

Questions - Part 1 – A National Spatial Strategy for Scotland 2045

1 Sustainable places. Our future net zero places will be more resilient to the impacts of climate change and support recovery of our natural environment. Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future net zero places which will be more resilient to the impacts of climate change and support recovery of our natural environment?

Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future net zero places which will be more resilient to the impacts of climate change and support recovery of our natural environment?:

We are pleased to see the inclusion of the climate emergency and biodiversity crisis as part of the draft NPF4. As a campaigning organisation that champions cycling, we know that this form of transport can make significant inroads to mitigating carbon emissions from transport and we are pleased to see NPF4 support this goal.

It is vital that planning policy underpins a shift to a more sustainable way of living. However, we think that this document needs to be stronger and more ambitious in its efforts to tackle climate change and the biodiversity crisis.

Ultimately, NPF4 should make it clear that every way we use or develop our land should contribute to making Scotland a more sustainable place.

We are pleased to see the inclusion of "reduce the need to travel unsustainably" as part of this section. This is key to ensuring that our built spaces are sustainable, accessible and equitable for everyone, including older people and disabled people. Furthermore, it will be critical to achieving the government's commitment to reducing car-km by 20% by 2030.

We have some additional suggestions:

- Planning departments need better support services including full and required liaison with active travel officers on planning matters ranging from area plans down to the detail of individual planning applications- we have plenty examples where active travel has been failed in planning application approvals.

- Planners, roads officers and councillors need training e.g. in carbon accounting and net biodiversity gain to understand how to deliver better decisions, including those surrounding transport choices and the benefits of active and sustainable travel.

- We should be clear that most developments contribute to a rise in climate emissions and a good number have the potential to lead to a loss of biodiversity.

- NPF4 policies need to recognise that a reduction in environmental impacts cannot be achieved without downscaling current levels of production and consumption.

- NPF4 should be looking to stabilise or even reduce the per capita consumption of residential space and built-up land area. Such ideas are in keeping with the principles of compact towns and policies on 20 minute neighbourhoods and circular economy but are not explicit in the document. Cycling can be a vital support mechanism when attempting to reduce urban sprawl and should be considered as a serious and relevant transport option as part of efforts to reduce consumption of space.

- Policies need to be strengthened to reflect the level of ambition. Developments that contribute to net climate emissions or result in a loss of biodiversity are no longer acceptable. The bar needs to be set very high for exceptions to these policies.

2 Liveable places. Our future places, homes and neighbourhoods will be better, healthier and more vibrant places to live. Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places, homes and neighbourhoods which will be better, healthier and more vibrant places to live?

Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places, homes and neighbourhoods which will be better, healthier and more vibrant places to live?:

We are supportive of 20 minute neighbourhoods and are pleased to see this included in the Liveable Places section. We are also pleased to see "We want to make better use of our spaces to support physical activity" as part of this section. Investment and the practical application of sustainable transport modes such as cycling will complement this aspiration.

We are supportive of the statement "We hope to empower more people to shape their places". At the moment it is difficult for communities to challenge unsustainable developments that do not meet planning requirements, and we would like to see this addressed through the right for communities to appeal planning decisions, particularly on proposals that do not aid sustainable and active travel but instead build in car dependency.

We also seriously question whether the idea of liveable places is supported when physical growth is concentrated in particular areas. The Edinburgh city region's allocation of housing growth is disproportionately high. Some brownfield land is used for this but mainly this uses agricultural land. The impact of this is that the countryside is getting further and further away from the city centre and separate towns are joining up e.g. Edinburgh and Musselburgh. For city centre residents access to the countryside, particularly by bike is made more difficult.

NPF4 says lots of positive things about the sustainability of our society and environment but is not this concentration of physical growth bad for

wellbeing? Should a truly sustainable society not avoid over concentration of development and try to ensure people are not cut off from the countryside. A sustainable travel network and green travel corridors are fine but we also need the countryside to be nearby too. In as much as it is needed at all, the physical growth of places needs to be more evenly distributed across the country. The spatial strategy / policy of the Government should be bolder about directing economic activity.

3 Productive places. Our future places will attract new investment, build business confidence, stimulate entrepreneurship and facilitate future ways of working – improving economic, social and environmental wellbeing. Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places which will attract new investment, build business confidence, stimulate entrepreneurship and facilitate future ways of working – improving economic, social and environmental wellbeing?

Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places which will attract new investment, build business confidence, stimulate entrepreneurship and facilitate future ways of working – improving economic, social and environmental wellbeing?:

We are pleased to see reference to a wellbeing economy, which is an economic model that rejects growth at all costs and instead focuses on serving people and communities first and foremost, offering a path toward greater social well-being and environmental health.

This section states "green investment is a key priority for the coming years", however the definition of "green investment" is not clear here. What does this mean in practice? A definition is needed if it is not to mean many things to different people.

4 Distinctive places. Our future places will be distinctive, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, welcoming, nature-positive and resource efficient. Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places which will be distinctive, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, welcoming, nature-positive and resource efficient?

Do you agree that this approach will deliver our future places which will be distinctive, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, welcoming, nature-positive and resource efficient?:

Distinctive Places states that future developments will be "easy to move around", but does not back this up with anything meaningful.

It would be good to include more mention of movement here - how our towns and cities could be shaped to allow everyone to move about easily by sustainable means and without the pollution, noise and danger imposed on citizens when places allow significant and unimpeded car access. People in future settlements, including people with mobility considerations, should not normally need access to a private car, especially when these developments are within 20 minute neighbourhoods.

5 Distinctive places. Our future places will be distinctive, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, welcoming, nature-positive and resource efficient. Do you agree that the spatial strategy will deliver future places that overall are sustainable, liveable, productive and distinctive?

Do you agree that the spatial strategy will deliver future places that overall are sustainable, liveable, productive and distinctive?:

6 Spatial principles. Do you agree that these spatial principles will enable the right choices to be made about where development should be located?

Do you agree that these spatial principles will enable the right choices to be made about where development should be located?:

7 Spatial Strategy Action Areas. Do you agree that these spatial strategy action areas provide a strong basis to take forward regional priority actions?

Do you agree that these spatial strategy action areas provide a strong basis to take forward regional priority actions?:

8 North and west coastal innovation. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

9 North and west coastal innovation. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area? :

10 Northern revitalisation. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

11 Northern revitalisation. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?:

12 North east transition. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

13 North east transition. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?:

14 Central urban transformation. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area? :

We welcome the recognition of the need to decarbonise transport and tackle congestion as well as creating more inclusive, greener and sustainable places in the summary for the Central Urban Transformation.

Given the opportunities afforded by active travel, including cycling, in helping to address the challenges presented for this action area, we would like to see it receive specific mention in the summary of challenges and opportunities. Investment in active travel could not only help to decarbonise transport and reduce congestion, it could also help to tackle health inequalities and provide people with opportunities for outdoor recreation.

15 Central urban transformation. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area? :

Action 13, "Pioneer low-carbon, resilient urban living" is particularly welcome as it recognises the need to invest in active travel networks and reduce urban car use. We would also like to see both active travel and reduction in car use recognised for the roles they can play in addressing health inequalities (increased physical activity, reduced pollution) and weigh the importance of measures to promote these accordingly.

Action 16, "Rediscover urban coasts and waterfronts". We welcome the progressing of long-distance walking and cycling routes and reclaim the waterfront. These routes should be well integrated with routes going inland and form part of the wider active travel infrastructure for the areas affected.

Action 17, "Reuse of land and buildings" is also welcome as use of brownfield sites is important in creating more compact cities which are easier to move around by active travel modes, including cycling. We would like to see an ambitious approach to this action and wording which reflects the opportunities offered, including the opportunities for the development of active travel infrastructure. For example, there are a growing number of places around the world where roads have been transformed into successful urban parks with active travel routes (e.g. Cheonggyecheon Restoration Project in Seoul, South Korea and the conversion of the right wing of the River Seine into a park in Paris, France).

Action 21, "Improve urban accessibility". We support the development of 20 minute neighbourhoods. Given the importance of cycling, walking and wheeling to the success of 20 minute neighbourhoods and improving urban accessibility more generally, we would like active travel infrastructure and reduction in car use to be given specific mention in this action point. Mass transit developments are welcome but must be completed with a holistic approach, which takes into account the safety of other road users and facilitates the use of active travel as part of journeys by mass transit.

