

How do you feel overall about the proposal?	Please give reasons or make any other comments about the proposal	In what ways, if any, could the proposals be improved?
I am neutral on the proposals	I haven't seen any proposals for increasing amenities in the local area (e.g. schools, doctors, parking)	Provide details of extra facilities to be provided in the local area and how traffic can be managed (given it's pretty bad at the moment).
I am neutral on the proposals	I have some concern about the number of residents you are creating in a relatively small area. This is already a busy area on a busy road. Has adequate thought gone into access for emergency services, etc? Portobello is a viable community - too many extra apartments might upset that balance.	Less residential properties.
I am neutral on the proposals	Not keen on the red brick and would prefer 4 storey flats instead of 6 (which I think will over shadow a lot of the site)!	Lower the height to a maximum of 4 storey buildings
I am neutral on the proposals	Concern about local facilities i.e. Schools and GP services. Also traffic at the junction with A1/A199 already busy.	More info on the impact on public services
I am neutral on the proposals	If the houses are affordable then I would be more supportive. Too many new houses are beyond lower income families.	I like the mix of houses it has a community look.
I am neutral on the proposals	More housing is needed in Edinburgh and it is better to use sites like this than greenbelt areas. I do have some concern over the amount being proposed. 483 homes could equal over 1000 new residents. I'm not sure existing transport routes and general infrastructure could cope. The local gp surgery for example is currently full. I also think the height rise 6 storeys being proposed will be too high and the style will jar with the existing landscape.	Less density and more family housing- this area lacks family housing.
I am neutral on the proposals	The plans seem very bland. The spaces in nearly all properties seem very small and I am surprised people would want to buy such a space. No personal gardens or outdoor drying space. Plans could show more consideration by backing one houses toilets and living spaces to each other rather than toilet or living room against a neighbors bedroom. Generally ok about building homes on this site. Concerned about the number of cars that may need to park with almost 2 per household nowadays, however good bus links are.	Rooms could be larger with a corresponding reduction in homes. Needs personal gardens or outdoor drying space. Plans could show more consideration by backing one houses toilets and living spaces to each other rather than toilet or living room against a neighbors bedroom. Charging points if we move towards elec cars. There seems too little parking space however good public transport links are.
I am neutral on the proposals	Portobello needs affordable housing. Access, parking, schools, doctors and public transport all need to be in place to support this though	More landscaping including playing and growing areas. Connections to local path networks

I am neutral on the proposals	I don't object to the land being converted into further housing for the area, however Portobello is already very heavily congested (and Kings Road junction in general) and I can only imagine this will make things much worse.	More information about parking - adequate parking is very important and the proposal suggests a lot of houses but makes little reference to parking.
I am neutral on the proposals	My worry is the infrastructure of Portobello is now fit to bursting. Our quality of life is already affected by full doctors surgeries and schools. Traffic in and out of Portobello is already at a standstill during rush hours.	A doctors surgery, school, nursery and no more cars.
I am neutral on the proposals	The crucial thing is how much of the housing will be affordable, particularly available for social rent. My vote would be for a higher proportion of affordable than the usual planning assumption of 25%. We need homes that local young people can afford to live in. I'm also very concerned about the heating and insulation. Homes need to be affordable to run as well as to buy/rent.	
I am neutral on the proposals	I am mainly concerned about significant loss of daylight/sunlight that will effect the cottages on Adelphi Place. Several of these homes have sunlights/windows built into the roofs to allow adequate daylight, and there is a concern this would be significantly impaired by building two storey buildings too close to where we are. If the proposed buildings overlook the existing properties on Adelphi Place, I hope this would be taken into consideration i.e by leaving suitable distance between the cottages (which sit low down the embankment) and any new buildings. Traffic in and out of Portobello is getting worse year on year - provision for 345 parking spaces is a concern as the area cannot cope with many more cars (I like the idea of the integrated garages, but not the amount of cars that will come with the new housing).	Giving adequate consideration to distance between any new builds and the existing housing on Adelphi Place, hopefully any impact on sunlight/daylight will be minimised. I've been told the new Porty High School was built by 'building down' into the ground, so the height of the building looks lower at eye level - it would be great if this could be considered for the 2 storey housing, if it is likely to overlook the housing on Adelphi Place. Also, keeping as much open space as possible will make the development more attractive.
I am neutral on the proposals	I don't generally have a problem with the proposal as Portobello is in need of more houses, but I do feel that having lived in Portobello for the last 20 yrs and having a young family, that there is a need for good quality houses, family houses, with gardens. Portobello has become a very big family orientated area and there are not enough of these types of houses, people are moving from the city to these areas to enjoy the family life.	I think this proposal would benefit from less of the high rise 1/2 bedroom flats and more larger family types houses with gardens. People move to the area of Portobello to experience the out door life of the beach and also enjoy the suburban life, which Portobello has and this project doesn't seem to encompass. There also needs to be more links and better infrastructure created between the surrounding areas, like to the Parks, especially Figgate and the area of Northfield which is also a very important.

I am neutral on the proposals	There is a shortage of such housing therefor it is a good idea, however the big drawback is that the infrastructure is not there to support this development. Where is the traffic going to go? Couple this with the crazy development of the Brunstane Green Belt and there is a huge traffic problem.	Better traffic management. Better public transport links.
I am neutral on the proposals	My concerns are shooting and Dr's . Town bank isn't big enough as it is and surrounding surgeries are not taking on any patients and this has been for sometime.	
I am neutral on the proposals		More mid market rentals
I am neutral on the proposals	It would be a lot more people in the area and I worry about the impact of that on the local environment and services.	A skate park or community garden would offer something back to local community in exchange for the increased impact on their local area. A route from Rosefield park direct to the bridge would be great.
I am neutral on the proposals	Dont like the Designs	no flats
I am neutral on the proposals	I am worried about the pressure this development would bring on primary and secondary school places. Additional traffic on Sir Harry Lauder Road is likely as well which is an already congested area.	
I am neutral on the proposals	Doesn't look very nice.	Change outside facade and have less flats and more detached houses
I am neutral on the proposals	parking allways a problem!!!!	more parking
I am neutral on the proposals	seems like a lot of new housing with no increased amenities. also a lot more traffic to an already congested area	reduce the density, improve traffic controls
I am neutral on the proposals	While using the land for housing would help increase trade for local business the fact is that in its current format the roads in Portobello would not be able to cope with the additional traffic created by both this and the development old Scottish power site development.	Less Flats, more detached house / green areas for residents of the new development to use.
I am neutral on the proposals	Very concerned about introducing yet more traffic into this area given the congestion at peak times coming into Portobello and on the High Street. No real objection to more housing per se.	
I am neutral on the proposals	Given the pressure on existing buildings for community use in this area, I suggest that a condition be attached to planning consent to require the developers to include a community hall.	See above.

I am neutral on the proposals	While I welcome the opportunity to build more housing, I have to express disappointment at the 'design' (using the term very loosely) of these dwellings. As ever, an opportunity is lost to really create something of quality and interest. This is the same bog-standard, unimaginative, third rate, could -be-anywhere type of development that should have been done away with in the 1970s. There are a myriad of good examples to emulate both in this country and abroad. Yet we remain stuck with the mediocre. Such a shame.	Try these people: <a href="http://www.createstreets.com/">http://www.createstreets.com/</a>
I am neutral on the proposals	I am neutral on the proposals at present, but I would qualify this statement by the following. - I am concerned that there may not be adequate provision within the schools catchment area/s for pre-school and school places, primary and secondary. for the increase in the number of family homes which will be included. I am also concerned at the increase in vehicular traffic on the existing busy roads, and the provision for adequate car and business parking within this proposed residential and commercial development. What additional medical and dental practice facilities are planned for the area, as the existing local practices are under strain at present?	By providing much more detailed information than on the leaflet which has been delivered in the Portobello / Joppa area.
I am neutral on the proposals	I am not sure about the exact location of the residential housing in midst of commercial and industrial site. its also very nea a really busy road.	as they stand they seem ok ...but perhaps a bit more about the surrounding impacts
I am neutral on the proposals	I think new (and affordable) housing is good in general, especially as it uses unused land instead of greenbelt. I think a new School MUST be built as Towerbank is too full. I assume it's going ahead regardless of any issues the tax payer and local residents have, as I see the council are knocking down their buildings on the site.	New School and playpark, access and exit both ways along baileyfield road
I am neutral on the proposals		As much green space as possible. Keep the mix of housing.
I am neutral on the proposals		Please do not forget to plant some green!

