

Submitted	your-preference	Comment
2016-05-10 09:34:	I support the proposal.	Good for the area and kids
2016-05-10 09:40:	I support the proposal.	I find the noise and litter issues ridiculous as the noise and mess from people using the beach is far worse . This is a great use of a piece of scub land , the guys pricing is not a problem if he contributes to repairing the grass at the end of the season.
2016-05-10 09:41:	I support the proposal.	It's good for kids to have some place to play outside and the bouncy castle provided this. I do agree that it was slightly expensive but the kids always seemed to get longer than the allotted 10 minutes.  I live next to Straiton Place park and I didn't have an issue with the noise.
2016-05-10 09:41:	I support the proposal.	Seems like a good compromise to me!
2016-05-10 09:47:	I support the proposal.	I would love to see the bouncy castle back, my kids aged 3 and 8 both loved it. I agree that it should come on holidays - it is a special treat for special occasions. I can see that 2.50, which is 5 pounds a go if you have 2 kids is a bit steep. However, I think this isn't unreasonable - better value for money than fairground rides, and I'm happy to explain to my kids that we can't go every day.
2016-05-10 09:52:	I support the proposal.	My sons and their cousins loved visiting the castle for a bounce over Easter - a great use of this rather wasted space.
2016-05-10 09:59:	I support the proposal.	My children looked forward to going at the weekends/holidays as a treat and have been asking when it will be back. We took visitors too and all felt it added to the current amenities on the prom.
2016-05-10 10:00:	I support the proposal.	I don't think the price is a problem £2.50 seems a fair price.
2016-05-10 10:11:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-10 10:13:	I support the proposal.	I think it is a great pull to the area and is fun for the kids. I do however think that the 6 week stretch over the summer is very long and if it is allowed back, id like to see some sort of sibling discount /loyalty scheme, but also limit the hours (9-5?) so it doesn't become anti social for the local residents.
2016-05-10 10:19:	I support the proposal.	It was a great way of getting the kids to excersise.
2016-05-10 10:21:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-10 10:28:	I support the proposal.	It's good for there to be a variety of things for children to do in the area. The bouncy castle occupied ground not regularly used.
2016-05-10 10:29:	I am neutral on this propo	I think it's a great idea to allow various activities on these bits of land but the residents nearby should be given some respite and maybe not have it on every time there's a holiday/limit the amount of consecutive days and "event" can run for. Only fair.
2016-05-10 10:32:	I support the proposal.	try to reduce the noise' leaves alot of wiggle room. Insist on noise reduction insist on a loyalty scheme, don't suggest, demand. And also demand you have something in writing from the individual ( not his ltd company that can disappear that the land is reinstated.
2016-05-10 10:32:	I support the proposal.	Brilliant fun
2016-05-10 10:35:	I support the proposal.	I think this bouncy castle is soo of for portobello! It brings the people down to the beach which has so many benefits, the children's well being, getting child out and about! Also while learning about the beach and the area! And most of all... For local business! He doesn't ask for much price wise so I think it would be a great loss to see it not be aloud back!
2016-05-10 10:54:	I object to the proposal.	The 6 - 7 weeks from 30th June to 17 August is too long for one, profit-making entity to have sole use of this PUBLIC space. This is a square of grass used by families and individuals to enjoy the prom without being on the beach, it's simply unfair that it be given over to a business with a market restricted to children. The castle itself is ugly and out of keeping with the locality. There are plenty of places it could be erected along the prom, possibly on a rotating basis. Straiton Place is not the only option but it is one of few grass spaces in the area.
2016-05-10 10:54:	I support the proposal.	Because the majority of the parents and kids in the area are clearly in favour of this.
2016-05-10 11:02:	I support the proposal.	It brings life, colour and vibrancy to the area and that's what we want to encourage.  As for noise, this is a 'red herring' for a lot of Porty initiatives. On a sunny day, noise levels will increase substantially, regardless of whether we have a bouncy castle with a generator. Consequently, the opposite is true when the weather is poor.
2016-05-10 11:09:	I am neutral on this propo	My Daughter loved this, she went everyday, staff are friendly and kind.

2016-05-10 11:13:	I support the proposal.	Great for the Prom and Portobello. The kids love it.
2016-05-10 11:21:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-10 11:30:	I support the proposal.	This was a great activity for local kids . It was run professionally with little noise
2016-05-10 11:33:	I support the proposal.	I love the sound of kids having a great time.
2016-05-10 11:34:	I support the proposal.	Kids loved it, good price, really nice guy who ran it
2016-05-10 11:43:	I object to the proposal.	It is next to one of my children's nurseries which prompts daily tantrums. It is on the school run for the other. It spoils the view from Straiton Place and it looks awful. Move it further up the beach if it has to be here. It also makes parking in Straiton Place even harder which is difficult for nursery drop off.
2016-05-10 12:36:	I support the proposal.	I would like to see it there more often than the dates listed and I believe the pricing is fair.
2016-05-10 12:53:	I support the proposal.	It would be nice to see an alternative to the heras fencing.
2016-05-10 13:05:	I support the proposal.	I think the bouncy castle is a great fun experience for the children of this area. They have fun, get some exercise and get some fresh air. I'm aware that the same experience can be had from the beach and playpark...which are of course free. But, what's fun about something like this is that in a weird way it's great leveller. There are lots of summer experiences - holidays abroad, flights, summer sports activity clubs, the kind of day trips that can be had in cars, that an increasing number of people just don't have and can't afford. The reasons for that are complex. But most folk can afford £2.50 or whatever price comes from this consultation. And most kids...whatever financial constraints or advantages divide them the rest of the time...enjoy a bounce. And maybe that bounce leads them to smile at someone they've never noticed or shared an activity with before. That seems more important than whether or not someone's view is affected, or whether it gets a bit busy on the prom for a while. No?
