

Compilation of comments received from people in the area.

6/7 lozenge shaped blocks too high and alien in form traditionally scaled street frontages are more appropriate.

The number of residences proposed (350) is excessive bearing in mind St James Centre development will deliver 250 apartments

Pressure on surrounding streets from visitors and residents who do not wish to enter the single access area. The claim that it would not cause increasing traffic problems is unrealistic.

Historic use of the land should be considered. In 1970s effort was made to include the car park at RBS into the King George V Park bringing visual coherence into the New Town. The RBS proposal to develop land on Eyre Place, which is marked as open space in the current local plan enhances this argument. The existing park is small even for the needs of the districts current inhabitants would be a less agreeable space when dominated by tall apartment blocks.

Stability of land to withstand a development of the scale proposed.

Storm water and drainage issues for the size of development.

Vehicular access restricted to one access

Waste management through one access

Vulnerability of properties at 12-20 Eyre Place and 1-9 Eyre Terrace and 15 Royal Crescent.

George V Park access cannot be used for vehicles servicing the proposed development.

There are 251 cars parked in RBS car park on a busy day at the moment and they have timed arrivals and departures as previously there were dreadful traffic jams in the exit road to Eyre Place.

Is RBS accepting this is a difficult site and has decided to sell as a result?

There is rock at some points in the site at 2 metres and other parts at 12 metres maybe the Georgians and Victorians knew a thing or two and did not build on the land originally.

In 1850 when the railway went in cracks occurred in the properties on Dublin Street and Scotland Street.

When the Applecross building was erected on the corner site of Dundas Street and Eyre Place cracks appeared in the flats in Eyre place the scale of the proposed site and the necessary piling and drilling would have serious repercussions on the surrounding buildings. SEPA should ascertain how deep it would be necessary to go down before reaching solid ground before any serious proposals can be accepted.

No justification for change from commercial to residential. Commercial property is needed city will become a jobless suburb.

Quartermile struggle to sell £500+ properties so where is the demand for properties of this value?

The right to view is not normally protected in planning regulations but your development faces Grade A listed New Town UNESCO World Heritage Site and the view from Dundonald Street would be blighted like looking through bars.

The proposed blocks are completely out of character with the area.

The proposed site is a low point in the area it is ridiculous to propose buildings that are HIGHER than those they face. The roofline seems to be taken from the height of the top of the chimneys at the tallest point of the corner block on Dundas Street.

The site previously at the lowest point was a wet ponded area which suggests sub surface aquifers draining to this area any development of this land will have problems with foundations and will interfere with the natural drainage of the area surrounding and the New Town potentially undermining buildings and causing flooding and subsidence (refer to Eyre Place demolition of building which suddenly subsided and was rapidly demolished.)

The previous use of the car park as a rail siding, in the days of steam and coal may have left a contaminated site which would require investigation by SEPA and require expensive remediation work and consequential adverse publicity.

The chances of the whole site being sold to ONE developer is slim therefore a number of different developers developing different parts of the site would lead to difficulties such as one firm going bankrupt as has happened twice already surrounding this site.

The right solution is to use the car park as a garden area blending into the adjacent park and effectively leave it undeveloped.

This would allow appropriate height developments on Dundas Street and Fettes Row sites.

By using the car park as a garden area, the land RBS owns facing Eyre Place, which is currently wooded with a tree preservation order, could be arranged with the Council to land swap this area and incorporate the car park into King George V Park. Therefore giving the opportunity to build a traditionally fronted building development on Eyre Place in exchange for the car park area.

As shown on the plans the Royal Crescent blocks have been straightened out not showing the decreasing space between them and the decreased view north.

The pavement area north is a narrow historic pavement. As a result of the limited access to the site it is inevitable that residents from the site and their visitors will park from 5 30pm and 8 30am in Fettes Row, Royal Crescent, Dundonald Street and Drummomd Place etc. and access the numerous walkways to the site.

The narrow historic pavement will be a dangerous place to exit the site as already Royal Crescent and Fettes Row are a rat run and cars speed through, so emerging from the tiny pavement between parked cars onto the rat run of the street with children will be dangerous.