I am neutral on the proposals	I am concerned about the height of the flats and the impact of their shadow as they are on the southerly side of the plot on the other houses. I am also concerned about the through road as it appears to become a potentially more popular "rat run" and therefore pose a risk to pedestrians living in the new development. I am also concerned about the trees bordering the Figgate Burn and hope that these will be preserved especially as Kingfishers are regularly seen on this stretch of the burn.	Lower flats and attention to the impact of their shadow on the rest of the development.
I am neutral on the proposals	I know we need housing. I feel we may be building too many too quick. Roads, parking, schools, doctors and infrastructure will be overwhelmed. Definitely don't need 6 stories high. Lower and more attractive looking. Worried that 68% parking proposed will mean nowhere to park and most households have 2 cars if it's a family with teenage son for instance. Think they could be more attractive. The tall blocks look like prisons with tiny windows. Bigger windows and maybe balconies. If housing is attractive you encourage people to care about their environment. Sorry this is so long winded.	Lower some of the higher buildings. Provide 100% parking spaces minimum and visitor parking.
I am neutral on the proposals	6 stories too high? Where are all the people going to park their car when all spaces are full?	Reduce the height of buildings. Needing 100% parking plus visitors parking spaces.
I am neutral on the proposals	I feel that the density is too high - so are the six storey blocks. Traffic will be problematic.	Reduce the 6 floor blocks to 4 floors. Exit to Sir Harry Lauder Road from Fishwives Causeway.
I am neutral on the proposals	We need housing. Would rather 4 floors maximum. Very concerned about traffic flow on to Harry Lauder Road and Portobello High Street. Thermal information?	Colour code on plans - height & for sale/rent
I am neutral on the proposals	Happy with proposed use, and colony style houses. but six storeys is too high, and parking/traffic is going to be a problem.	3 to 4 storey maximum height - less residential, development, more parking. Sandstone facing instead of brick.
I am neutral on the proposals	Too dense, not enough parking, schools and doctors? Good for High St shops	

I am neutral on the proposals	We all need somewhere to live but every house will create an average of at least one car! We also have the proposed 1,300 houses at Brunstane Farm. The existing main road through Portobello High Street is already cluttered, clogged, congested and polluted. We must do all we can to discourage the use of motor vehicles. Have bus lanes 24 hours 7 days to ensure public transport has 100% priority. Prohibit car parking on main bus routes so that buses don't have to weave in and out of bus stops just ask any bus driver. They do a very good job in very trying conditions. Cycling in the bus lane (in single file) would give cyclists segregation from cars continuous bus lanes should enable buses to maintain/improve their timings. Our Holyrood claims they want to see 10% of journeys by bicycle by 2020 and more active travel! But their efforts to encourage this are poor.	
I am neutral on the proposals	I would like to see a higher proportion of affordable homes. 25% is not enough!	See above.
I am neutral on the proposals	I have no objection in principle to this development and it could be beneficial to the longer term prosperity of Portobello town centre. I would just make one qualifying comment: this extra housing would add a few hundred extra cars using the surrounding roads. These are already very busy at most times and careful planning needs to be made to prevent further congestion and encourage future residents to limit car use. This could be achieved by planning safe and attractive walking and cycle routes to key locations such as the prom/beach, Towerbank Primary School, Portobello baths/gym and the local shopping centre.	See above
I object to the proposals	The flats are too high and not in keeping. In addition, the additional traffic has not been thought through. The Harry Lauder exit /entrance does not allow for proper access and as such, the high street will be yet more congested.	Reduce the flat height and the number of units to reduce traffic
I object to the proposals	More sub-standard housing when the local infrastructure can barely cope as it is. Car Pollution levels are already unacceptable on the bypass and on the High Street.	By providing imaginative and adequate housing, not fuelling more slums for the future, using the same tired methods and companies that consistently fail to deliver decent housing
I object to the proposals	Traffic is nightmare already in area and design is poor	Less properties
I object to the proposals	There is not enough infrastructure to support this - doctors, nurseries and schools in local area , traffic is already congested , this needs addresses first.	School , nursery , community space all needed ahead of more housing

I object to the proposals	I object on the grounds we have enough traffic in Portobello as it is , with Aldis opening the volume of traffic has increased and thats even before the rest of that site is constructed, Standard Life site will make Portobello grid locked all day, has consideration been taken on the increase of people on already overcrowded schools, doctors and dentists, come and talk to the local residents before deciding, remember we live here and decide who will be our councillor.	Give us more green space
I object to the proposals	Too high density, too high, out of keeping with conservation area adjoining	Lower density, limit to two storey, include playpark and other recreational facilities
I object to the proposals	Brick is a poor material choice, compared to natural materials. It also has no tradition of being used in general use in Edinburgh - we should be encouraging higher quality construction methods that use both quality materials and ones appropriate to the local environment. These are identikit houses which could be in Milton Keynes, Glenrothes, or any other faceless new town. As the capital city, we need to demand more.	More variation in style of housing; no brick - rather sandstone. Fewer units - far too many for an already horribly congested area, the knock-on effect of which will be more vehicle journeys, more pollution, more congestion and more ill-health.
I object to the proposals	I think there will be too much traffic associated with this development, on top of the new housing associated with the Aldi development on the other side of the Fishwives' Causeway. In particular, the access points will create traffic jams on Portobello High Street and Sir Harry Lauder way. These roads are already busy, especially at rush hour. The additional traffic from this new development will make the area less pleasant to live in, and more difficult to negotiate. The additional traffic coming to Aldi will create more problems at Fishwives' Causeway and King's Road, as more people start to use it, and as the residents move in to the adjacent development. It would have been much better to see jobs created on the Standard Life site.	There must be an incentive for bicycle use, and walking, to stop gridlock several hours a day.
I object to the proposals	Infra structure can not cope with this amount of housing	Access roads need to be improved so that the new development does not create a bottleneck. Nothing can be done te primary school place schools already full to max.

I object to the proposals	This is simply far too many homes for the site and for the available community facilities. 6 storey buildings are far too high for the skyline (the fact that an 8 storey building was once permitted should not be used to justify this development, when the original building is clearly at odds with the character of Portobello and the current local plan). The developers are clearly trying to shoehorn as many people as possible into limited space and this must not be accepted. Primary school facilities are already severely stretched, and this sort of development should only be considered AFTER a commitment has been made to a new primary school.	This space should remain as light industrial or similar to provide local jobs. If it must be developed for housing it should be lower density, lower skyline, with the capacity of community facilities expanded first.
I object to the proposals		
I object to the proposals	Portobello cannot sustain another housing development. Schools , dentists, doctors hospitals already over stretched and traffic impact will be detrimental to the current residents.	Very close to conservation area. Housing with more green space and provision for more public services to the site. Housing more sympathetic to the area no more than 2 floors.
I object to the proposals	Harry Lauder and Baileyfield road are already highly congested and adding over 400 new homes without any additional access points is likely to lead to even more traffic chaos	Reduce the number of homes proposed, particularly the number of flats. Reduce the number of storeys - 6 is way too high. Rethink the access proposal
I object to the proposals	6 stories is higher than the current height of the buildings on the site and is not in keeping with the area	Reduce the height of the buildings
I object to the proposals	I think 6 storey apartments are too high, they do not fit with the character of the area. I am concerned about the traffic congestion that such a large development will bring. Inclusion of a community space would be great, the circus training site was fantastic while it lasted.	Improvements as per reasons for objecting in previous response.
I object to the proposals	There is no considered info structure like a new doctor surgeries dental practise and we desperately need a new school	As stated in last answer
I object to the proposals	This is a very high number of houses for this development site with very high population density. The size of the development will have a negative impact on traffic flow in and around Portobello. The lack of capacity in local infrastructure and services- schools, nurseries, doctors surgeries, social care and other services- will put heavy pressure on the local community and demand cannot be currently met. There will be little green space or potentially play areas for children near to their homes.	Significantly lower numbers of houses and therefore lower population density would improve this proposal. Planned development of services such as GP service, school capacity etc in neighbourhood. Environmental assets built in. Traffic management so that High St could cope with demand
I object to the proposals	Where is the promised additional resource to the local community? It looks to block out views from the promenade.	Explaining how such an increase in housing will be supported by existing services. Other planning applications had reference to 'planning gain'. Remember one of the warehouses was being used for community purposes through Out of the Blue.Demonstrate it will not block out views from the promenade.



I object to the proposals	There are already serious problems with infrastructure especially the roads with all the new housing developments Portobello existing residents are going to be seriously disadvantaged.	Improve infrastructure I have to drive all around Scotland I cannot sit in traffic for one hour before another hour on the bypass before I have even started my journey say to Aberdeen, Dundee etc
I object to the proposals	Too many small flats are being built in the area. No green space, box type construction. Low quality buildings that will become derelict in 20 years. No enough trees or green spaces or spaces between buildings that would allow enough light/sun for a communal garden. Front elevation looks like the flats built in Leith/Seafield road are. Cannot imagine anything more architectonically unimaginative, with no character and with poor internal illumination- just square shoe box type construction. Only acceptable buildings are the town houses/colonies. Remember: beautiful buildings are an historic legacy and investment for future generations. I cannot imagine anything pretty coming from these plans that do not seem to focus in improving public environments. Importantly, the planning does not provide information of the proportion of space that would be occupied by townhouses or flats. Should most of the space be occupied by flats- the communal space will be dark, cold and uninviting failing the social connection that the pictures in the planing is suggesting. I struggle to see how this site, with the current proposal, can be transformed to enliven and enrich urban life as suggested by planning proposal.	More townhouses, less apartments- Larger windows? Drop the shoe box apartment style
I object to the proposals	This is a point where traffic which has increased greatly in the last 2yrs. This number of homes will simply lead to further traffic issues backing up to jocks lodge. It will change the community feel of portobello. Its already a choked area. Fully oppose the building of this volume of homes. Where are these residents going to go to school, access gp services?	Far far less houses. A third of this number is enough. Nearly 500 is ridiculous.
I object to the proposals	As usual with recent developments there is insufficient infrastructure planning for additional traffic demands likely to cause increased delays and hold ups on high street and Harry Lauder. No information on plans for increased need for school places and patient registrations at GP surgery (existing NHS practices already have closed lists)	Consider impact of additional housing on local infrastructure and local community rather than company profit trying to fit in as many housing units as they can get away.
I object to the proposals	There is already a housing development being built next to this site adn there isn't the infrastructure - schools, doctors etc. nor roads infrastructure as portobello high st / harry lauder road already are a major log-jam as busy periods.	Either reduce housing dramatically or include infrastructure.