2016-05-10 13:26:	I support the proposal.	I live opposite this and I did not find it to be a nuisance at all in facet I found it cheerful and fitting for a seaside area. The staff seemed sensible and in control whenever I passed by and if council safety offices have approved then I see no problem with it. Of course ground must be reinstated afterwards but otherwise would like it to stay over the summer.
2016-05-10 13:41:	I support the proposal.	It brought a different variety of fun and the owner was very fair
2016-05-10 13:56:	I support the proposal.	I'm not keen for it to be there all the time, but its a lovely treat for the holidays. Makes it more special. I'm indifferent about weekends. £2.50 is not much for a child, but if you have 3 then it mounts up. Maybe a family price or something. But then if it's only there occasionally it doesn't matter so much.
2016-05-10 14:45:	I am neutral on this propo	I would love for this to come back as my boys love it being here,its a great thing for the beach,there is nothing for the kids apart from the parks,I would love it to be here all the time,its a shame that some kids miss out because of one person moaning about it,the man that run it was great with the kids and he always gave them extra time if it wasn't busy,he was great with the adults and he never once but pressure on us to make our kids go on it
2016-05-10 15:01:	I support the proposal.	My wee one absolutely loved it and was gutted when it went
2016-05-10 16:50:	I am neutral on this propo	Yes. Kids loved it. Great value.
2016-05-10 17:03:	I support the proposal.	Portobello is a seaside town and should have more attractions like this in the summer months to get more people down to the beach. I think holidays and weekends is a good compromise.
2016-05-10 17:41:	I support the proposal.	It's fun and active treat for kids . We are to be encouraging active play
2016-05-10 18:06:	I support the proposal.	My son and his friends loved the bouncy castle. I think it's a great addition to Porty beach, particularly at the weekends and holidays. Give a seaside feel to the place!
2016-05-10 18:08:	I object to the proposal.	I think it's over priced and I have avoided going to that section of the beach to try avoid it as my wee one wants on it. Will just make me use the hoops end more and avoid this end in future.
2016-05-10 18:21:	I support the proposal.	Yes, great fun for children. Loyalty scheme for local children would be fantastic. Beachfront location ideal. Will encourage visitors to the prom if there is more to do as the play parks are quite limited.
2016-05-10 18:32:	I support the proposal.	It is great for kids.
2016-05-10 19:21:	I support the proposal.	Yes as portobello was a place for kids to go and have fun they took most stuff away and soon there will be nothing but old grumpy adults so they can walk there dogs and mone if they see any kids. Portobello is a joke now snobby place for stuck up arseholes that like a mone. That's all u ever get on porty people is curtain twitchers saying a lot of shit like a seen 3 kids go down Ma street look out for them haha joke piss them off and bring it back let the kids have fun it's not like it's on open till all hours please bring it back

2016-05-10 19:22:	I support the proposal.	I think this is great for the children here and the applicant delivered excellent customer service when here in April. We were disappointed when they left.
2016-05-10 20:00:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-10 20:14:	I support the proposal.	It's used to be a pleasure beach. Now it's just a beach. Hardly anything for the children. The parks are small and old fashion. Just a sheer lack of money put into the area!! I hope the kids have their bouncy castle back!!
2016-05-10 20:17:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-10 22:52:	I support the proposal.	The noise from the blower is hardly audible as it is. The price for the bouncy castle is acceptable. I can not understand the opposition for this castle the children enjoyed it and it was an attraction to portobello for visitors helping local shops etc
2016-05-11 00:40:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-11 01:09:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-11 03:25:	I object to the proposal.	I know the lady who lives next door, her kitchen diner on the other side of the fence. The noise is loud and must be very stressful to put up with it. Also the houses that look on to the patch of grass have the bouncy castle as their view.  Another solution would be to have it in Saturday's and Sunday's only and on Bank Holidays.  Portobello beach is a Conservation Area and the bouncy castle takes over. Surely there are bouncy castles elsewhere where people can visit on a day out.  What's wrong with sand, sea and buckets and spades?
2016-05-11 07:32:	I object to the proposal.	I object to this proposal. I don't think this monstrosity adds anything to Portobello at all. I feel that money spent on an exciting playground for children would be money well spent and I would definitely support this - the present playground is unimaginative and dull. The noise from the generators was disturbing and distressing for some residents - I suspect some of the rabid supporters of the castle may not be so enthusiastic about it if the generator was outside their door all day. Views were obscured for others. A premium is paid by home owners for sea views which are then marred by a ghastly, garish plastic castle. Streets leading down to the sea are supposed to have splays which offer uninterrupted views of the sea. A bouncy castle is not in keeping at all with the ethos of a conservation area. Again, residents pay a premium to live in such an area and have to go through rigorous planning applications to make changes to their homes. For example, 'plastic' windows are not allowed - yet a giant plastic, multi-coloured monstrosity is! Parking in this area is already a nightmare. Cars are regularly scratched and bumped. This castle will potentially add to this problem. Children in Portobello are privileged to have a huge length of beach to play on. There is Tumbles for indoor play, a swimming pool and two swing parks on the prom. Bouncy castles are notoriously dangerous. Children of varying ages are usually on at the same time and this can lead to injury and even death - Google it. I'm unsure if they are even able to gain insurance due to the inherent dangers. The bouncy castle has led to unpleasant disputes on Porty People (although this is a regular occurrence for most topics) with people objecting to it being called snobs, kill-joys etc. This has put a lot of people in a difficult position. Of course it is lovely to see children enjoying themselves (I used to be one myself, I have some of my own as well as grandchildren!) and I would really welcome an imaginative, safe and exciting play park in this area where the sound of children's laughter (when it isn't obscured by a noisy generator) is not dependent on a large plastic monstrosity to jump on. Buckets and spades?
2016-05-11 07:32:	I support the proposal.	It will provide an additional attraction that could benefit shops and cafes in Portobello.