16 Southern sustainability. Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?

Do you agree with this summary of challenges and opportunities for this action area?:

17 Southern sustainability. What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?

What are your views on these strategic actions for this action area?:

18 National Spatial Strategy. What are your overall views on this proposed national spatial strategy?

What are your overall views on this proposed national spatial strategy?:

Overall, the action areas broadly support Spokes' objectives to enable more people to safely cycle for everyday trips. We recognise that this is a strategic document and therefore doesn't get into fine details around sustainable transport in the wider context of planning in specific areas.

It is good to see focus on modal shift away from the car, towards 20 minute neighbourhoods and active travel networks. We would be keen to see more inclusion of mobility hubs, on-demand transport and last-mile logistics as part of the planning solutions to enable more sustainable transport choices for individuals and businesses in both urban and rural areas.

An important point is that there is mention of "travelling unsustainably" sprinkled throughout, but it is not made clear what this encompasses. What is the definition of this in practice? Would the same number of short car trips currently taken by ICE vehicles and swapped out to EVs be considered travelling sustainably? It's obvious that car trips swapped from ICE to EV are still unsustainable in many different ways (congestion, lack of physical activity, road safety etc). Our view is that sustainable transport is accessible, environmentally sound and equitable, so would mean walking, wheeling, cycling, public transport and, where cars are needed, car clubs or other shared provision.

Questions - Part 2 - National developments

19 Do you think that any of the classes of development described in the statements of need should be changed or additional classes added in order to deliver the national development described?

Do you think that any of the classes of development described in the statements of need should be changed or additional classes added in order to deliver the national development described?:

We note the inclusion of urban/mass transit networks as national strategy 3. Spokes supports public transport and specifically expansion of Edinburgh's tram system. However, despite warnings from ourselves and others, the first Edinburgh tram line was installed with virtually zero consideration for

cyclists (or pedestrians). It was also under a design and build contract where amendments could only be made at exorbitant cost.

The basic tramline layout is therefore particularly cycle-hostile and as a result literally hundreds of people have attended A&E following bicycle/tramline crashes (research by Prof Chris Oliver) some with life-changing injuries, many suffering days or weeks of pain off work, and of course there has been a tramline-related death. We have been convinced from the outset, as we unsuccessfully tried to impress on the promoters in the early planning days, that a different tramline layout, along the same route, would have brought far fewer injuries - and indeed Edinburgh Council is now installing a series of measures which attempt to ameliorate the position at some of the worst locations, although sadly the basic layout can not be changed.

Therefore the wording of this national development must be very explicit that mass transit expansion must be designed holistically with associated active travel provision, to ensure safety as well as boosting active travel. Specific reference must also be made to ensuring segregated cycle provision alongside tramlines and provision of safe crossing points of the tramlines - and indeed for pedestrians. Although by far the greatest number of tramline injuries have been to cyclists, Prof Oliver's research shows that the poor layout and design of the initial tramlines has also resulted in a significant number of pedestrian injuries.

20 Is the level of information in the statements of need enough for communities, applicants and planning authorities to clearly decide when a proposal should be handled as a national development?

Is the level of information in the statements of need enough for communities, applicants and planning authorities to clearly decide when a proposal should be handled as a national development?:

Statement 2 covers the national walking, wheeling and cycling network. Is this network defined as Sustrans numbered routes? It is unclear from the statement which active travel routes are currently considered part of a national network.

The document states:

"New/and or upgraded routes suitable for a range of users for walking, cycling and wheeling that help create a national network that facilitates short and longer distance journeys and linkages to multi-modal hubs."

However, it is worth noting that many active travel networks in villages, towns and cities are fragmented - they are not really networks at all. It is arguable that any good quality cycling and walking infrastructure would contribute to a national network.

Spokes believes that there may be more clarity required on what proposals or routes would actually comprise being part of a national network. All active travel infrastructure creating or upgrading fragmented routes in urban and rural areas could easily be considered of national importance, as our current network is so rudimentary and lacks connectivity across population centres in Scotland.

21 Do you think there are other developments, not already considered in supporting documents, that should be considered for national development status?

Do you think there are other developments, not already considered in supporting documents, that should be considered for national development status?:

Questions - Part 3 – National Planning Policy

22 Sustainable Places. We want our places to help us tackle the climate and nature crises and ensure Scotland adapts to thrive within the planet's sustainable limits. Do you agree that addressing climate change and nature recovery should be the primary guiding principles for all our plans and planning decisions?