I object to the proposals	I feel it is too many houses with too much strain on the local resources I'd be happier with fewer with more land around them and some 4 beds	Fewer flats Some larger houses 4 beds Etc
I object to the proposals	Flats too high. The road should not be a through road.	
I object to the proposals	There is so much proposed and housing being constructed in this area there is no way the roads and facilities in the area can cope with more and more dense housing without leading to a very poor quality of life for all	Less fence housing
I object to the proposals	The proposed development is far to large for the area. The roads in the Portobello area already struggle to accommodate the current level of traffic. Air pollution will be significantly increased with this development.	Reduce the size of the development. Create a large area of green space with woodland to offset the air pollution caused by the increased traffic.
I object to the proposals	6 storey blocks are not in keeping with the surrounding buildings. Cramming so many flats into this area will significantly impact on the surrounding area, infrastructure and amenities. This will put further pressure along portobello high street to the Kings Road/Seafield junction increasing air pollution around the area. This needs to be considered alongside the increase in housing and traffic from the new site beside Aldi. Portobello lacks affordable family homes with gardens.	Reduce the height of the blocks of flats. Reduce the number of units overall by increasing the number of houses with gardens.
I object to the proposals	Where are the schools, doctors and other supporting infrastructure for these homes?	The area is already filling up with more and more houses. But there are no new GP practises and local residents cannot get registered. The local school is over subscribed. A home is more than bricks. New developments need to include all the basic services.
I object to the proposals		
I object to the proposals	Too high. Going to feature too prominently compared to the other buildings in the area. Too regimented and similar looking. They look cheap and bland.	Make them a maximum of three stories high, therefore it's less dense. And break up all the straight pathways and building fronts to create more interest and individuality.
I object to the proposals	Already too much construction going on in a very small area adjacent/close to this. Roads and pedestrian crossings do not have capacity for this. Already very dangerous junction at Harry Lauder Road.	Road at Harry Lauder junction needs redesigned with flyover/pedestrian underpass for safety. This junction is already unsafe and over-capacity.

I object to the proposals	I am concerned about traffic impact. But I am mostly concerned regarding the effect on local school catchments, especially Towerbank primary, especially considering that there is a large development being built on the adjacent site.	Restrict traffic to just the Harry Lauder road. Retain permeability for cycle traffic, though. I am suspicious regarding the developer's assessment that there will be only slight increase in peak-time traffic. Their prediction is based on an assumption of 500 members of staff for Standard Life previously working on this site: which is hugely inaccurate. The developers should also be responsible for the costs of any school building works to increase capacity for the new resident children.
I object to the proposals	Design is completely soulless, just another pile of boxes. Portobello does not have the infrastructure to cope with that many additional people. Why can we not have some thought put into it and get something designed that will enhance the community rather than detract from it.	Tear it up and start again
I object to the proposals	The infrastructure of Portobello is already overstretched. Towerbank Primary is at capacity. Local GP surgeries are full. The High Street is frequently choked with traffic. The new Portobello High School is also at capacity. We don't have the services to embrace yet more houses. There are already two new housing projects being built. Every inch of Portobello is being built on. We need more green space, more GP surgeries, more school and better roads, not more housing.	If it was withdrawn
I object to the proposals	Far too high a concentration of properties in the space. Too many flats at too high a height. No community facilities. Has to be seen in context of adjacent development.	Reduce height and number flats. Increase green space. Reduce overall amount of homes. Create an actual community facility.

I object to the proposals	<p>Too many houses/flats for the area and a clear case of land cramming to maximise profits for building company. Roads in this area are already congested and this number of properties will increase the burden onto these. The six storey flats are far too high and will be far too obtrusive.</p> <p>Little concern has been given to a development of this size onto the infrastructure of the surrounding portobello area. The new development will have nice green spaces and two roads in and out whereas the surrounding areas are being used as rat runs so cars can avoid congestion which this will dramatically add to.</p> <p>333 parking spaces are being incorporated for 483 flats and 10 commercial. Clearly indicating that cars from this area will be parking in the surrounding areas as already happens.</p> <p>Can buses run through this new development?</p>	<p>Use the land to improve the infrastructure of the portobello area. If houses must be built then Dramatically reduce number of properties proposed. Give Consideration to the impact on portobello area as a whole and not just councils need to bring in more tax and builders profits.</p> <p>Reduce the height of any flats to three stories maximum. Improve roads and infrastructure as a whole in the portobello area.</p> <p>The questions later seem slanted as this development is not adding to the public transport but will be an increased pressure on what is already available.</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Enough housing in this area.road access points limited and further congestion inevitable. No place for six storey building. how much of development is low cost? Any 'council' rented property proposed here?</p>	<p>No high rise</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>I think that a 6 storeys building is too tall, 3 storey and colony flats should be the maximum allowed in the center of Portobello</p>	<p>removing the 6 storey building or convert it to a 3 storey</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>The congestion at the moment on Sir Harry Lauder at peak times brings this area to a halt. Vehicles sometimes back up Inchview Terrace as far as Craigentiny junction. A junction on this road would need traffic lights which would make this problem worse</p>	
I object to the proposals	<p>Additional strain on an already busy pair of junctions, both of which feed into the Kings Road junction, Portobello, and the Harry Lauder/Baileyfield Roads.</p>	<p>Tell Barratt to bugger off - but that will never happen, will it?</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>The height of some of the larger flatted buildings would be intrusive to the skyline, and incongruous with the smaller neighbouring new build properties.</p>	<p>Reduce the height of the taller flatted buildings by several storeys.</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Sir Harry Lauder Road and Portobello High Street junction with Seafiel Road/London Road are amongst the most congested roads in the city as it stands, they are already building new homes next to the Aldi, another 500 homes here is going to make the traffic congestion even worse.</p>	

I object to the proposals	Portobello is already overcrowded. Towerbank is already bursting at the seams. Surely a new primary school should be top of the agenda.	Make it a primary school
I object to the proposals	Far too many apartments. Traffic provision is inadequate. 200+ Baileyfield flats are not yet built yet already Aldi traffic has some impact. Add another 700 and we'll have gridlock. Artists impressions are misleading showing only pedestrians and cyclists	Not building any additional houses. Over supply after Baileyfield is finished. Or, make it a car free development.
I object to the proposals	I am concerned that the proposed development is extremely dense, green space is seriously limited, and the density would negatively impact on the area unless more infrastructure support is created.	More green space, higher quality of design, max story height 4 floors not 6, massively improved masterplanning, properly integrated with landscape design. With both green space, hard landscape and buildings designed to charm and delight, create something we're proud of, not just to maximise profits. The Social Bite project in Granton proposed housing has bags more charm. Let's aim HIGH Portobello.
I object to the proposals	Traffic and congestion	Do not build
I object to the proposals	There is already too much congestion on Sir Harry Lauder road. Portobello High Street is heavily congested and this will compound it! Far too many properties in one place.	Do individual houses. Stop cramming properties into small spaces into an already crowded area that suffers from bad congestion.
I object to the proposals	My main concern is the increased volume of traffic at the Portobello Rd/Kings Rd etc junction. When the Traffic Management Committee studied this area before making the last changes (removal of roundabout) they were short sighted with what was a possible development in this area. A straight through flyover from Seafield Road joining the Sir Harry Lauder Rd at Baileyfield Rd should have been the plan from the onset regardless of cost. Skimping on finance almost always results in more money being spent in the future correcting the past errors of judgement (just look at the proposal to re-instate the roundabout at the top end of the Sir Harry Lauder Rd!).	Good road infrastructure!
I object to the proposals	This looks like a high density development crammed into a low density area.	The access off Sir Harry Lauder Road is limited to traffic coming from the Kings Road roundabout and any outgoing traffic will similarly be obliged to turn southbound, thus limiting the options of residents or creating a temptation to cross a very busy fast highway. At present this works due to the low volume of traffic using this access - but if that volume is increased to the levels likely from the scale of this proposal then it is likely that accidents will increase. The actual house designs are tolerable, even better than much of the housebuilding industry.

I object to the proposals	I have no issues with the design or site being developed however there are quite a few new developments in Portobello already and i am concerned about the infrastructure, GP, Dental and school access In simple terms this is too many homes and people	Limiting the scale to 250 homes
I object to the proposals	I agree with the building of the 3 storey townhouses and 2 storey houses but I object to the 6 storey buildings as I don't think they will fit well in the surrounding area. Also, 483 flats seems an awful lot and the proposal doesn't give much information about how much commercial space for amenities will be left to create a safe urban area.	Get rid of the 6 storey flats and give us more information about space for amenities.
I object to the proposals	I feel that 6 storeys is too high. The blocks should be restricted to four storeys max.	Restrict the height of the 6-storey blocks to 4
I object to the proposals	The density is too high and will put pressure on existing services such as primary and secondary schools, GP practices .	Lower the density by reducing the height an number of flatted properties and increase the number of townhouse properties.
I object to the proposals	Location next to busy road. Local services (health, school) capacity will increase.	Less housing
I object to the proposals	Too many houses in a small area. New houses also mean increased traffic in out of Portobello and on Sir Harry Lauder Road. Traffic is at a standstill at peak times already.	None. Green space would be nicer than increased housing and exhaust fumes.
I object to the proposals	East Edinburgh / Musselburgh have already been approved for thousands of homes with no thoughts of education and healthcare provision. This will also add many many more cars on the roads which are already gridlocked - including Sir Harry Lauder Rd.	Less homes on this site with more green space.
I object to the proposals	The proposals are car dominated, and of poor design quality.	Better active travel links should be incorporated into design. More effort should be made to minimise the extent of public space dedicated to car parking. More thought should be put into the shadowing and micro climate of public green spaces.
I object to the proposals	Too many houses and appartments in close proximity.	Less houses and apartments. More green space for community in Portobello
I object to the proposals	Portobello infrastructure cannot support. Traffic is already unacceptable	significantly less houses and large parking area
I object to the proposals	This proposal is for a significant increase in the housing in Portobello, putting more pressure on traffic, an already overfull primary school and all public services.	Halved
I object to the proposals	Local services are strained, the influx of new families will serve only to worsen the situation. Portobello is one of the greatest communities in Scotland and should be wary of rapid expansion.	I completely oppose said proposal.