2016-05-11 07:51:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-11 08:02:	I object to the proposal.	I don't think it lends much if anything to the promenade, apart from a money making operation for the owners. There is a beach, the sea, amusements, playpark, cafes and the promenade itself already available for childrens entertainment. Bouncy castles, inflatables, call them what you want, are generally a funpark staple and this particular one is too big. There are surely better options to utilise the space, ie. food stalls, markets, putting greens, educational installations, sculpture park....i could go on. It does also make a mess of the ground and i'm not sure it would be restored in reality. Having said all this, it is an eyesore as it stands anyway and a crying shame it's not used for something useful. How is it left unused and in bad state anyway?

2016-05-11 08:07:	I object to the proposal.	The residents most affected by this appeared to have reasonable objections regarding constant noise and blocked views. Although I have 2 young children who would love to have access to the inflatable, the impact on those residents in the immediate vicinity appears to be too great.
2016-05-11 08:08:	I object to the proposal.	
2016-05-11 08:14:	I object to the proposal.	The Bouncy Castle is large and intrusive but provides remarkably little to stimulate the mind or exercise the body. The Childrens' Play Park and Sand Pit opposite is much better value educationally and costs end users nothing.
2016-05-11 08:15:	I object to the proposal.	<p>I live next door to the park. My understanding that this is a public space. I welcome the space being used for the benefit and recreation of local residents and visitors to Portobello, but approving a bouncy castle for a further 8 weeks plus 5 weekends over one summer appears to me wholly excessive.</p> <p>I am very keen to know if the local community would benefit at all from this commercial enterprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are those running the business paying rent for the space?</li> <li>- Are any of the profits reinvested in the local community (eg for upgrading this or other spaces?)</li> </ul> <p>If not, I fail to see how this can be approved by the council as being in the best interests of the community.</p> <p>If this space is considered available for use, there are many creative ways it could be used by local groups or small enterprises that would be of sustainable benefit to the community (and cause less noise/ disturbance!).</p> <p>IF the application for the business to continue were approved by the council, in my opinion there is no question that the business owners should pay for the ground to be reinstated at the end of the season. This is the very least that would be expected.</p>
2016-05-11 08:15:	I object to the proposal.	The proposal is out of keeping with the environment. Destroys residential amenity with noise, visual pollution and damage to the grass. Excludes other park users whilst in place removing our residential amenity. Simply not appropriate for the site. Leaves mess and damage to the grass which will take a season to repair. No more plastic intrusion invasion.
2016-05-11 08:16:	I object to the proposal.	I don't accept that there is a need for a play option which is paid for. It is divisive and causes those parents who are not able to pay considerable unnecessary stress. Many free play opportunities are available.

		<p>I object to the proposal (on all dates) on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) The structure (though designated as 'temporary') is not in any way, shape or form compatible with the guidelines contained in the Council's own publication entitled "Portobello Conservation Area Character Appraisal".</p> <p>In this document, there is a stipulation that there should be an open vista at the end of each street within the conservation area, which this temporary structure will be obscuring for virtually the entire summer...for both residents and other visitors alike.</p> <p>The bouncy castle also contravenes numerous aesthetic considerations outlined in the document and while (undoubtedly) a fun place for children to play is completely incompatible with the proposed location.</p> <p>2) Access and parking issues for residents in Regent Street, Marlborough Street and Straiton Place residents have been highlighted by the council for many years, with various solutions (one side parking, one way only, 'end on parking' etc) being mooted after feasibility studies being carried out. This is also mentioned in the Portobello Conservation Area Appraisal document.</p> <p>With the normal extra seasonal traffic in summer, coupled with the visitors attempting to park as close to the bouncy castle as possible, these problems will be exacerbated. Residents are all aware of the results of inexperienced reversing techniques and...at first hand.....I have recently had to replace a complete wing mirror which had been sheared off one afternoon recently.</p> <p>3) Commercial operation using publicly funded park ground.</p> <p>How does this work? Do the operators pay rent, and if so, what budget and account is it paid into? If there is an accident and in the unfortunate event that a child is injured, who will ultimately be held responsible? Would parents or guardians be litigating against the bouncy castle owners or the Council? Is there a Health and Safety audit carried out? Do parents sign an injury waiver?</p> <p>4) Amenity implications to immediate residents.</p> <p>I understand that there has been only 1 formal complaint registered, concerned with the noise nuisance, although there were 54 objections registered during a previous request for feedback, from the PCC.</p> <p>I can only add my objection to the proposal again here. Immediate residents now have lost their view to the esplanade and beach/sea view, alongside any premium paid to enjoy these lovely aspects of our conservation area.</p> <p>The bouncy castle may well be a fun and enjoyable addition to the other more creative ways to play on a world class beach, I have no argument with this.</p> <p>The Location of this bouncy castle (at any time of the year) is completely incompatible with the Conservation Appraisal and also the environment of local residents, and I am objecting to the above proposal on these grounds.</p>
2016-05-11 08:23:	I object to the proposal.	
2016-05-11 08:29:	I support the proposal.	
		<p>When the bouncy castle is in place, vehicles drive down the path in Straiton Park and park on the grass, which is a bad precedent to set.</p> <p>Since the bouncy castle has been removed, the grass is in a very poor state. The area was one of the few level and safe grassy areas near the beach where children could safely play. Even if reinstatement is carried out quickly, to a good standard, and at no cost to CEC, all other possible use of the area is denied when the castle is there. The bouncy castle, if it is popular, would be better sited somewhere else that is less well-used and has no other useful purpose.</p> <p>The dates suggested are not occasional, they cover the entire summer, with only a few days relief.</p> <p>The bouncy castle is noisy.</p> <p>Portobello prom is extremely busy during the holidays anyway, and the bouncy castle is not very likely to make a difference to visitor numbers.</p>
2016-05-11 08:52:	I object to the proposal.	