To compound the difficulties delivery vans will double park on Fettes Row and Royal Crescent to deliver to the site as they do at the moment causing serious obstruction and limited view of the street and traffic.

Fears that because of infrastructural problems that cannot be altered it will be unlikely that an appropriate scheme will arise on the site and there will be a number of incoherent solutions some not finished for years and existing residents will have to put up with noise, dust and pollution.

What about Phase 1 No development has taken place on that proposal?

There is no adequate provision for damage to properties. RBS paid for repairs as a result of building the Computer Centre in the 70s it would be easy for unscrupulous developers to get away with it under Scots Law.

The proposal is visually bland designed as something to gain permissions rather than provide imaginative solutions, which would add quality to the area and community.

Were there any constraints on the use of this land at the time the RBS purchased it?

Any proposed building should follow the topography of the land and continue the slope of the New Town buildings.

The public /Private boundary is not clear on the plans this should be clarified.

The single access into a one-way system at Eyre Place is clearly unrealistic. What will be the traffic impact on local streets – has a survey of this effect been carried out? The impact of traffic during construction will be a problem.

Concern about structural damage to surrounding properties.

The pie chart shown at 3rd consultation was clearly wrong and was based on reactions to the first consultation when we were all bamboozled by the plans. An updated consultation should be conducted now that residents immediately affected and those not informed but also affected are clearer about the implications.

The consultations were manipulative as no measurements were shown and no heights clearly defined so incorrect impressions were given.

UNESCO's Director is quoted to observe that Edinburgh's attitude to planning is putting at risk the World Heritage Site status.

RBS has taken no cognisance of the impact of such a development on residential amenities, infrastructure, service, and external appearance as well as loss of

privacy/overlooking/loss of light, increased noise and public services to our community.

Assurances offered in the consultations are hopeful fictions and wildly misleading as landscaping will be up the purchaser or purchasers and the proposals deal only with 'mass'.

It is a mistake for the RBS legacy in this historic city to be one of placing a blot on the landscape and community of one of the most widely appreciated areas. Might I suggest that it would be more in line with the corporate responsibility and values of the brand to do something positive for the city and go some way to repairing the negative associations of a once well-loved brand. Surely that is an asset worth investing in, and a legacy with promotional prospects worldwide?

It would be essential to get a condition in any outline planning permission that prevented demolition until full permission is granted and the work planned is to start. Developers can be quick to send the wrecking ball in because it minimizes cost of security and owning existing structures. It also leaves an eyesore gap site that CEC will be desperate to fill. Think about Fountainbridge and the Waverley development just off the Royal Mile. Developers have a stronger negotiating position when they have a dusty windswept eyesore that has been empty for years.

The proposal for tall coffin shaped blocks is out of keeping with the area.

Although an engineer was present at the 3rd Consultation event there was no detail of the ecology and environmental studies that will be part of their submission. They will have problems with these e.g. site drainage will have to separate rainwater from the foul sewer (unlike the New Town properties where it all goes down the same pipe).

They will be hoping to put it to a soakaway which will affect existing aquifers and make flooding more likely.

We should consider writing to the statutory consultees who will be asked for their input. They need to know this is a contentious development and that they need to put their best people on to it. SEPA for water and the environment, Historic Scotland and Edinburgh World Heritage hopefully they will all object.

Car parking and provision of green space are specified in planning guidance but are often underprovided in city centre locations. Existing local services cannot be relied upon in this instance.

350 underground car parking spaces will be provided in the proposals. There will be nothing to stop site residents using Royal Crescent and Fettes Row when restrictions are not in force and the easier the access the more likely this will be. I do not think there should be pedestrian access to these streets for personal and road safety reasons.

We do not know who will occupy these flats at the moment there are five students who may all have cars in these streets how will their parking be accommodated?

Why was such a limited area informed of the consultation events when a much larger area is likely to be affected? E.G. Eyre Crescent, Dundas Street, Drummond Place, Dundonald Street, Scotland Street etc.

Which primary school would accommodate the children who inhabit the flats on the site, as Stockbridge Primary School is full?

If the guidelines state that 20% of the site should be green that would mean the car park as it exists would constitute 20% so should be given over to parkland.