I object to the proposals	Over 400 houses ,roads, school and doctors are already over crowed this will just add to it and make this area unusable	Build houses not 6 floor flats
I object to the proposals	Already several new housing estates being built in the area so can't understand the need for more traffic etc in whats already a huge traffic hot spot	Withdraw the application
I object to the proposals	The houses and gardens are all too small and brick is not commonly used as the most visible building material in this area.	Fewer, larger properties with larger gardens and more communal public space. Use more traditional materials such as sandstone.
I object to the proposals	The roads cannot take more housing in the area.	
I object to the proposals	Too many high rise flats	More houses not flats
I object to the proposals	As an owner of one of the properties at Adelphi Place, which faces the proposed site to the rear, I am very concerned about significant loss of daylight/sunlight that will effect my property. My single storey cottage has a velux window built into its roof, to allow for adequate daylight, due to its location directly below the rear facing wall. There is concern that daylight would be significantly impaired by the building of two storey buildings too close too to the rear of the property. If the proposed buildings overlook the existing properties on Adelphi Place, there is also concern over privacy, from having a property look directly into the velux window and rear garden. It would also be a slight concern that the levels of street parking at Adelphi Place may be impacted by any overflow parking requirements from the new residents at the site.	More consultation needs to be made with the residents of Adelphi Place, in order to ensure that the new properties do not impact on the privacy/ natural lighting of the Adelphi Place cottages, as these sit directly below the ground level at the boundary embankment of the proposed site. As much open space as possible needs to be maintained between the new properties and the boundary wall, whether this be for resident car parking or garden space. Having the new properties built directly up to the boundary wall would be unacceptable.
I object to the proposals	Companies are too busy selling brownfield sites for housing instead of investing in these sites to increase jobs.	No housing..more jobs
I object to the proposals	This is far too large a development for this area. The infrastructure in Portobello is already overstretched.	They could be shelved. We do not need further developments i portobello.
I object to the proposals	6 stories is too high and reflective of builders who are seeking profit before community. Traffic congestion is already too great in Portobello and these houses with the additional traffic will make the situation impossible. There is a lack of infrastructure in Portobello to accommodate the needs of these and other properties being built in the area.	fewer properties

<p>I object to the proposals</p>	<p>There is a massive amount of development being proposed in around Portobello at the moment, on top of several developments already underway. There appears to be no plan for managing the increased number of people and (inevitably) traffic that this will bring, to an area where schools are full, and the local GP surgery has had to suspend taking on new patients from time to time.</p>	<p>I would want there to be robust research carried out to look at ways the local built environment could be better designed, to proactively encourage sustainable travel to be used by a far higher proportion of residents. The High Street is already ridiculously congested during the rush hour, and that is before the residential properties currently being built at Baileyfield, on Bath Street (2 developments), and on the High Street, have been completed.</p> <p>I would also want to see a robust assessment of the capacity of existing facilities such as GP services, schools, library, etc, and a plan for how these would be expanded to deal with such an increase in the local population in a short space of time. I don't believe further local development should be allowed until this infrastructure is planned/in place.</p> <p>The proposals in the plan for cycling infrastructure are vague, and appear to be minimal. I would hope that a residential development of this size could be required to provide excellent segregated cycling infrastructure, as well as upgrade some of the existing local provision nearby.</p> <p>I would also like to see more emphasis on actively reducing the likelihood that cars will routinely be used for local trips, and that the area would be designed in a way to prevent roads being used as rat-runs</p>
<p>I object to the proposals</p>	<p>it sounds as though some of the buildings are going to be too high and therefore overlooking existing housing;</p>	<p>Better building materials. Why choose brick? It is not appropriate for the locality! TALL trees would be good to soften the impact of the buildings.</p>
<p>I object to the proposals</p>	<p>far too many homes. what schools can take this number? what gp services are there because books are closed. In the past 1year the traffic has increased greatly, more homes and businesses will cause even more gridlock than now. Its a narrow area. Its only going to become impossible for traffic to move. The community will be lost. I FULLY oppose this build.</p>	<p>by either stopping the build or reducing to a quatre size.</p>
<p>I object to the proposals</p>	<p>I think that there are too many properties in relation to the space. Though some of the properties have integral garages, the majority do not. The surrounding roads are often grid locked at the moment and additional cars heading to this small area can only make things worse.</p>	<p>I think that the number of properties should be cut by at least half. It could be an attractive little housing estate with lots of landscaping and a pleasant place to live.</p>



I object to the proposals	These plans include far too many dwellings in a relatively small area. Portobello is a thriving community and these extra 300 homes would upset the balance in the existing infrastructure.	Less dwellings.
I object to the proposals	Conjestion in Portobello is already high - what is being done to improve public transport to the area to reduce impact of additional cars?	reduce height of buildings exceeding 3 levels and ensure there's a green space on the roof to improve environment.
I object to the proposals	The Macarthy and Stone retirement development, under construction, is four storeys high, and it would be quite unacceptable to permit the Standard Life site to contain buildings any higher than four storeys. There must be consideration given not only to aesthetics, but to density of population, traffic etc on this relatively small site. Air quality will be seriously compromised and traffic noise will increase. Light and space are valuable commodities and should be maximised in all new developments. By restricting maximum building height to four storeys there will be more light, the development will feel airier and less crowded, new residents will be more comfortable and the overall appearance and "feel" of the area will be more aesthetically pleasing.	Fewer residential units at maximum four storey height, and low level commercial buildings. Efficient traffic management is imperative, as is careful and thoughtful landscape architecture.
I object to the proposals	There are already too many developments in this area and the area 's infrastructure is under great strain: particularly roads and schools and health facilities. The introduction of so many more housing units in that place will have a significantly deleterious effect on the quality of life of those of us who live here.	large reduction in number of units, size of units and height.
I object to the proposals	The level of density and height gives me great concern with no new support facilities being added to the community. The road structure is already strained and I cannot believe the existing road systems are adequate.	Identify what the developers can do to improve local facilities. Do detailed planning as to impact on already over-congested road links. What is impact on pollution levels?
I object to the proposals	A bland, architecturally uninteresting plan. with not enough carparking for families, not enough soft landscaping to lessen the blandness and unnecessary high rise flats that will block out yet more of the long distance views of Arthurs Seat and the Pentlands to which we have long been accustomed.	less dense block buildings and better designed housing
I object to the proposals	Far too many people, the flats are small, the houses are small garages are too small to out car in in a useful way. Meaning people will forced to use overcrowded amenities.	Larger homes which provide quality of life. Space.

I object to the proposals	<p>housing is far too dense with only one very small green area . The blocks are stark and rely too much on colour for interest, the flat roofs being particularly uncompromising - suggest tilted or wave-like roofs as approved for development on the other side of Fishwives Causeway. Projected photos suggest streets and walkways will be much wider than the map shows. The commercial space will be required for a health centre and possibly a primary school - Planning should insist on this. Traffic onto Sir Harry Lauder Road will be much increased because few people worked in the current Standard Life building. Portobello High Street can't cope with more traffic.</p>	<p>Far fewer houses, lower blocks, more space especially required for children who will effectively be trapped between two major roads.</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Too many houses without the info structure like school doctors surgery</p>	<p>New school in plan</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>the whole infrastructure of the area cannot cope at present. You are already putting housing on adjacent site and adding this proposed site would be madness. We have insufficient road access to start with, this is a well known bottle neck for traffic without adding another extra 1400 vehicles (approx) to this area. Schooling and nhs practises are already at breaking point and this will put both these facilities past breaking point. You are also aware no doubt that new housing is already underway at Newcraighall with further proposals to massively extend housing on an adjacent site. If all of this goes through on top of your proposal this whole area will become totally grid locked. Add to this your shoppers at Fort Kinnaird in the evenings and weekends and you will not be able to leave your house unless you are prepared to walk everywhere. This for me is a total non starter.</p>	<p>Only by being rejected.</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Building more homes will further congest Portobello which already struggles. Further, building more luxury homes (which 75% will be) will likely attract richer buyers and prices of all commodities in Portobello will rise to meet influx of money. The buildings themselves are also architecturally very different from the late-Victorian aesthetic that most of Portobello has, which would dilute the character of the community.</p>	<p>Make the large majority of the buildings affordable, as opposed to luxury, and change the exterior designs so that they better reflect the character of the surrounding buildings. The current designs are also very poor in and of themselves, even outwith the context of Portobello's aesthetic.</p>