2016-05-11 08:53:	I support the proposal.	<p>Well managed and within scope of agreed guidelines the proposal seems to be good balance of reasonable concerns and offering an enjoyable summertime seaside amenity.</p>

2016-05-11 09:10:	I support the proposal.	It is an excellent addition to the beach area
2016-05-11 09:14:	I object to the proposal.	I would prefer that the castle is around for holiday weekends and perhaps part of summer holidays but not every weekend as I think it spoils the amenity aesthetically but can see the fun/ attraction as well- so think should be available but on more limited basis- also makes it more of a treat for parents and children rather than expectation. Torn on it being there for whole summer holidays? Can see attraction of this but I do really think it spoils the view outlook etc. which is also what people come to Portobello for. Hope this assists
2016-05-11 09:24:	I object to the proposal.	Apart from the fact that I doubt the noise would be reduced, I feel for the people who live beside it. It's ugly and unnecessary entertainment. There is an arcade, soft play, an outdoor play park, activities at the swimming pool, not to mention the beach for playing if children want to let off steam and have fun. It's also an invasion of green space, that may not be utilised as much as it could be but it's important to preserve it without seeing it as a commercial opportunity.
2016-05-11 09:27:	I support the proposal.	My 5 yr old daughter had a great time playing on the bouncy castle. The pricing was reasonable given that the operator allowed her on for much longer than the specified time. The bouncy castle was an added attraction to the beach front and park areas for children.
2016-05-11 09:29:	I support the proposal.	My kids love the bouncy castle and I think it is a positive addition to the promenade. I do agree with the pricing it is a little expensive so if a loyalty scheme was available would be great.
2016-05-11 09:30:	I object to the proposal.	It means that this piece of open space is taken over solely by one commercial profit-making enterprise. The price they charge of £2.50 for 10 minutes is far too costly. They are not up front with their prices - i.e. They do not display their prices clearly so parents have to ask the cost - making it hard then in front of the child to say they can't go on because it is too costly. A Loyalty Card scheme is of no use to people coming from far and wide to enjoy Portobello beach - it's just another way for the business to make more money. The grassy and open area cannot be used for anything else whilst the bouncy castle is there - it remains on the grass overnight, resulting in a loss of use of the area, as well as the grass dying off under the plastic. It is a loss of green space. This area would be better used for purposes involving the enjoyment of a greater number of people, and at less cost.
2016-05-11 09:37:	I support the proposal.	The promenade is a vibrant, popular place, increasingly so these days. This is wonderful for the town. We need attractions, as the promenade rediscovers itself as a modern visitor destination and as a leisure resource for those of us who live in the area.
2016-05-11 09:44:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-11 09:49:	I support the proposal.	I think this is a great addition to our prom at summer time.
2016-05-11 09:55:	I object to the proposal.	I think it is unnecessary to have this when there is already plenty for children to do in the area (playparks, prom, beach, amusements). It's noisy, unattractive, has killed the grass that is underneath and takes up a large area of space in a *public* ground (which is well used in the summer) as a money-making scheme.
2016-05-11 10:05:	I am neutral on this proposal	
2016-05-11 10:50:	I object to the proposal.	It takes this prime site out of use for local events and ruins the ground. For the ground to be usable it would need re turfing tho both turfing and seeding also take away from the time the space might be used. Bouncy castle good to have but perhaps on the Beach?
2016-05-11 10:50:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-11 11:41:	I object to the proposal.	Occasional weekends are fine, but the summer period is far too long for this to be in place.  Disappointed that the council doesn't have any sort of longer term plan for this green space that would better benefit the whole community rather than just the applicant/council.

		<p>Why not let the licensee have the pitch for the entire Summer season?</p> <p>The pricing is steep, but no steeper than pretentious cafes and food outlets along the Prom. The inflatable's owner has made reasonable investment in the equipment, generators and transport, so let him have the pitch, and let him make some profit. He might even sponsor some new benches, poo bins, and free litter bags.</p> <p>Alternatively, we could refuse him permission to operate, and sink back into the seaside Mecca that we all enjoy. Tours of the five a side football pitches, the defunct bowling centre, the kilns, several interesting sewage pipes, the pumping station, deserted police station, missing benches, paltry numbers of refuse bins, broken bottles, barbecue detritus, and perhaps rides on the beach tractor.</p> <p>A little bit of colour, silliness, and natural, healthy, children laughter might disturb the neighbours, so better not,.</p>
2016-05-11 11:47:	I am neutral on this propo	
2016-05-11 12:03:	I support the proposal.	<p>During the several visits I made when this attraction was here earlier it proved popular, I found it fairly priced, it was well-maintained and the operator was exceptionally polite and good with the children.</p> <p>It was a lovely thing to see on a promenade and I would welcome its presence.</p>
2016-05-11 12:09:	I support the proposal.	Great, fun activity for the children to utilise. promoting health, wellbeing and exercise as well as promoting the promenade and improving the local economy
2016-05-11 12:52:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-11 13:32:	I am neutral on this propo	A wonderful attraction for children. Exactly what we need!
2016-05-11 14:01:	I support the proposal.	Pricing needs to be looked at. Perhaps a discount for families with more than one child. 30 June -17 August is a long stretch for residents to have to put up with noise and crowds which there may well be in the summer holidays. Maybe it should finish at the end of August. I do not live close by so the residents views are more important than mine.
2016-05-11 14:02:	I support the proposal.	I think it would be great to have the bouncy castle back. However, I do think if reinstatement of ground means he has to replace the grass at the end of the season, is unfair. If he pays rent already surely the council should pay for this. I have no idea how much the rent is but surely if the land is being put to good use and is making the council money they should have the good grace to pay for it to be replaced. I just feel the council should be encouraging this sort of thing not putting barriers up.
2016-05-11 15:12:	I object to the proposal.	The inflatable play area is unsightly and ruins the view towards the sea and promenade. During the summer, this area is often used by locals and families to sit.
