Drive	0.44	1.09	14	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Roman Catholic Church	Current Use St. John Ogilvie RC Church. No known intention to sell.	No
200	Clovenstone Drive	0.23	0.57	22	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0	Baptist Church	Current Use - Wester Hailes Baptist Church. No known intention to sell.	No
202	Lanark Road West	0.27	0.67	10	0	No relevant residential planning history	No		Council?	Currently Currie Community Centre w meeting spaces and football pitch	No
203	Lanark Road West	0.14	0.35	7	0	No relevant residential planning history	No		Not in land reg	Current car sales court and MOT/repair centre	No
206	Rosefield Avenue	0.07	0.17	11	0	No relevant residential planning history	No		Council	This is Portobello Library	No
208	Windsor Place (2)	0.07	0.17	1	0	No relevant residential planning history	No		Owners - of the relevant resi, + car company bit in a different title	Part seems to already be resi, other part a car repair company	No
212	Figgate Street	0.13	0.32	5	0	No planning history	No		Only owners of resi	Currently already resi with a car park.	No
213	Stanley Road	0.31	0.77	33	0	No planning history	No		Not in land reg	Works yard/depot in use no indicator of this changing	No

215	The Loan	1.5	3.71	45	0	Most of the site was developed for retail and resi in the early 00s and the other part is functioning retail	No	Some different owners, some not in land reg	Current uses are functioning	No
216	Builyleon Road	0.53	1.31	10	0	Recent apps extending hotel	No	Premier Inn	Current Premier Inn	No
218	Hopeton Road	0.16	0.40	5	0	2016 app for a BT cabinet	No	Owned by Telereal Securities Property + BT	Used for BT services	No
219	Roseberry Avenue	0.58	1.43	19	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	Owned by the dental surgery and the health centre	BUPA dental care + "The haven" care centre	No
220	Roseberry Avenue	0.1	0.25	4	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	1 title	Currently a fire station	No
222	Station Road, Ratho	0.44	1.09	14	0	Only historical apps related to industrial use	No	Not in land reg	In business/industrial use 4x4 hire and another car-related use	No
223	Telford Road	0.48	1.19	55	0	17/02440 grants permission for a care home, 19 Dec 2017, Northcare.	No	"Home in Scotland Ltd" and "Northcare (Scotland) Ltd"	To become a care home for the elderly	No
226	Royston Terrace	0.15	0.37	11	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	1 title but mostly not in land reg	site partly slightly derelict, partly in good use as motor company	No
227	Seafield Road	0.39	0.96	44	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	Not in land reg	Site in use as SIG roofing Maybe possible in future	No
229	Craigour Gardens	0.35	0.86	10	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	Not in land reg	Tron Kirk, Gilmerton	No
230	Broughton Road	0.09	0.22	11	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	1 title	Industrial Doors Scotland - Scotland's premier industrial door company since 1968.	No
232	Gilmerton Station Road	6.93	17.12	207	0	18/01557 app for mixed use (retail, services, food, business, hotel, lesiure TBD	No	Only couple of small areas in land reg	Intention is to build a retail/office development here, see if Council approves.	No
233	West Pilton Grove	0.42	1.04	55	0	No planning history	No	guessing Council	"West pilton Neighbourhood Centre", offering activities, clubs and classes for the local community	No
237	Calder Estate (I)	0.21	0.52	33	0	No planning history	No	Council I guess	Open space on current housing estate	No
238	Calder Estate (H)	0.15	0.37	22	0	No planning history	No	Council I guess	Open space and road on current housing estate	No
239	Calder Estate (J)	0.1	0.25	11	0	No planning history	No	Council I guess	Open space and car park on current housing estate	No
240	Calder Estate (K)	0.21	0.52	22	0	No planning history	No	Council I guess	Open space and car park on current housing estate	No
243	Calder Estate (G)	0.43	1.06	44	0	No planning history	No	Council I guess	Open space and car park on current housing estate.	No
244	Calder Estate (A)	0.11	0.27	22	0	No planning history	No	Council I guess	Open space and car park on current housing estate.	No
245	Calder Estate (B,C,D)	0.2	0.49	6	0	No planning history	No	Council I guess	Open space and car park on current housing estate.	No
248	Colinton Mains Drive	0.36	0.89	11	0	14/00335 approved 2014 for GP/NHS/Council use	No		Been built out as not resi use	No
249	Watertoun Road	0.85	2.10	30	0	No history	No		It's St Crispins school for additional needs for god sake	No
253	Westfield Road	0.15	0.37	22	0	No planning history	No	Council I guess	Gorgie Memorial Hall.	No
255	McDonald Road	0.61	1.51	77	0	Previous 1999 outline app for resi refused other than that only a couple of apps related to business use	No	2 main titles	Currently big indstrial/office buildings including Capital document solutions	No