I object to the proposals	This development is too dense for the site. The amount of traffic it will engender will cause congestion at the access points. There are so many regulated crossing points on Portobello High Street that traffic will come to a standstill. During the rush hour traffic will also come to a standstill on the Sir Harry Lauder Road. It is already at this point so it will be even worse.	It would help to reduce the height of the flats to a maximum of four stories. People working in the commercial areas should use public transport so limit parking space to these areas.
I object to the proposals	The local infrastructure struggles to cope as it is. The doctors and dentists are regularly full, as are the schools. The roads struggle to cope with the current traffic volume. With the huge development at Necraighall and the proposed development off Milton Road, going over to Newhailes Estate, this situation is only going to be further compounded. The last thing we need is more houses and more people in an already overcrowded area.	Non residential development.
I object to the proposals	the existing infrastructure cannot cope as it is with the sheer volume of traffic this would compound an already over stretched road road system your proposal offers no value or improvement to the existing infrastructure.	reduce site by half then half again make harry lauder road one way portobello high st/ baileyfield one way in the opposite direction.
I object to the proposals	Primarily, for traffic and resource reasons. Already 1300 homes planned for Milton Rd, this proposal will cause total mayhem for roads, schools, doctors etc.	Scrap them.
I object to the proposals	No mention is made on the impact of the development on medical and educational services in Portobello or resulting pressure on already congested road networks	If the Council also considered the surrounding infrastructure and its ability to support the size of the development
I object to the proposals	It is such a huge development and the increase in traffic would be substantial. It is very difficult to get in or out of Portobello as it is now. New roads or something would have to be put in place.	Fewer units, better access.
I object to the proposals	The traffic within the area is already too much.	Cancel them or vastly reduce amount
I object to the proposals	I think the main arteries in Portobello; Harry Lauder Rd and Portobello High Street are already choked with traffic. There are long tailbacks at peak times and these are getting increasingly worse. Also, I am quite disappointed by the lack of green space. There seems to be more paved / road space than green. I also think houses need their own gardens, rather than communal space.	More varied greenspace. Less faceless buildings.
I object to the proposals	I am significantly concerned about the impact upon the road network. Secondly, the local doctors will not be able to support and influx of another 1500 people.	Put into the complex another set of small shops and health centre.

I object to the proposals	Such a sizeable development should include more provision for community facilities so badly lacking in portobello.	Community hall or similar
I object to the proposals	The proposed development is unsuitable due to the extra traffic and access issues that would be created and would most likely negatively impact an already congested area. To expect to add a development of the size proposed without creating a solution for traffic that only wishes to go directly through the area on what are main arterial routes is inappropriate.	use a great deal of imagination to mitigate the effect the development would certainly have on existing traffic flow
I object to the proposals	I don't like high buildings. I agree with providing more housing although it would be nice if it was 100% affordable.	I prefer standard housing that does not block light from any aspect. It makes an area less built up.
I object to the proposals	I object to the strain that these new families will put on the local facilities, such as the surrounding schools, doctors and other other health care failing since they are all at full capacity as they are	Proposals on the potential help the services above could acquire
I object to the proposals	Too many properties. Even 100 fewer dwellings would be preferable. The increase in population will swamp the school and medical provision in Portobello. Traffic volume will be increased on an already congested road system in this area. The 4-6 storey block of flats is unsightly and lacks architectural merit or imagination. Whilst removing the present "industrial" site is a positive step for our area, what is being proposed seems to be an exercise in putting as many properties as possible into a relatively small area, and lacks any thought and sensitivity as regards design and imagination, but that is the case in all recently approved new developments in this once beautiful city of Edinburgh.	Removing the 4-6 storey block of flats. Producing a plan which has attractive housing of top quality design, which will enhance Portobello, not detract from it. Reduce the number of dwellings.
I object to the proposals	We have too much being built already. Let's have a hold until we see how existing work changes Porto bellows.	By not having it built at all
I object to the proposals	Worry that the infrastructure needed doctor schools etc can't support this Will make traffic in Portobello even busier	Reduce number of houses
I object to the proposals	Far too many houses for the site available	Less housing

I object to the proposals	<p>Completely Inadequate access to such a big development via the two existing roads _Portobello High Street and Harry Lauder road are already congested to the point of complete standstill at many times of the day. More traffic would cause complete gridlock and compromise access for all other residents in Portobello. Existing schools and GP surgery are already overstretched. The sheer density of housing is already stressful and more tall buildings would make this feel worse. This size of development would add greatly to local pollution - the existing rubbish collection services cannot cope with the current amount of rubbish, which blows around the streets because bins have been overfilled and not emptied often enough. Police are unable to enforce safe school streets at Towerbank school because they are already overstretched. Even with walking and cycling routes people will still want to own and use cars, and most of their visitors will expect to drive there and be able to park their car nearby or else they will double park and block access for everyone else, as already happens in Portobello.</p>	<p>Small scale development like the council housing off Figgate Street and Figgate Lane, where there are maximum of two storeys and gardens for all the houses so that there is some quality of life and parking cars is possible.</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Far too many houses planned. Reduce by 50%.</p>	<p>As said, reduction in number of houses.</p>
I object to the proposals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Portobello does not currently have the capacity (road and transport links) to take on so many extra houses. Particularly the High Street and Brighton Place. This should be worked on before any additional housing projects are allowed. Particularly those of this scale.</li> <li>2. According to the planning proposal, there will be 60% parking allocated to the housing development. Portobello is already extremely tight for parking places and this will only make it worse.</li> <li>3. The 6 storey flats will border onto the current car park and flats at 67-73 Portobello High Street. This will severely effect the light into the majority of these properties.</li> <li>4. The appearance of the flats does not fit in with those currently in Portobello. Particularly given the fact they will range from 2 to 6 storeys high.</li> </ol>	<p>More parking allocated.  Improve road access to Portobello and the proposed site.  Change 6 storey flats to 4 or move these blocks away from current buildings to avoid blocking light from existing flats from 67-73 Portobello High Street.</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Too many new households in the area and the roads and amenities can't support them</p>	<p>Less households</p>

I object to the proposals	The housing planned is unattractive, too many homes crammed together, the flats are too high. The infrastructure within the area could not cope with so many people squeezed in. The roads are already blocking. The schools overcrowded with no space to expand, the NHS surgeries overrun by the needs of their patients. I would be overjoyed if quality housing could be built in various sizes to suit differing family and single people's needs. Most importantly allowing living space and green surroundings to promote happiness within our community. Please do not allow money to be the driving force but quality of life for all.	By not having so many homes, by not cramming as many homes as possible in the space. Show some regard towards the existing community and the impact of overcrowding. Look at the existing buildings within the area and the impact of previous mistakes. Learn from these mistakes and believe that people deserve quality environments to live their lives.
I object to the proposals	traffic already horrendously busy. council already re-done school catchment area as they are bursting at the seams	none
I object to the proposals	There are enough houses in this part of Edinburgh. More housing puts more and more pressure on already overstretched resources - spoiling everyone's lives.	Just don't build any more houses.
I object to the proposals	Too high density and not enough parking and traffic into bailey field causing blockage	Maximum of four stories and more parking
I object to the proposals	Too High, far too many, infrastructure would be swamped, traffic chaos!	A lot fewer, not so high.
I object to the proposals	Too many houses and not enough infrastructure to support it	scale the size of development down, to match the infrastructure of the area, which is already close to capacity
I object to the proposals	Too high density and not enough attention to the traffic problems which will be increasd at the Kings Road roundabout and West Portobello	Reduce density

I object to the proposals	<p>I wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The density of the development is too high for the surrounding environment as the strain on local services and infrastructure will not be sustainable. I note that the developers do not propose to provide any social amenities within the scheme – e.g. a medical centre or a nursery school or even any recreational facility. This means that the existing local services will be severely over stretched. This would include medical, dental, educational and physical infrastructure like water supply, and sewage.</li> <li>2.The number of homes in the development and the low parking provision will put very great strain on local on-street parking and increase dramatically the congestion at Fishwives Causeway access to Portobello High Street, Kings Road junction and if traffic lights are introduced to Sir Harry Lauder Road which is already regularly jammed even outwith rush hours.</li> <li>3.The design of the scheme with 9 six storey blocks is out of character with Portobello and will dominate the existing townscape to the detriment of nearby housing. The minimal provision of green space within the proposal will put increased pressure on Rosefield Park which currently has Green Flag status.</li> <li>4.I am concerned also about the increased flood risk arising from the removal of trees – the developer specifically refers to removing ALL the trees – and the building over the culvert.</li> <li>5.A further concern is the effect on local wildlife which includes such comparatively rare species as Kingfishers of which at least two pairs are regularly seen in both Rosefield Park and Figgate Park. The actual process of the works and its inevitable pollution of the Figgate Burn along the increased footfall in the parks on completion will disturb the fragile ecology of the habitat.</li> </ol>	<p>The density of the overall scheme could be reduced; the height of the flats could be lowered; provision could be made for essential services - social, educational and medical; green space could be enhanced; existing trees along the bank of the Figgate Burn could be retained and planting arranged to improve the embankment.</p>
I object to the proposals	This is an overdevelopment of this area and needs to be cut back	the flats should be no more than four stories high
I object to the proposals	I feel that this is a large number of houses on a relatively small area and that surrounding roads, parking provision, and local services are already stretched	Reduce the number of houses and ensure 100% parking provision. I also believe that the height of some of the proposed buildings should be reduced as existing heights will have a negative impact on surrounding areas due to the ground height of the site being much higher.