2016-05-11 17:30:	I object to the proposal.	Why waste this plot of land on something that is both temporary and expensive? This land could be put to use to create something permanent for the kids which wouldn't involve parents having to pay for their children to play by the seaside. It's peculiar that the council refuses to develop the plot for years and then one day decides to let a private business open up a costly play area, it just seems lazy. In my opinion, the council should have put something here years ago. Besides all of this it seems to be of great inconvenience to the people who live right next to it, if it must be kept it should be moved to a more practical site.
2016-05-11 17:31:	I object to the proposal.	Keep the area for public use.
2016-05-11 19:59:	I support the proposal.	It's bright and cheery. It is positive to see the land being used. It is beneficial for children.
2016-05-11 20:38:	I object to the proposal.	It's an eyesore. It's very expensive and causes a great deal of friction having to say "no" every time we pass it. It's so in your face. If it has to happen take it down towards Seaford and people who want it can go and find it.
2016-05-11 20:47:	I object to the proposal.	<p>Who has decided to allow the bouncy castle back</p> <p>1 the community council</p> <p>2 Edinburgh council</p> <p>Surely the democratic way would be to consult with the community first.</p> <p>The applicant would have to agree to the conditions before any permission is given.</p> <p>Would it not be better to have it on a hard standing ( concrete or Tarmac )</p>

2016-05-11 21:09:	I object to the proposal.	I strongly object to this proposal for the reasons already iterated in my last response. The object is garish, ugly, noisy and an eyesore. The noise pollution from the generator and blowers is incessant and disturbing. It is totally out of place in this quiet and select residential area. The Council must begin to realise that Portobello long ago stopped being a cheap, tacky, leisure destination. This proposal is wrong-headed and deeply unpopular with local residents. What possible rationale can the Council have for this outlandish proposal? How much tax payers' money is the Council paying to subsidise this private enterprise? I have requested this information in my previous response and if I do not receive a reply I will invoke the Freedom Of Information Act in order to elicit a response.
2016-05-11 21:54:	I object to the proposal.	<p>* It is an extremely large, unsightly, ugly structure that just dominates the wee park and why could it not be placed on the beach.</p> <p>* It must be awful for the residents living very close to this structure, we live nearby and it was awful to look at every day.</p>
2016-05-11 22:05:	I object to the proposal.	space needed kickabout football, dogs. free stuff only!
2016-05-11 22:18:	I support the proposal.	Hi, could we have an analysis of the responses/reasons why consent was refused. I responded very positively to their remaining on site. As one of the closest neighbours (38 Marlborough St, immed opposite with 5 members in our household), were the responses weighted by those of the immediate neighbours as opposed to those living further afield? Could I have a response sent to my email please.
2016-05-12 09:19:	I object to the proposal.	The beach is beautiful attraction in itself, we should be encouraging our children to use the beach and the natural surroundings as play. Free play with commercial gain is everywhere, lets leave ine of the last sanctuary alone. I have two toddlers and want the beach to remain a beach. There are plenty other facilities I can take them to but when we go to the beach we want to see and play in the sand.
2016-05-12 09:37:	I support the proposal.	The kids loved it, it was a real draw and centre point for them, it is healthy outdoor fun opposed to the alternative on the front which is the gambling amusements (with the exceptions of the 'tired' play parks that are not nearly as an attractive prospect). It is also the sort of attraction that brings families to Portobello for days out from the city centre which in turn is good for the local economy.
2016-05-12 12:44:	I support the proposal.	I replied to the original consultation when I was against the proposal, as at that time I thought it was a permanent fixture over a number of months, and was concerned for many reasons about that. A holidays and weekend-style situation as applied for here is perfect, I think, and balances the interests and disinterests of many in the community. That said, I would also give a lot of weight to those who live in immediate proximity, if they have continued concerns, as although it is a temporary structure it is a big thing for them to have to live with!
2016-05-12 13:23:	I support the proposal.	<p>We're never going to be Blackpool with its all year round lights and arcades. But we are a seaside resource with a long tradition of welcoming all kinds of visitors to a lovely seaside (made lovelier because it is a loved residential town too).</p> <p>A bouncy castle is the least we can do to meet the need. (And deckchairs too would be appreciated by others who would visit if they could hire one!)</p> <p>It seems to me the operator of this bouncy castle is particularly keen to make it work and fit in with the visitor and local community. Because it is not a fixed facility it is one thing that we can welcome with open arms - try it out at least.</p>
2016-05-12 16:08:	I support the proposal.	I believe it brings a welcomed additional resource for kids on the prom.
2016-05-12 17:01:	I support the proposal.	It was a great addition to the facilities offered in the community. children loved it. it also benefitted local businesses through increased footfall.
2016-05-12 18:51:	I support the proposal.	<p>A drop kerb at the road crossing to this stretch would enable wheelchair carers equal assess to this feature.</p> <p>A longer matting area laterally/to the side not just in front of the bouncy castle would be beneficial. Our daughter grazed her face landing to the side instead of the mat!</p> <p>Ensuring the grass is adequately replaced after the castle has been removed would be great.</p> <p>Ensuring removal of the fencing during periods the castle is not in use.</p>
2016-05-12 20:45:	I object to the proposal.	I would not like this to return as it is far too expensive and over in a few minutes



2016-05-12 20:47:	I object to the proposal.	As a neighbour the wording of your feedback indicates a decision has been made Without consultation the people right next to it, The size is overbearing The noise is distressing Is the image Portobello wants If so pity help us
2016-05-12 22:43:	I support the proposal.	It's a nice addition to the prom/beach activities for residence and visitors. Portobello is a seaside location so will inevitably attract a high proportion of families and children. I think it was a pleasant addition to the area and a lot of fun.  Certainly my kids loved it and it was very popular- admittedly I don't live next to it but if it is only there sometimes and during the day I can't see the problem
2016-05-13 10:35:	I support the proposal.	What a great idea as another focal point for families on the prom. As for the pricing requirements on the applicant, its a business and he can surely charge what he likes? The market would decide it was too pricey as people wouldn't use it! The area of ground is also mainly used as a dog toilet? We've lived in Portobello 15 years and my children have never been allowed to play on that patch of grass due to its disgusting nature. What is he going to reinstate about that?