257	Chalmers Street (Eye Pavilion)	0.21	0.52	22	0	Apps related to eye hospital use	No	Hospital	It's Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion, no sign of this discontinuing	No
259	Astley Ainslie Hospital	18.7	46.21	560	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	Hospital	No recent news, maybe in future	No
264	Leith Walk	0.13	0.32	22	0	14/03513 granted for student accom to S Harrison Development Ltd	No		Student accomodation + mixed use built out	No
268	Harewood Road	0.53	1.31	44	0	08/02553/OUT   Erection of mixed use development including, residential (houses + apartments), residential care homes (class 8), business (class 4), retail (class 1), food store (class 1) (including cafe), petrol filling station, classes 2 and 3, Community High School (including public library, cafe and sports/ leisure facility), Train Station, with associated landscaping, infrastructure and car parking - Withdrawn Nov 2016	No	0 Parc Craigmillar	Business and Industry Area. Adjacent allocation and regeneration of HSG 14 will take priority. Not effective.	No
279	Parkview	0.35	0.86	23	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 Private	Operating as Park View House Hotel	No
280	Clovenstone House	0.67	1.66	66	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 City of Edinburgh Council	Operating as a care home	No
282	Turnhouse Road	3.25	8.03	211	211	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 Private	Ex quarry site - viability issues of ground conditions and buying out of existing long term leases. Not effective.	No
288	Spylaw	0.18	0.44	22	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 Private	Operating businesses / Waddell's Garage	No
289	Liberton Hospital	2.67	6.60	173	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 NHS	Subject to NHS disposal. Not effective.	No
293	Westfield Avenue, Wickes	0.68	1.68	66	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 AXA	Site subject to a lease to a going concern Wickes. Owner not willing to sell, not effective.	No
295	McDonald Road (Fire Station)	0.55	1.36	55	0	17/04803/FUL McDonald Road Fire Station 93 Mcdonald Road Edinburgh EH7 4NS Internal and external alterations to existing fire station on McDonald Road, including new elevational treatment to Dryden Terrace and McDonald Road elevations and reconfiguration of the existing McDonald Road Fire Station to provide a modern fire station, LSO regional headquarters, facilities for support staff, the community and a community engagement centre	No	0 Scottish Fire Service	Given recent refurbishment of existing building, indication is unlikely to sell.	No
296	Leith Walk/Manderston Street	0.58	1.43	44	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 Two separate owners, Council and Mecca Bingo	Access / demolition	No
297	Inglis Green 2	0.14	0.35	11	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 Unknown	Going Concern - Oriental Supermarket inlikely to sell	No
299	Roseburn Terrace	0.69	1.71	42	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 City of Edinburgh Council	Conservation Area / Local Nature Conservation Site / Open Space / adjacent to Tram Route Safeguard with Proposed Stop	No
300	Keir Street	0.15	0.37	22	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	0 The University of Edinburgh - Edinburgh College of Art	Car park for current university use	No
48	Traquair Park	0.45	1.11	55	0	17/03433 refused for 51 units and appeal PPA-230-2235 dismissed 4/10/18 - Dandara	No	1 owner, ROSEMARY LENNOX	Old vacant office building,	No
124	Ratcliffe Terrace	0.66	1.63	66	0	No relevant planning history	No	Part - National tyre Service, part not in land reg	Old buildings, businesses present	No
127	St Leonards Street (Police Station)	0.35	0.86	66	0	Only several police-use related apps	No	Not in land registry	It's a police station in use	No
265	Leith Walk	0.34	0.84	33	0	Student accom now 16/00191/FUL	No		Student accom now built out	No
266	Niddrie Mains Road	1.21	2.99	78	0	14/03416/PPP granted to Parc Craigmillar Ltd in Sep 2015 for new town centre at craigmillar. At this particular section it is to be a foodstore	No		to be a foodstore	No
61	Stevenson Road	2.04	5.04	132	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	4 separate titles and some not in land reg	Several large buildings in use as industrial/office and different owners	No
210	Joppa Road	0.1	0.25	2	0	No relevant residential planning history	No	1 title	former piano showroom, was being marketed earlier this year http://www.ime.co.uk/ime-market-former-piano-showroom/ unsure if resi co or other co would have bought it	No
98	Washington Lane	0.23	0.57	33	0	No relevant planning history	No	Not in land registry	Auto services, dentist, and some flats already	No
91	Dundee Street	1.08	2.67	108	0	Student accommodation approved 2017 15/05422/FUL	No	3 titles		No
<b>Total</b>		<b>124.76</b>	<b>308.29</b>	<b>8271</b>	<b>211</b>					

Private				158
Affordable				53