I object to the proposals	I do not object to any development - but the number of houses is far too much ( 100 houses possibly OK). Portobello is already pretty overcrowded with cars and with additional agreed development beside Aldi - it is going to get much worse - notwithstanding this development	reduce number of houses by 80%
I object to the proposals	There is and already has been extensive development and building within Portobello, not to mention at Newcraighall and (no doubt very soon) at/near Gilberstoun. This has to stop. The infrastructure cannot support continual building of new properties within what is already a highly populated area. The roads are already extremely congested, commuting by bus is a nightmare - it will have a devastating effect on the community as a whole. One has to wonder if these comments are ever really taken into account as I have yet to see any development proposal ever turned down!!	A considerably smaller number of properties built. I notice there are no plans for any bungalow type properties for the elderly.
I object to the proposals	I am concerned about the number of flats and houses and how this will impact on travel time, parking, Portobello community and local amenities including GP surgeries. I very much object to any building over 3 stories as this will change the character of the area.	No building over 3 stories and less housing in the area
I object to the proposals	Portobello is a densely populated area. The schools are currently oversubscribed. There is limited parking for local houses, schools, shops. This amount of homes will create more congestion getting in and out of the high street and neighbouring areas. There have been hundreds of houses built in the area in the last few years, it is a popular area and there is a demand for housing however, the quality of living is further reduced if flats get crammed into every vacant space. The number of homes seems excessive, fewer and of higher spec would be preferred, the market is there for these types of property too. Rather than again making profit margins bigger for developers, let's stop and think about what mark we leave on the land for future generations. I'm in my 30's, so not set in my ways by any means but would like to think we take pride in our buildings and don't just throw up flats every time a lot becomes free.	Fewer homes, unique and eco friendly designs. Aiming at families and elderly community's.



I object to the proposals	483 new homes is a huge number on top of the new homes now being built on the other side of Aldi. There will be an inevitable increase in car traffic adding to an already congested Portobello High St on one side and Harry Lauder Rd on the other side. These two roads are just a quarter of a mile apart.	Perhaps the multi storey dwellings could be lowered cutting down on the density.
I object to the proposals	This development would put huge stress on Doctors, Dentist, Schools as well as Traffic problems.	Do not build any more houses, Portobello is so congested at this time it cannot support this development.
I object to the proposals	Too high, too much density. Concerns about environmental implications (e.g. tree felling?, more sealed areas leading to flood danger?). But in principle ok to build on brownfield site.	Take a story or two off all the buildings; make housing less densely-packed; make sure flood protection culverts are left untouched
I object to the proposals	I object to a six story block overlooking the park and the area. I agree a development of housing is good, however there is not enough parking or green space in a conservation area.	Reduce the height of the block overlooking the park to 2 or 3 stories. Increase number of parking spaces, increase green spaces. Have some 3 or 4 bedroom flats,
I object to the proposals	I think the density of housing is too great leading to problems with car parking and general movement of people and traffic. Cars will try and park off site. Surrounding streets are already parked up. Local schools are already full. Bus provision could be worse in the future. Cycle routes should be included in the plan. Generally the housing density and height of flats should be less - maybe half the number of housing units.	Reduce density of housing and parking - make it a car free zone - have a large club car pool.

I object to the proposals	<p>Given 300? houses are being built on former Scottish Power site this proposal presents some major issues: Considerable increase to what is already a very congested area of Portobello, increased pollution, further congestion on Harry Lauder Road coming from the A1 - how will access and egress from the site be managed and congestions reduced not increased? Parking why do the houses and Scottish Power site have to have 100% yet this proposal is only 68%. There is little to no capacity in Portobello to cope with this scale of potential increase in residents vehicles. Can local schools cope with increased numbers of children living in this development. What will the impact actually be on my street? Particularly neighbours whose homes will be overlooked by this development - loss of privacy, light etc? Will the development impact at all upon the culvert that was built at the standard life site and runs under the ground at the back of houses on Adelphi Place? This is a major factor in the flood prevention strategy as the Figgate Burn was identified as a potential flood threat to this area in Portobello. This site gives an opportunity to build attractive housing not cram as many in as possible for maximum profit without acknowledging the impact this will have on the local area. Just because historically Portobello had a mix of housing 4/5 storey tenements etc. This is not justification for building 'high rise' homes - times have moved on! Have pollution surveys been undertaken that show what impact a proposal of the scale will have locally?</p>	Reduce number of housing units, no 6 storey buildings, 100% parking for all residents.
I object to the proposals	Too high; too dense; parking insufficient; insufficient green space for number of properties. Negative impact on residential amenity and conservation area as designs do not fit in with surrounding housing.	Lower heights and density. Increase on-site parking to council standard (100%). Increase green space. Improve design. Change from brink to stone facing.
I object to the proposals	I'm concerned about the lack of green space allowed within the development, about the impact on traffic on an already very busy High Street and the 6 storey flats interrupting the view.	Building lower apartment blocks and allowing more green space, therefore reducing occupancy.
I object to the proposals	Overcrowded development - welcome the idea of housing but the six storey blocks in particular will totally dominate and change the area, affecting privacy, public views and strain on all infrastructure.	Fewer houses, do not remove trees (plant more). More parking spaces, suggestions/invitations for commercial site to include - GP surgery? Overall - too dense.
I object to the proposals	Traffic. Too dense. Height of building. Closeness to culvert/flood prevention scheme. Height of even 2 storey will have impact on Adelphi Place as land is higher.	Less properties. Less height. Keep properties away from culvert area.

I object to the proposals	Overdevelopment - too high a density and breach of council guidelines. Poor visual quality of designs. Impact upon traffic volumes.	Less dense development. No 6 storey blocks. More on site parking provision.
I object to the proposals	Not enough schools, doctors, dentist. Traffic problems and parking. Royal High School too far for young children to travel safely.	
I object to the proposals	With Brunstane and Portobello together another 1,813 dwellings. Road congestions will be severe at times. An overcrowding atmosphere. Why? I think I will leave the area!	Reduce the number of dwellings to improve quality of life. Need bridges or tunnels to improve traffic flow.
I object to the proposals		Would like to see some 1 story houses. It is sad to see that bungalows have gone out of fashion.
I object to the proposals	Infrastructure in Portobello already stretched - schools, parking, health services, public transport, police, are already stretched/at capacity. This will greatly exacerbate all issues. Shocking proposal!!! House design is unattractive, have the look of 1960 council housing. Will not stand the test of time i.e. age well. Predict in 10 years time they will be considered an eye sore. Portobello has come on leaps and bounds since 20 years ago. This development is a step back in the time and the wrong direction. The staircases up to the second story are horrendous. Reminiscent of Niddrie and Craigmillar. Portobello does not have the services, infrastructure, transport links to absorb such a development. The fact the housing design is so dated, ugly and reminds me of the 'projects' in America, cements my objection to this proposal.	Reduce by 75% number of houses, increase parking, new health centre, school. Would make this viable. Build only houses - no 4 or 6 storey flats.
I object to the proposals	Density of houses/occupation is too high. Not enough residents parking/parking will overflow into surrounding streets. Quality of build looks poor/cheap. Road infrastructure won't take added traffic. Local doctors and primary schools already at bursting point.	Cut house numbers, increase parking.
I object to the proposals	Public services and parking in Portobello already stretched. Schools - concern that resources are at capacity.	Fewer houses - unattractive exterior, needs improved. Improved roads - traffic already a nightmare. Exterior - cheap and unsightly.
I object to the proposals	Infrastructure cannot cope with this density. The designs remind me of Eastern Europe. No storage space for bikes.	Lower density, no flat roofs. Pavements and car free routes. Variety of design. Pedestrian link from Harry Lauder to Rosefield.
I object to the proposals	Concern about increased traffic at already over-busy junction of High Street/Harry Lauder Road. Increased pollution levels in area with many young families. No provision for cycle storage.	