2016-05-13 10:50:	I object to the proposal.	
2016-05-13 11:27:	I object to the proposal.	It's really unfair to put a massive bouncy castle there because it costs money to go on it. We have a two year old and had to pick him up and run past it. It's not something you can just ignore because it's so enormous bright and noisy. It will be really hard to visit the beach when it's there as he will want to play on it and not understand why he can't.
2016-05-13 11:31:	I support the proposal.	My kids loved it. But the price is too high or amount of time too short. This needs changed and/ or loyalty scheme introduced.  It adds to the Porty offering and might draw people here who will go into spend at local shops and cafe etc.
2016-05-13 13:30:	I support the proposal.	Great for the kids and the local shops/cafes as will bring people to the area. Holidays and weekends is a great compromise.
2016-05-13 14:34:	I object to the proposal.	I find the Bouncy Castle to be unsightly. It detracts from the natural beauty of the prom and the beach.  Also I think that the proposed dates are excessive. Perhaps a compromise would be a total of four weekends plus one week during the summer holidays.
2016-05-13 17:04:	I object to the proposal.	The bouncy castle is an eyesore and very expensive to boot. To charge £2.50 per child for a measly 10 minutes is shoddy and grasping. There's plenty for children to do on the beach without this monstrosity blighting the landscape. I suspect most parents of small children could do without the blackmail they will certainly be subjected to! Sand castles rule!!!
2016-05-13 17:04:	I object to the proposal.	Too expensive and not sure who is gaining from the presence of this thing, doesn't feel like the local community. Was the price advertised on the fencing? I also object to the use of green space for commercial use and do not want to set a precedent in this by continually having castle (don't know how you can call it a play area) there this summer.
2016-05-13 17:10:	I object to the proposal.	Personally I'm not a fan of this sort of attraction at the beach, but I can see that for many people it would be a bonus. As a local resident, who really appreciates the fact that Porty beach is relatively unspoilt despite being so close to the city, I feel it is quite an imposition to have the bouncy castle at the bottom of the street for 6 weeks non-stop over the summer. I find it a visual eyesore, and noisy. Would there be any expectation that the owner would ensure the area was left free of litter at the end of each day? I feel it would be fairer if it was only there part time over the summer, say 2 or 3 days each week, so that those with kids had a chance to enjoy it, but those without kids also have a chance to enjoy the space on other days. This would also allow the grass a chance to recover between sessions when it is on site.
2016-05-13 17:34:	I support the proposal.	when o was a child, bouncing on trampolines on this site was a source of great joy. i want children today to have happy memories!!!
2016-05-13 20:51:	I object to the proposal.	I am not entirely against this, but I feel that it would be fairer on the local residents if the location of the castle were rotated around a few different sites in Portobello - in front of the public toilets, the wide areas of the Prom etc. If it does come back, then it needs to be erected on the morning of the first day of operation and removed on the evening of the last (ie: the Saturday and Sunday of each weekend) and the fencing removed with it each time. I do not feel that it needs to be in Porto for this amount of time and really should only be around in the holidays as a treat, rather than here every weekend.

2016-05-13 21:09:	I object to the proposal.	I find the bouncy castle hideous and told my kids that can not go on it. It is ugly, noisy and should not be at that location. I am still surprised how they got the permit in the first place.
2016-05-13 21:15:	I support the proposal.	We loved the bouncy castle, it's one of the many things going on which makes Portobello so fantastic. The guys who ran the castle were polite, friendly and great with the kids. We are local and got between 30 mins and 50 mins of bouncing during quieter times. We'd love to see it back.
2016-05-13 21:23:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-13 21:25:	I object to the proposal.	I object to the bouncy castle being present for all these holidays and the entire summer. The impact will be my daughter will pester me to allow her to go on every time we pass it along the prom which we can't afford. I believe it is an eyesore which spoils the outlook. I wouldn't object to the odd day but not for the entire duration of the school holidays. There are far better ways to encourage our kids to be outdoors and getting fresh air and exercise.
2016-05-13 21:37:	I object to the proposal.	No thank you. It is loud and annoying for the people who live close by and the proposals mean it will be there constantly without a break. I live on the prom and am irritated by its presence myself. What is more, I have a young child and every time we walk past it I am asked if we can go on it - which I can't afford to do.
2016-05-13 21:44:	I support the proposal.	I support the proposal but don't necessarily feel prices need to be re considered. £2.50 for 10 minutes is high but when there is no queue children were allowed a good 45 minutes for the same price. As a customer of several other local businesses i wouldn't wish to undermine their pricing but several also charge over £2.50 for a hot drink which can also be enjoyed in less than 10 minutes! It is a choice as to what you want to pay for it. As for the generator there didn't seem to be enough noise coming from it to make a noise complaint at the time of day that it is actually in use, and is far outweighed by the general noise of activity on the prom and even the sea itself!! A fun activity for the wee ones. I have heard complaint about never being able to get past it without having to cave to the kids demands and pay up, but this is no different to any other business e.g. arcade/cafe/former chip shop along the prom and is a matter for the parent/carer to decide rather than an obligation to the business owner to make it somehow less appealing!
2016-05-13 21:57:	I support the proposal.	I support the bouncy castle but believe this proposal in its current form is a disgrace. I understand the need to reinstate the grass at the end of the season although as this is an added attraction to portobello I am sure there could be reasonable discussions with the Edinburgh council on this. The blowers are not that loud and my understanding is that they are not used at a time and are not loud enough to warrant a noise pollution complaint.. No more so than the noise coming from delivery trucks on the high street at 5am in the morning. But the most prolific abuse of council authority is to have the audacity to propose the business reduced its prices or creates a loyalty card. £2.50 is a reasonable price and the gentleman who runs the castle does not adhere to the 'ten minute' timing unless incredibly busy.. My kids were on for at least 30minute before further more A coffee from any of the local outlets costs around £2.50 and would take less the ten minutes to drink. I thought the castle was a great idea and should definately be there over the summer if not every feasible holiday. My only complaint is there was no adult times. Veve la Révolution!