Do you agree that addressing climate change and nature recovery should be the primary guiding principles for all our plans and planning decisions? :

Yes, we agree that addressing climate change and nature recovery should be at the heart of the planning system and decision making. Cycling as a sustainable form of transport has a big role to play as part of this system.

However, the current wording in the draft NPF4 doesn't say that policies on climate and nature should be given more weight than other policies, so it's not clear how these issues will be considered in decisions. We would like to see more weight given to policies which aim to tackle the climate and nature crisis, including policies which support active travel. Without this, there is a risk that unsustainable, car-centred developments will continue to be granted planning permission.

23 Policy 1: Plan-led approach to sustainable development. Do you agree with this policy approach?

Do you agree with this policy approach?:

We support a plan led system of planning. A plan led system provides certainty for communities, as well as developers, and in theory provides a degree of democratic involvement and accountability.

The policy should state that developments which stray from local development plans (LDPs) should be actively and strongly discouraged - if not outright refused - otherwise it defeats the purpose of LDPs. Applications that are submitted out with LDPs waste the time and resources of planners and the limited time and effort of the public and voluntary organisations (such as ourselves) who respond to consultations on LDPs in good faith.

We also have examples where approved plans for areas of the city are not adhered to by developers of individual sites within that area; in particular losing the option for high quality active travel networks which the plan had promised. Even where the routes are provided, pedestrian/cycle conflict is

often built in by the developers. Councils can be too keen to approve such developments for economic reasons, conveniently overlooking the damage to the potential active travel network.

24 Policy 2: Climate emergency. Do you agree that this policy will ensure the planning system takes account of the need to address the climate emergency?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure the planning system takes account of the need to address the climate emergency? :

If Scotland is serious about using planning to tackle the climate and nature emergencies, it stands to reason that we should not be planning for, or consenting to, any new development that will contribute to climate change or the loss of biodiversity unless it is absolutely necessary to meet social needs.

Part c) of this policy provides significant wiggle room for unsustainable developments. What are the criteria for "proposed development... in the long-term public interest"? This statement is nebulous at best, and without clear parameters as to what "long-term public interest" is, it could be used to push through development that actively works against net zero ambitions. As we are in a declared climate emergency, unsustainable developments that add net carbon emissions should not be progressed.

Also on part c), re the following statement "Where significant emissions are likely (even as minimised) in relation to national decarbonisation pathways but the planning authority is minded to grant consent, emissions off-setting measures may be considered including nature-based solutions". While we argue that any unsustainable developments should be refused, off-setting measures should be a requirement rather than merely a consideration.

We suggest amendments to this policy in its current form:

- This policy must make it clear that emission reductions and a lack of support for high emitting developments is the policy's primary aim, with offsetting very much a last resort.
- Exemptions should not be seen as a standard approach, but very much a last resort.
- The public interest exemption must be removed. Although significant emissions are not defined, it is clear that any development that contributes significantly or even moderately to climate emissions cannot be viewed as being in the long term public interest.
- Significant emissions need to be defined or made clear how they would be measured.
- Viability exemptions should be removed

25 Policy 3: Nature crisis. Do you agree that this policy will ensure that the planning system takes account of the need to address the nature crisis?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure that the planning system takes account of the need to address the nature crisis? :

The climate and biodiversity crises are interlinked. We therefore suggest that Policy 3 should be amended to echo Policy 2a), by stating 'When considering all development proposals significant weight should be given to the nature crisis'.

26 Policy 4: Human rights and equality. Do you agree that this policy effectively addresses the need for planning to respect, protect and fulfil human rights, seek to eliminate discrimination and promote equality?

Do you agree that this policy effectively addresses the need for planning to respect, protect and fulfil human rights, seek to eliminate discrimination and promote equality?:

This policy should recognise that to achieve equality in the planning system communities should have the same rights and opportunities as developers. This includes the right to appeal the planning decisions that are contrary to LDPS. Providing communities with a right to appeal will also help deliver Policy 1.

27 Policy 5: Community wealth building Do you agree that planning policy should support community wealth building, and does this policy deliver this?

Do you agree that planning policy should support community wealth building, and does this policy deliver this?:

28 Policy 6: Design, quality and place. Do you agree that this policy will enable the planning system to promote design, quality and place?