<p>I object to the proposals</p>	<p>Highly undemocratic / insufficient info at library exhib/event for me to be able to comment sufficiently to my mind. Health - as someone who has severe reaction to traffic fumes, this looks as if up to 400 homes with cars (note, SO MANY families NOW have 2 CARS). Could push fumes levels over the top. Some testing on behalf of council would appear to be essential on behalf of residents this end of Portobello. Unjoined up thinking in council policy (stated?) to encourage cycling. I thought the council was actively promoting cycle-communting. This particular site even carries a safe cycle route (Fishwives Causeway) which has been used/known for years. Does Barretts know? I am told their pre-application consultation mentioned safe cycle storage, but I see nothing about this on these plans today in the library. Often towns have stipulated housing only for those with no cars. I am surprised a large proportion of these houses don't carry this stipulation.</p>	<p>Need to look at airflow between and across runs of terraces to avoid dangerous build up of traffic fumes. Wind direction tests publicly needed? Can be death-deadly for asthmatic children for instance.</p>
<p>I object to the proposals</p>	<p>Traffic in and around</p> <p>Traffic around this area is very heavy especially at peak times. This will just add to it.</p>	<p>Build the houses somewhere else or significantly reduce the number</p>

I object to the proposals	<p>The development is too high and too dense. Traffic will not be able to cope and the traffic impact of the development at the former Scottish Power site has not been taken into account by the developer. The lack of signals at the HLR entrance is unacceptable from a road safety point of view. The design and materials will be detrimental to the adjacent conservation area. There will be a negative impact on public views and the loss of trees on the site will lead to a reduction in residential amenity. The green space provision is inadequate. The parking provision is insufficient and will lead to overspill parking problems in the surrounding streets.</p>	<p>The density needs to be reduced, in line with the Scottish Power site. Also building heights should be reduced to a maximum of four storeys, also in line with the Scottish Power site. Adequate parking as per the councils' parking standards should be provided. The building materials and design need to be improved; we should have better quality construction adjacent to the conservation area. Traffic will not cope as the Seafield junction will be saturated once the Scottish Power site development is built, never mind the traffic generated by this development. Reducing the density will help to mitigate this. Signals need to be introduced at the HLR entrance/exit. Otherwise, motorists will try and cross the traffic, causing road safety hazards. Open space needs to be increased to serve this number of properties and play equipment should be added. Community space should be added, perhaps in the commercial block as we are losing church halls, etc, and we will need more community space to serve the growing population. Also, services such as doctor and dentists' surgeries should be included.</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Massive over-development; six-storey flats mean too many people for available parking space. Traffic issues have not been addressed.</p>	<p>Reduction in number of units</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Not enough parking for the houses Flats at 6 stories are far too high for the area Not enough road infrastructure to support the traffic Too many houses per hectare. 100 compared to 70 in the Scottish Power site</p>	<p>Flats no more than 4 storeys high.</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>The last thing Party needs is more high density housing. Doesn't it strike anyone else that while this site was considered too small for the new Party HS (now built on formerly inalienable public land) and the new Boroughmuir is being built on a much less expansive site (built up the way) off Dundee street? Still, must let the private speculators have their way, making profits out of public resources.</p>	<p>Build publicly funded social housing (what used to be called council houses before the Labour Party decided it was better for their chances to be elected to be more like the Tories) and stop developers taking over publicly owned space for their private aggrandisement. The next few questions have no indication as to what 1 - 7 mean. Is 1 good or bad?</p>
I object to the proposals	<p>Although I support the building of houses in principle I would prefer that they are not as high as 6 stories. A maximum of 4 stories would be high enough. I am concerned about the traffic coming onto Harry Lauder Road so close to the fork in that road.</p>	<p>More green space. No buildings higher than 4 stories.</p>

I object to the proposals	There is a lot of residential building already underway in this part of Portobello and the roads are already very busy, to the point of stand still often at rush hour and weekends. I don't see how building another 400 plus homes, and so double or more the amount of inhabitants, even with the two entry points will do anything but add exponentially to this traffic build-up in an already congested area. I live in Electra Place and the volume of traffic creates significant noise and air pollution already.	Less high density housing. For the scale of Portobello High Street and the access roads to and from this significantly-sized site, the amount of housing is just disproportionately large.
I object to the proposals	An additional 500 new homes is too much for the current road infrastructure. Local junctions already suffer from congestion. Without a cohesive plan to improve traffic flow into the site and Portobello/seafield I can't support this. Also too many properties for local schools to cope. Further, the six storey blocks are too tall, especially around conversation areas. Parking inadequate.	Working with Edinburgh council and plan needs to be put in place to improve traffic flow around Portobello. As the developer will be the primary benefactor financially, they should support this infrastructure. Also the council and developer need to divide a plan as to how schools will support these new families. The developer wants to dump 500 families on the area and have the council take shoulder these costs, there needs to be a plan presented. Parking in Portobello is inadequate, provision needs to be at 100%. I will never support 6 story blocks in Portobello, plans must be re-drawn at 3 storeys.
I object to the proposals	Too many houses which will put pressure on community services and increase the traffic jams which are already a problem. The 6 storey flats are not in keeping with the houses in the area.	Less housing with reduced number of storeys.
I object to the proposals	Overdevelopment of the site resulting in too much traffic congestion and increased pollution. Plain brick facades looking like communist era eastern European blocks. lack of communal spaces and other services that add value to Portobello. Detriment to public views from Rosefield Park and adjacent areas. lack of adequate parking provision within site putting pressure on surrounding streets. Use of different coloured bricks in patchwork effect is not a substitute for good design and use of materials that would contribute to a good sense of place. The junction at Seafield Road will be over capacity when the Scottish Power site is developed so there should be account taken of the cumulative impacts of all the developments around Portobello including the 1300 houses proposed for Brunstane. All of these will add to extra congestion at Portobello junctions. The scoring on the following thumbs-up assumes one is low and seven high.	Reduction in height of the six storey blocks of flats would mitigate the problems that would arise from this particular proposal.

I object to the proposals	There is too high a density to the development. The 10 blocks of flats and the commercial block are far too high at 6 storeys and should be reduced to 4 storeys to comply with the NW Portobello Development Brief. 68% residential car parking is not sufficient. It should be 100% as it is at North Baileyfield. This low provision of car parking spaces will create overspill problems for surrounding streets. The proposal will also create traffic problems for the surrounding area. The Seafield junction already has problems at peak periods. The Traffic Assessment is flawed in that the current use of the site does not generate the 500 visits the developers say it does as Standard Life used the premises to store archive material. 483 residential units will generate far more traffic than current use of the site and more than the developer predicts	Lessen the density, lower the height of the 10 6 storey blocks, provide more car parking spaces, provide more open green space and plant larger more interesting trees
I support the proposals	Think it is good use of a site which is currently a bit of an eyesore and we need more housing.	
I support the proposals	It seems like a good site for housing	Affordable rental properties. Not a massive fan of so much brick
I support the proposals	House's on this site would be better than derelict industrial units	
I support the proposals	Local housing is needed	Unsure
I support the proposals	There is a shortage of housing which this proposal addresses in a sympathetic way.	More landscaping.
I support the proposals	We require more housing.	
I support the proposals	Hopefully these will be affordable for midrange houses	Be sure to include the grass and trees and hopefully a play area for children, our development included them but were left out at the final stages in development.
I support the proposals	The site is currently an eyesore and this will bring needed homes to the area	Pro ions of electric charging points for cars
I support the proposals	There is a need for more housing in Portobello. This site has been a blot on the community especially since Standard Life vacated it but it was a bit before then too. Good quality housing will help draw that end of Portobello into the town. This might also draw in more young people and families who will help support the local high street	I don't have any particular issues that it should have added
I support the proposals	It makes sense to use that space, it been empty for long enough. It has decent access and is better than building on undeveloped greenfield sites. A far better idea than the proposals at Brunstane/Newcraigall on open space.	I think it is fine as it is.

I support the proposals	My only anxiety is the noise as I love on Baileyfield road and cracks have appeared with the piling vibrations on the current site	Additional access
I support the proposals		
I support the proposals	An unsightly, unused brownfield site will be used for housing.	It's boring and boxy so perhaps a more adventurous landscaping plan would soften it.
I support the proposals	The area needs more housing.	Traffic control onto Sir Harry Lauder Road. Better pedestrian access to Figgate Park.
I support the proposals	Seems moderately well thought out. 25% affordable provision OK.	To discourage car ownership on site, look to facilitate Car Club spaces with free membership for say 5 years and discounted rates for the first year. I'd be inclined to say 10 to 20 cars, but that's an SEP
I support the proposals	New housing, some of which appears to be "affordable" is to be welcomed. The 5/6 story blocks are not very beautiful. Presumably, many of those who come to live in this development will be young families; can local schools cope?	Pitched roofs would improve the look of the multistory blocks, failing that, could there be roof gardens or "living roofs"? Figgate Burn will need to be better maintained and kept cleaner than it is now to keep the peripheral flood risk low and to improve the amenity value of the site.
I support the proposals	It adds in extra housing, which Edinburgh as a whole, and especially Portobello will benefit from.	Slightly more detailing would be great, such as if they are planning to make it more affordable housing
I support the proposals	Will give further life to Portobello	
I support the proposals	I am only worried about there not being enough Schools, Doctors surgeries, as there seems to be a lot of new houses already in this area, I know that there are also great pressure on these services	More schools, doctors surgery,
I support the proposals		
I support the proposals	Portobello is a desirable area and would be hopeful that this development would be affordable to the middle class and would not be priced out the market. A playpark would be a nice feature also	A playpark to be added
I support the proposals	This is a well needed plan not only for Edinburgh but for the economic growth and developmental growth of Portobello.	N/a
I support the proposals	The area is currently largely unused and as Portobello is such an attractive area to live it makes sense to have more housing available in the area. As a young person who is looking to buy their first property it can be extremely difficult to find a nice flat or house in a desirable area that is also affordable so hopefully new builds like this will be able to help change that.	N/a fully support the application for new housing/industry in this area.
I support the proposals		
I support the proposals	Will be good to have more affordable housing	