2016-05-13 22:07:	I object to the proposal.	I think the bouncy castle is an eyesore and is too expensive.
2016-05-13 22:58:	I am neutral on this propo	It is a great addition but not a great location. There are too many residential properties locally impacted by noise and view whose opinions need to be taken into account. The bouncy castle is great and the guy who runs it is lovely and gives the kids loads of time if he can. I'm just not sure it is in the best place to be there very regularly.
2016-05-14 00:31:	I object to the proposal.	An eyesore unit in keeping with the surroundings and a safety risk.
2016-05-14 07:18:	I object to the proposal.	
2016-05-14 07:29:	I object to the proposal.	I object. I think it is in the wrong position. It is totally unacceptable to expect the local residents who look on to this or who are effected by the noise of the generator to tolerate this for such a large amount of time. It also ruins the grass. Surely it can be moved to a more appropriate sight?Also £2.50 for 10mins is obscene.

		<p>The bouncy castle is an offensive, tatty eyesore and the possibility of its extended tenure is causing considerable upset in the community. Even a community divide is enough reason to not allow it. It was not a conscious community decision to enhance our encirclement. No one here thought 'what this place really needs is a bouncy castle. Let's get one'. It was not missed.</p> <p>In addition, it's not in keeping with the vibe here. If you want to provide quality play opportunities for kids may I suggest something like the following:</p> <p><a href="https://www.playdale.co.uk/playground/adventure-trails/timber-adventure-trail/playspaces/playspace-1.html">https://www.playdale.co.uk/playground/adventure-trails/timber-adventure-trail/playspaces/playspace-1.html</a></p> <p>Or if you must make money, some quality pop up food places like Rost would be OK. Not tatty burger vans though!</p>
2016-05-14 07:51:	I object to the proposal.	
2016-05-14 12:22:	I object to the proposal.	I think it is unfair on local residents as the view of the fencing and castle is unsightly.
2016-05-15 07:42:	I object to the proposal.	<p>Personally, I feel the bouncy castle would be best as a treat for the school holidays only, regardless of where it is situated. However, if the majority would like it for weekends too, something must be done to address the concerns of those living around Straiton Park. None of the residents object to the sight/sound of children having fun, if they did they wouldn't live so close to a park/beach/prom/nursery. We are amongst these residents and fully expect things to come and go outside our house, most of which we will enjoy, some of which we won't but having a generator outside your window or a view of an industrial style fence with or without a giant pink inflatable for 6 months is too much to ask of anybody. It would be fairer to all to rotate sites over the 6 month period, if 3 suitable locations can be identified, each group of neighbours could enjoy the bouncy castle for 2 months rather than complain about it for 6 months. Or is there a suitable location which doesn't impact so directly on any residents? If Straiton Park is the only location, we will embrace it for the summer holidays only. If weekends are also approved then the whole thing, including the fencing should be removed during the week, this will also allow the space to be used again by dog walkers, nursery sports day etc or different entrepreneurs.</p>
2016-05-15 18:13:	I object to the proposal.	Children at risk, noise to nearby residents, stress to parents/carers re cost etc.
2016-05-15 21:45:	I object to the proposal.	Weekends only from May to August are acceptable, but no more than that. Other concerns are noise, litter, cost etc.
2016-05-15 21:56:	I object to the proposal.	I think it is an eyesore and not fair to the residents that have a look onto this !!!
2016-05-15 22:30:	I support the proposal.	Think it was a good fun addition to the beach area
2016-05-15 22:33:	I object to the proposal.	<p>I think that the decision of whether to bring back the bouncy castle should belong to the people who live next door to it, as it is their enjoyment of their homes and potentially the values of their houses that will be affected.</p> <p>If the bouncy castle is to return then I support the suggestion to look at alternative locations. A rotation of the location with the gravelly area next to the public toilets and new flats would be fairer to those who have to live next door to it. It could also be sited on the beach itself, perhaps up in front of the amusements or tumbles. This part of the prom is far more appropriate as they are already busy and full of fair ground type attractions and it would mean that those that enjoy the bouncy castle could still enjoy it without it being next to anyone's house. It is possible to site the inflatable safely on sand or tarmac/gravel, just more expensive/inconvenient for the operator as it requires many sandbags. It seems unreasonable though to inconvenience residents rather than the operator.</p> <p>If it is to come back then yes, all the bullet points are necessary, along with the operators improving the aesthetic quality of the fences and their equalities policy/attitude to disabled children.</p>
2016-05-15 22:44:	I support the proposal.	I think the inflatable play area was a fun attraction to the Portobello promenade. The owner was really friendly & happy to let the kids stay on longer if it wasn't busy. Although the pricing was slightly higher I agree with the loyalty scheme suggestion.

		<p>I would support the inflatable play area returning for occasional weekends and some of the summer holidays. It's run by a pleasant guy and it creates an atmosphere of fun if it's there for a short time. But I don't support it being there for the whole of the summer holidays and all the warmer weekends of the year. The park also serves a purpose as a green and peaceful space. The inflatable play area is less fun if it comes to be seen as a semi-permanent fixture.</p> <p>The dates as given in this consultation make it look as though the castle and fencing would be removed between weekends. But is this the case? The temporary fencing around the inflatable play area is depressing and out of keeping with the area and I think many respondents might weight their responses differently if the fencing is going to remain there through the weeks between weekend usage.</p> <p>The summer holidays and summery weekends are the main time of the year the park and the prom and the outdoors can be enjoyed by all residents. I recognise these are also the times the inflatable play area would be profitable for the operator, but I would be grateful to the PCC and Edinburgh City Council for protecting the other uses of and enjoyment around the space, including enjoyment of the space *as* space in a reasonably high density living area, and for restricting the summer holiday days when profit can be made of the park.</p> <p>The inflatable play area was in place for all of April. To be using the park for another 3 and a half months is too much of the year -- far too great a percentage of the warmer, lighter months of the year.</p> <p>The inflatable play area is hard on the residents immediately beside the park because of the generator noise and its visual dominance. It is not in keeping with the conservation area. It is a fun temporary addition, but becomes less fun when it is there so much of the time.</p>
2016-05-15 22:44:	I object to the proposal.	