Do you agree that this policy will enable the planning system to promote design, quality and place?:

It would be pertinent to include transport policies which dovetail into planning, such as the newly revamped Cycling By Design, in this section.

RE Designed for lifelong health and wellbeing - we would like to see inclusion of neighbourhoods being easily permeable for cycles, as well as being walkable.

RE Well connected and easy to move around - there is no mention of cycling here, which is an oversight. The phrase "designing places for everyone for walking and wheeling" excludes cycles as a sustainable transport option and the sentence should be amended to include cycling.

29 Policy 7: Local living. Do you agree that this policy sufficiently addresses the need to support local living?

Do you agree that this policy sufficiently addresses the need to support local living? :

30 Policy 8: Infrastructure First. Do you agree that this policy ensures that we make best use of existing infrastructure and take an infrastructure-first approach to planning?

Do you agree that this policy ensures that we make best use of existing infrastructure and take an infrastructure-first approach to planning?:

31 Policy 9: Quality homes. Do you agree that this policy meets the aims of supporting the delivery of high quality, sustainable homes that meet the needs of people throughout their lives?

Do you agree that this policy meets the aims of supporting the delivery of high quality, sustainable homes that meet the needs of people throughout their lives?:

32 Policy 10: Sustainable transport. Do you agree that this policy will reduce the need to travel unsustainably, decarbonise our transport system and promote active travel choices?

Do you agree that this policy will reduce the need to travel unsustainably, decarbonise our transport system and promote active travel choices?:

In general this section contains too many ambiguities and let-outs which will enable unsustainable development to proceed. We list below some of the most obvious examples.

Part f) has no reference to carbon emissions from the building of trunk road junctions. Carbon emissions from the build and, even more significantly, the resulting likely rise in private car trips should be included as considerations for refusal. Expanding road capacity at the same time as committing to cutting car-km by 20% makes no sense at all, and generates widespread scepticism as to how genuine is the 20% commitment.

Part g) states "Development proposals should put people and place before unsustainable travel where appropriate". If the government is serious about its climate ambitions, and its 20% car-km reduction commitment, this should always be the case, not just when considered appropriate. There is opportunity for unsustainable developments that are car-dominated to progress based on this statement in its current form.

Part g) states "Effective design can reduce the number and speed of vehicles and provide safe crossings on local roads". In our view, effective design MUST reduce the number and speed of vehicles - this should not be an option.

Part h) of this policy is unclear in its current form, as it can be interpreted in several different ways. For example, it could be interpreted that if a development would increase reliance on the private car, then it can be approved as long as there are cycle routes, walking infrastructure and access to public transport. This policy statement should be amended so that it is very clear that any developments that increase reliance on the private car should be refused, regardless of associated sustainable transport infrastructure.

We have known for a very long time that by making driving convenient and accessible to people, it is the mode of transport that most will choose, regardless of quality and access to public transport or walking/cycling infrastructure. The Scottish Government has committed to reduce vehicle trips by 20% by 2030 - they will absolutely not be met if private vehicles continue to be the easiest and most convenient transport choice, even when sustainable alternatives exist.

Scottish planning policy must be absolutely clear that any developments that increase reliance on the private car should be refused outright.

33 Policy 11: heat and cooling. Do you agree that this policy will help us achieve zero emissions from heating and cooling our buildings and adapt to changing temperatures?

Do you agree that this policy will help us achieve zero emissions from heating and cooling our buildings and adapt to changing temperatures? :

34 Policy 12: Blue and green infrastructure, play and sport. Do you agree that this policy will help to make our places greener, healthier, and more resilient to climate change by supporting and enhancing blue and green infrastructure and providing good quality local opportunities for play and sport?

Do you agree that this policy will help to make our places greener, healthier, and more resilient to climate change by supporting and enhancing blue and green infrastructure and providing good quality local opportunities for play and sport?:

35 Policy 13: Sustainable flood risk and water management. Do you agree that this policy will help to ensure places are resilient to future flood risk and make efficient and sustainable use of water resources?