I support the proposals	I think the mix of flats and houses is good. I also like the use of brick as the predominant building material.	Balconies on the flats would add a small amount of private outside space to them which would be good.
I support the proposals	The land is unused and would be good to have more residential buildings in the area.	
I support the proposals	More visually appealing than an industrial estate	
I support the proposals		
I support the proposals	I support it as long as it's affordable homes	Infrastructure in surrounding areas to cope with more traffic and people
I support the proposals	More affordable housing is needed to allow people born and brought up there to move back.	Ensure the houses are affordable to lower earners
I support the proposals	Edinburgh needs more new builds but traffic might be a problem as area already congested	New road layout
I support the proposals	This is a brownfield site, and is underused in an existing residential area. For me this just overrides my concern over the increase in traffic. BUT if this happens alongside the 1500 houses in Brunstane the area will be ruined, traffic will be appalling in particular.	It would be good to keep the houses in keeping with the area in terms of colour of brick. I.e paler rather than red bricks. Improving public transport in this area would be important - extending the tram line to the kings road?
I support the proposals	Using brown site	Lots of trees
I support the proposals	Need to be additional school places and gp practice	Additional Social housing not student accommodation or buy to let
I support the proposals	I would like to see a leisure centre form part of the project	See 2
I support the proposals	In support of the proposal to build on this land but detest the designs they're proposing.	Designs are awful. Improve the design.
I support the proposals	Need more housing in Portobello	
I support the proposals	Portobello is a thriving area but needs more housing to accommodate this	
I support the proposals	Will be vast improvement to the area and provide more investment opportunities	More landscaping
I support the proposals	Good use of the land. Brighton park very close. I would be concerned about the addition traffic onto the already congested sir harry Lauder road and through onto portobello high street	Upgraded roads and junctions. Possibly 2 lane from kings road to Milton link. Tram link? Upgraded/additional bus provision
I support the proposals	.	.
I support the proposals	-	-
I support the proposals	Housing is needed and the site is empty better to build than leave to rot	Support facilities must be incorporated i.e. schools, medical facilities and shops
I support the proposals	There is a need for houses....not flats. If we can get more family homes built then the community can be maintained and we don't need to see offspring forced to move away for portobello as they can't get a home there themselves.	Less flats and more detached homes. Not elite expensive executive homes but reasonable detached family houses. This would also reduce the negative effect if traffic and admittedly reduce their profits which is why they are cramming in so many flats

I support the proposals	Brings much needed housing to an area which is currently lacking quality housing for families	Better transport links
I support the proposals	I would welcome to opportunity to make be to a larger home and stay in the area I've live in for 18 years!	No
I support the proposals		
I support the proposals	There is a need for housing in Edinburgh, so as long as this site provides affordable, quality housing, I am in favour of it. I'd like barrett to ensure there are sufficient parking spaces for residents and visitors as parking is difficult in the area already. A swing park and communal green park area should also be included, and if possible, direct access to roseburn Park. I live on a property on the edge on the site so this will have a big impact on me and my family.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* ensure a swing park is included</li> <li>* provide a grassy civic park</li> <li>* provide sufficient parking for residents AND visitors</li> <li>* ensure the housing is affordable, so normal families can move in (not luxury high spec apartments)</li> <li>* possibly provide another access or exit point, as I imagine having only two will make them very congested at peak times</li> </ul>
I support the proposals	Excellent way to develop what is essentiallywaste land at present	?
I support the proposals	The place just now a bit of a dead zone More people for porty retailers to sell to?	No comment
I support the proposals	There is a housing shortage and this land is unlikely to be used.	
I support the proposals	Portobello needs more quality housing in a range of sizes	None
I support the proposals	The area needs a mix of housing not just flats. Makes good use of a brown field site.	
I support the proposals	much needed housing in the area	cycle paths added
I support the proposals	Looks like decent quality development and an improvement for the area.	Shops are needed, and definitely NOT another low-quality discounter.
I support the proposals		
I support the proposals	Improves the area from what is there currently	None
I support the proposals	The area has a demand for more houses which are affordable	More family homes than apartments. Don't overcrowd the space
I support the proposals	I support the density and housing mix. I do not support use of brick and pitched roof detail on townhouses as not on keeping with Scots vernacular /complementary to conservation area. Principals of landscape strategy sound but lacks detail. Lack of connectivity to high st and Adelphi place a major flaw. I see no reason why gardens to low rise should vary by tenure- seems discriminatory	Further development of landscape and urban design principals, more effort made on connectivity and frontages to support active travel
I support the proposals	it's good for the area	
I support the proposals	Upgrades the area	concerns over increased pressure on utilities and traffic
I support the proposals	We need more housing, Brownfield sites are preferable to encroachment in the green belt. This site is ideal for housing. It is close to shops etc.	

I support the proposals	Portobello is a place where people want to live. This development will bring in lots of people and the businesses in Portobello will thrive	
I support the proposals	We need housing	Not using brick as the main material
I support the proposals	This is a neglected area and there is a need for more housing. One concern is that the issue of infrastructure - schooling, doctor etc, also traffic flow - is sufficiently addressed in advance of the build - but overall am positive	As above - making sure good infrastructure
I support the proposals	Pleased to see the land developed for housing but concerned about the effects of increased traffic on the High Street and how local services: schools, health care etc will cope. There seems to be no information regarding these in this questionnaire	Happy with what is shown but, as outlined above, need to know about effect of increased traffic on the High Street and local amenities.
I support the proposals		
I support the proposals	It is better to redevelop a site than have it fall in to derelict space that gets vandalised. There is a right of way in to Rosefield park and I would hope that this will also be maintained.	
I support the proposals	However we also desperately need a car park for residents and visitors to Portobello	
I support the proposals	A development of this nature could be good for businesses and our town centre. However careful thought has to be given to ways to encourage access to the existing town centre (paths and cycle paths) and to how existing services (schools, doctors surgeries etc) will cope with 500 new households.	Direct access for pedestrians and cyclists to the town centre. To encourage use of existing facilities. The road access isn't direct and would encourage excessive use of cars

I support the proposals

With reference to the proposed development at Baileyfield I wish to make the following comments.

In principle I am in favour of residential development for this site which incorporates much needed affordable housing with an element of commercial development. It is also important to use the site efficiently but not at the expense of not forming an attractive development which is a pleasure to live in and which enhances the townscape of Portobello.

In general the current proposals are poor and sterile in terms of urban design and townscape plus the facades of the blocks lack style and elegance. I would like to see the following improvements and modifications before the developer secures planning approval.

a) The main entrance into site via Block 25 is poor. This is a very important corner as you enter the development via Fishwives Causeway. The facades to this block are very uninspiring and I think 6 storey high blocks are probably too high for this part of town unless the upper floor is set back or located within the roof space.

b) The townscape and roovescape within the site is also boring and uninspiring. There are no vista stops. Blocks 17, 18 & 19 which are six storeys high turn their backs on the principal open space within the development. These flats don't have any personal outdoor space in the form of nice balconies from their living spaces. This would enrich the lives of the residents and could greatly enrich the elevations of these blocks and the townscape within the development.

c) Good structural and soft landscaping also play a very important role within a neighbourhood. The current proposals appear to be too minimal and should be given a higher priority.

d) The elevations of the blocks/buildings play a key role in the overall appearance of a development. Lorimer is quoted as saying architecture has three main principles. Proportion, proportion and proportion. Improving the proportions of the windows on the facades and adding some additional features such as balconies and porches could enhance the development if done well (but nothing cheap and tacky).

In principle I am in favour of the development but only if there are significant amendments to improve its townscape and overall appearance. The redevelopment of brownfield sites such as this should be encouraged and having additional housing here will help enhance the micro economy and vibrancy of Portobello as an attractive place to live in.

Your faithfully  
Jim O'Neil

Please refer to my previous comments which outline in detail my reservations with regard to the poor quality of the current design proposals but suggestions which may help to improve the eventual outcome of this planning application

I support the proposals	Extra people in party will benefit businesses. There has to be some consideration in the impact of schools but the catchment areas may need to be redrawn to accommodate	Not applicable
I support the proposals	People are in need of local houses so the more built the better. This is a perfect site as it does not use a green space.	No way
I support the proposals	Edinburgh is in need of more housing and this plan looks like it will positively impact the area.	Not sure
I support the proposals	It will keep the community alive and prosper	There has to be proposals about adequate schooling
I support the proposals	It will be nice to see this area being put to good use, as long as a thorough and satisfactory impact assessment has been made. Particularly in relation to traffic, parking and access and egress. I would also like to see a few retail premises here, like a coffee house? And plenty of well maintained green space. And bike racks for visitors	As per previous point, a coffee house/ meeting area, well maintained green space and bike parks for visitors.
I support the proposals	Dislike little boxes design but housing needed. Needs better balance of social housing and housing with access e.g. 50%. Six story - four story blocks bad but 3 socially OK - more socially and environmentally friendly & reduce traffic pressure.	low rise apartments, more family houses with gardens.
I support the proposals	I feel that at 6 stories those buildings are too high but the rest of the proposals seem acceptable	
I support the proposals	I am currently unable to move from a 1 bed flat to a 2 bed flat due to current valuations. I have lived in Portobello for 20 years and welcome affordable housing that may enable me to continue living in Portobello	
I support the proposals	Good on Portobello Community Council organising this public consultation event to gather local views. Good to see high density redevelopment on a prominent brownfield site and with central open space. And also good to see 25% social/affordable housing.	Essential 'proposed' pedestrian link to Rosefield Park occurs to connect new residents with wider open space.
I support the proposals	The place has been run down for years and whilst we await the usual pretty 'ideal' nothing happens. Affordable.	
I support the proposals	Overall, seems an excellent project for a brownfield site.	
I support the proposals	Near a main/busy road, might be noisy and unattractive. Not many local shops in the area. In an commercial estate with lots of warehouses, not much of an environment. Still has the vibe and the atmosphere of an industrial estate not a housing environment.	Completely change it from commercial to residential rather than half and half. More openings and entries rather than just the main road. A local shop in the residential area, like a costcutter for example.
I support the proposals		