2016-05-15 22:53:	I am neutral on this propo	Still in two minds. Would like a longer term use for the under-used space but don't want to see someone with entrepreneurship held back by niggling complaints.
2016-05-15 22:55:	I object to the proposal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- eyesore</li> <li>- expensive</li> <li>- the beach is the reason we visit. We don't go to Portobello for bouncy castles. Leave the structured entertainment at nobles amusements.</li> </ul>
2016-05-15 22:56:	I support the proposal.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It's another good attraction to have on the prom</li> <li>2) It's Edinburgh's seaside - things like this are an asset&amp; in keeping with the fun of the seaside</li> <li>3) It's good fun</li> <li>4) People visiting the bouncy castle may support other local businesses (from ice cream van to Beach House)</li> <li>5) It gives people another reason to come to the prom (could just cinch it for some)</li> <li>6) Children love it - really, what is not to love?!</li> </ol>
2016-05-15 22:59:	I object to the proposal.	It's most and unsightly. Don't mind for the occasional bank bol weekend but not as a long term feature.
2016-05-15 23:00:	I support the proposal.	<p>Reduced hours offers a fun play option for children but maintains a balance for the community.</p> <p>Perhaps holidays could be kept to 4 days out of 7 or similar?</p> <p>Agree that care should be taken with the ground.</p> <p>Overall, really good fun for the kids!</p>
2016-05-15 23:04:	I support the proposal.	My child has enjoyed this. I think £2:50 for 10 minutes is a fair price, these time limits only seem to be in place during busy periods as when quiet my child has played for over 20 minutes. The staff are friendly and helpful. There are no other facilities like this in the area.
2016-05-16 00:02:	I object to the proposal.	<p>There is a brilliant soft play at Tumbles and a really good trampoline centre. It would be a pity if these facilities were compromised.</p> <p>Should it be approved - it would be important that staff working in the venue had a current first aid certificate and had child protection checks similar to other leisure facilities in the city.</p>
2016-05-16 01:05:	I object to the proposal.	Think it's a long time for local residents. How long would a fair be around? Typically a fortnight. That seems appropriate here.
2016-05-16 05:37:	I support the proposal.	A reasonable suggestion with my only concerns for local residents being what the hours will be and the reinstatement costs should be taken up front so there is no issues at the back end of the season.
2016-05-16 06:39:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-16 07:08:	I object to the proposal.	It doesn't belong in a conservation area at any time. No thanks.

2016-05-16 07:23:	I support the proposal.	Excellent for children. Price was very reasonable.
2016-05-16 07:38:	I support the proposal.	It is great fun for children. We were there once only but would be more Than happy to go there again and again.
2016-05-16 07:47:	I support the proposal.	This addition to the attractions/ choice of activities on the beach was a welcome one. the beach and promenade is largely underused and this is one of the last usable spaces. I think it was opportunistic yet refreshing to see 'the applicant' make this activity available. He was also always courteous and fair with the time allowed to play. if it was quiet he always allowed the kids to play a bit longer. mike
2016-05-16 08:11:	I object to the proposal.	The constant noise from the generator / blowers is extremely detrimental to the amenity of local residents. The operation does not bring other trade / businesses to the area ,only profit to the individual operator.
2016-05-16 10:16:	I support the proposal.	
2016-05-16 10:38:	I object to the proposal.	<p>I think the bouncy castle is fun for the holidays - a cheery throwback to Portobello's past. No problem! But that isn't what is being proposed here. Rather we are being asked to have a commercial development from March (when it first opened) to September - the majority of the year! One assumes that if permission is granted this year, then it will become an annual fixture.</p> <p>I don't think it is appropriate for one of Porty's scarce greenspaces to be given over to a development that is, in effect, semi-permanent. Especially so, given that during all that time it will be secured using unsightly construction fencing; it's hard to imagine this being permitted for this duration in other parts of Edinburgh. Although this is proposed for weekends only in Aug/Sept, presumably it will remain there uninflated during the week, along with the fencing and generator? The fact that this isn't specified makes me think that all of the infrastructure will actually remain there until 27th September.</p> <p>Mr Reid has been very considerate and the generator noise is not technically a breach of guidelines. But the noise, visual disturbance and additional traffic is still very considerable for nearby residents and there's only so much that can be done to mitigate that. That's really fine for holidays – I wish Mr Reid all the best – but for seven months of the year? I think that's too much for any one site.</p>
2016-05-16 11:41:	I object to the proposal.	The temporary fencing is very unsightly- can it not be at one end of the prom - say King's Road?
2016-05-16 12:38:	I support the proposal.	I understand both sides of the proposal but as my children loved the bouncy castle and still talk about it. I would like to see it return even if it was kept for holidays and any inconveniences to the surrounding homes and neighbourhood kept to a minimum.
2016-05-16 14:54:	I support the proposal.	Given the lack of other activities that involve movement and fun, as opposed to feeding machines in a zombie like fashion, this should be a shoo in!
2016-05-16 15:15:	I support the proposal.	I have grandchildren who would enjoy this facility
2016-05-16 16:34:	I am neutral on this propo	Would be fairer if moved to different sites periodically.
2016-05-16 20:17:	I support the proposal.	<p>Why not? its not doing any harm. I would have liked a variety of different entertainment but then again I would like to have enough money to never work again, so I can't have everything I want.</p> <p>The people are lovely and the kids love it.</p>