Do you agree that this policy will help to ensure places are resilient to future flood risk and make efficient and sustainable use of water resources?:

36 Policies 14 and 15 – Health, wellbeing and safety. Do you agree that this policy will ensure places support health, wellbeing and safety, and strengthen the resilience of communities?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure places support health, wellbeing and safety, and strengthen the resilience of communities?:

37 Policy 16 – land and premises for business and employment. Do you agree that this policy ensures places support new and expanded businesses and investment, stimulate entrepreneurship and promote alternative ways of working in order to achieve a green recovery and build a wellbeing economy?

Do you agree that this policy ensures places support new and expanded businesses and investment, stimulate entrepreneurship and promote alternative ways of working in order to achieve a green recovery and build a wellbeing economy?:

Questions - Part 3 - National Planning Policy continued

38 Policy 17: Sustainable tourism. Do you agree that this policy will help to inspire people to visit Scotland, and support sustainable tourism which benefits local people and is consistent with our net-zero and nature commitments?

Do you agree that this policy will help to inspire people to visit Scotland, and support sustainable tourism which benefits local people and is consistent with our net-zero and nature commitments?:

We would like to see developments that hook into or contribute towards the national walking, wheeling and cycling network and encourage more active travel to be given some weighting as part of this policy. Sustainable tourism via foot and cycle is very important for many rural communities.

39 Policy 18: Culture and creativity. Do you agree that this policy supports our places to reflect and facilitate enjoyment of, and investment in, our collective culture and creativity?

Do you agree that this policy supports our places to reflect and facilitate enjoyment of, and investment in, our collective culture and creativity?:

40 Policy 19: Green energy. Do you agree that this policy will ensure our places support continued expansion of low carbon and net-zero energy technologies as a key contributor to net-zero emissions by 2045?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure our places support continued expansion of low carbon and net-zero energy technologies as a key contributor to net-zero emissions by 2045?:

41 Policy 20: Zero waste. Do you agree that this policy will help our places to be more resource efficient, and to be supported by services and facilities that help to achieve a circular economy?

Do you agree that this policy will help our places to be more resource efficient, and to be supported by services and facilities that help to achieve a circular economy?:

42 Policy 21: Aquaculture. Do you agree that this policy will support investment in aquaculture and minimise its potential impacts on the environment?

Do you agree that this policy will support investment in aquaculture and minimise its potential impacts on the environment?:

43 Policy 22: Minerals. Do you agree that this policy will support the sustainable management of resources and minimise the impacts of extraction of minerals on communities and the environment?

Do you agree that this policy will support the sustainable management of resources and minimise the impacts of extraction of minerals on communities and the environment?:

44 Policy 23: Digital infrastructure. Do you agree that this policy ensures all of our places will be digitally connected?

Do you agree that this policy ensures all of our places will be digitally connected?:

45 Policies 24 to 27 – Distinctive places. Do you agree that these policies will ensure Scotland's places will support low carbon urban living?

Do you agree that these policies will ensure Scotland's places will support low carbon urban living?:

46 Policy 28: Historic assets and places. Do you agree that this policy will protect and enhance our historic environment, and support the re-use of redundant or neglected historic buildings?

Do you agree that this policy will protect and enhance our historic environment, and support the re-use of redundant or neglected historic buildings?:

47 Policy 29: Urban edges and the green belt. Do you agree that this policy will increase the density of our settlements, restore nature and promote local living by limiting urban expansion and using the land around our towns and cities wisely?

Do you agree that this policy will increase the density of our settlements, restore nature and promote local living by limiting urban expansion and using the land around our towns and cities wisely?:

48 Policy 30: Vacant and derelict land. Do you agree that this policy will help to proactively enable the reuse of vacant and derelict land and buildings?

Do you agree that this policy will help to proactively enable the reuse of vacant and derelict land and buildings?:

49 Policy 31: Rural places.Do you agree that this policy will ensure that rural places can be vibrant and sustainable?

Do you agree that this policy will ensure that rural places can be vibrant and sustainable? :

50 Policy 32: Natural places.Do you agree that this policy will protect and restore natural places?

Do you agree that this policy will protect and restore natural places?:

51 Policy 33: Peat and carbon rich soils.Do you agree that this policy protects carbon rich soils and supports the preservation and restoration of peatlands?

Do you agree that this policy protects carbon rich soils and supports the preservation and restoration of peatlands? :

52 Policy 34 – Trees, woodland and forestry:Do you agree that this policy will expand woodland cover and protect existing woodland?

Do you agree that this policy will expand woodland cover and protect existing woodland?:

53 Policy 35: Coasts.Do you agree that this policy will help our coastal areas adapt to climate change and support the sustainable development of coastal communities?

Do you agree that this policy will help our coastal areas adapt to climate change and support the sustainable development of coastal communities?:

Questions - Part 4 - Delivering our spatial strategy

54 Do you agree with our proposed priorities for the delivery of the spatial strategy?

Do you agree with our proposed priorities for the delivery of the spatial strategy?:

55 Do you have any other comments on the delivery of the spatial strategy?

Do you have any other comments on the delivery of the spatial strategy?:

Questions - Part 5 - Annexes

56 Annex A.Do you agree that the development measures identified will contribute to each of the outcomes identified in section 3A(3)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997?

Do you agree that the development measures identified will contribute to each of the outcomes identified in section 3a(3)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997? :

57 Annex B.Do you agree with the minimum all-tenure housing land requirement (mathlr) numbers identified above?

Do you agree with the minimum all-tenure housing land requirement (mathlr) numbers identified above?:

58 Annex C.Do you agree with the definitions set out above? Are there any other terms it would be useful to include in the glossary?

Do you agree with the definitions set out above? Are there any other terms it would be useful to include in the glossary?:

Questions - Integrated Impact Assessments

59 Environmental Report.What are your views on the accuracy and scope of the environmental baseline set out in the environmental report?

What are your views on the accuracy and scope of the environmental baseline set out in the environmental report? :

60 Environmental Report.What are your views on the predicted environmental effects of the draft NPF4 as set out in the environmental report? Please give details of any additional relevant sources.

What are your views on the predicted environmental effects of the draft NPF4 as set out in the environmental report? Please give details of any additional relevant sources.:

61 Environmental Report.What are your views on the potential health effects of the proposed national developments as set out in the environmental report?

What are your views on the potential health effects of the proposed national developments as set out in the environmental report?:

62 Environmental Report.What are your views on the assessment of alternatives as set out in the environmental report?

What are your views on the assessment of alternatives as set out in the environmental report?:

63 Environmental Report.What are your views on the proposals for mitigation, enhancement and monitoring of the environmental effects set out in the environmental report?

What are your views on the proposals for mitigation, enhancement and monitoring of the environmental effects set out in the environmental report?:

64 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment.What are your views on the evidence and information to inform the society and equalities impact assessment?

What are your views on the evidence and information to inform the society and equalities impact assessment?:

65 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment.Do you have any comments on the findings of the equalities impact assessment?

Do you have any comments on the findings of the equalities impact assessment?:

66 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment.Do you have any comments on the findings of the children's rights and wellbeing impact assessment?

Do you have any comments on the findings of the children's rights and wellbeing impact assessment?:

67 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment.Do you have any comments on the fairer Scotland duty and the draft NPF4?

Do you have any comments on the fairer Scotland duty and the draft NPF4?:

68 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment.Do you have any comments on the consideration of human rights and the draft NPF4?

Do you have any comments on the consideration of human rights and the draft NPF4?:

Do you have any comments on the consideration of human rights and the draft NPF4?:

69 Society and Equalities Impact Assessment.Do you have any comments on the islands impact assessment?

Do you have any comments on the islands impact assessment?:

70 Business and Regulatory Impact Assessment.Do you have any comments on the partial business and regulatory impact assessment?

Do you have any comments on the partial business and regulatory impact assessment? :

About you

What is your name?

Name:

Spokes, The Lothian Cycle Campaign

What is your email address?

Email:

spokes@spokes.org.uk

Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?

Organisation

What is your organisation?

Organisation:

Spokes, The Lothian Cycle Campaign

The Scottish Government would like your permission to publish your consultation response. Please indicate your publishing preference:

Publish response only (without name)

We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Yes

I confirm that I have read the privacy policy and consent to the data I provide being used as set out in the policy.

I consent

Evaluation

Please help us improve our consultations by answering the questions below. (Responses to the evaluation will not be published.)

Matrix 1 - How satisfied were you with this consultation?:

Please enter comments here.:

Matrix 1 - How would you rate your satisfaction with using this platform (Citizen Space) to respond to this consultation?:

Please enter comments here.: