Members' Library Service Request Form

Date of Document	13/02/19
Originator	Iain Mcfarlane
Originator's Ref (if any)	
Document Title	East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018: Supplementary Planning Guidance – Green Network Strategy – Consultation Report

Please indicate if access to the document is to be "unrestricted" or "restricted", with regard to the terms of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

Unrestricted	☒	Restricted	☐

If the document is "restricted", please state on what grounds (click on grey area for drop-down menu):

For Publication

Additional information:

This report accompanies the report to Council on 26 Feb 2019 - East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 – Supplementary Guidance: Town Centre Strategies, Report on Consultation; and Supplementary Planning Guidance: Green Networks; Design Standards

Authorised By	Douglas Proudfoot
Designation	Head of Development
Date	13/02/19

For Office Use Only:	
Library Reference	25/19
Date Received	13/02/19
Bulletin	Feb19

Consultation Report- Green Network Strategy SPG

Issues raised in the Green Network Strategy consultation and response.

The following table shows issues raised through consultation on the draft Green Network Strategy SPG. Responses were received from the key agencies Scottish Natural Heritage, Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Historic Environment Scotland. The Scottish Geodiversity Forum, John Muir Birthplace Trust and Esk Valley Trust also responded, as did 3 members of the public. This level of response is too low to make any meaningful analysis differential responses from equalities groups. The questions asked in the consultation are annexed.

In addition to changes made in response to consultation comments, some editorial changes have been made to improve its clarity.

The main changes are:

- Reordering of the introductory section of the document to follow a more logical structure
- Removal of the section on Information Provision, as it was not felt that this would be sufficiently useful in understanding how Green Network measures have been provided to require this of developers
- Separation of the Nature Network mapping into habitat types; although it is thus less obvious how the different habitats work together it is clearer what is the focus in different areas. The underlying coherence of the network remains.
- Changes to mapping at the request of SNH to remove an area of aspirational woodland from pink footed geese feeding area
- Some movement of between 'Aims' and 'Actions' to separate items which apply across the area from those with a spatial focus
- Replacement of the checklist for developers with Guidance for Developers. The checklist was felt to be too long, with some of the items reflecting generic good practice which may not apply to all development and was difficult to interpret for specific proposals. The remaining guidance is shorter and easier to interpret.
- A Glossary of abbreviations and terms was added.

Ref no.	Respondent	Consultation Response	Officer Comment	Summary of Proposed Change to Document
01/1	SEPA	Support creation of the document, especially delivery of multiple benefits including flood risk management. They support the aim of the guidance with respect to use of Green Network assets in addressing flooding and erosion as a first resort. Support use of SUDS as a multi-benefit resource. Comment inclusion of how green networks can contribute to mitigation and management of climate change impacts.	Support noted.	No change requested.
02/01	SNH	Consultation Question 1 (Objectives) The range of objectives is very broad potentially leading to difficulties delivering the green network due to the document fulfilling multiple roles of strategy, planning guidance and action plan. The non-planning actions should be separated from things that will be delivered through development.	The document is intended as being the Council's Green Network Strategy as well as being supplementary planning guidance.	The document will be altered to make it clearer what is expected of developers.
02/02	SNH	Consultation Question 2 (Actions) Some of the actions are broad ranging (as above) and may be difficult to deliver, monitor and maintain. There are actions in this part of the guidance that do not read across to the Green Network Priority Tables that follow.	Agreed.	Some of the actions will be moved into the Priority Tables (and vice versa) and a link shown between the Aims and the Priorities by way of an additional column in the Priority Tables.

02/03	SNH	Consultation Question 3 (Other comments – objectives/actions) Presentation of information across the themes changes with some themes being grouped together and some not. This is somewhat confusing.	The reason for this is that some 'What's…' have more than one 'How…' and some 'Hows..' related to all the 'what's...'	The aims and objectives have been put in tables to group them together more coherently.
02/04	SNH	Consultation Question 3 Remove word 'scruffy' from Theme 2 Aim 2.	Agreed	Word 'scruffy' removed
02/05	SNH	Consultation Question 3 A Place in Balance Action 3 – queries how an increase in in local food growing can be measured and suggested this should focus on allotments as provision in private gardens is difficult to deliver and monitor.	Private food growing in gardens should be encouraged despite difficulties of measurement.	Aim re-worded to separate allotment and private food growing.
02/06	SNH	Consultation Question 3 A Place in Balance Action 9 – green roofs are a weak measure to counter urban heat island effect but have other benefits; measures should address climatic influences more generally.	Agreed.	Reference to green roofs moved to Aim 12, Aim 13 expanded to cover design for a changing climate more generally.
02/07	SNH	Consultation Question 3 A Place for Nature Action 1 cites improvement to access to Local Nature Conservation Sites. There should be an action to quantify this.	On reflection this action should not be in this section as the action is about people's experience of the sites rather than conservation. Access is listed in the Geodiversity Audit; assessment of access to the Local Biodiversity sites would be	Reference to access has been moved to A Place to Belong Aim 4.

			undertaken through Local Biodiversity Site audit.	
02/08	SNH	Consultation Question 3 A Place for Nature Action 2; this is re-statement of existing LDP and national policy.	Agreed. It is included as there are links to Priorities further in the plan and it ties it into the Green Network Strategy.	No change.
02/09	SNH	Consultation Question 3 A Place for Nature Action 4; this should show actions/projects where habitat connectivity can be improved.	This is shown in the Nature Network Table and maps. The tables are general, and the map shows specific (although broad) areas where this is intended. The mapping could be clearer.	Produce individual maps for each habitat.
02/10	SNH	Consultation Question 3 A Place for Nature Action 6; this is re-statement of existing LDP and national policy.	The second part is specifically to retain an important element of landscape character.	Remove reference to LDP Policy. Insert specific examples of the intended action.
02/11	SNH	Consultation Question 4 (Delivery checklist) The checklist doesn't say whether it applies to the proposal in its entirety or should only meet certain items. How the checklist is to be used should be set out more clearly, and whether it applies only to new development or more generally.	Agreed. The checklist would be better as guidance.	The checklist has been shortened to focus on what is required and presented in a different format.
02/12	SNH	Consultation Question 4 Use of alphanumeric list is somewhat confusing, a tick box may be more useful.	Agreed. The alphabet was used to allow consultees to easily refer to items.	Remove alpha-numeric numbering of checklist.
02/13	SNH	Consultation Question 5 (Delivery checklist)	Agreed. The list should focus on requirements rather than good practice.	The checklist has been shortened to focus on what is required and

		The checklist should show what is essential and what is high priority. This would also allow monitoring.		presented as Guidance for Developers
02/13	SNH	Consultation Question 7 (Information provision) The section on Information Provision does not make it clear which functions of the Green Network are to be assessed.	Agreed.	This section has been removed.
02/14	SNH	Consultation Question 7 The key to the B-plan is illegible.	Agreed. This was taken from Scottish Government Guidance.	This section has been removed.
02/15	SNH	Consultation Question 8 (Delivery) SNH are unclear on the need for a separate Priority Area for 'Evidence Base and Working Groups'	Agree that this is not spatial in the way that the other Priority Areas are. However it is still needed in the Strategy.	Moved to a separate section for monitoring at the end of the document.
02/16	SNH	Consultation Question 8 Figure 4 is difficult to read.	Agreed. There is a lot of information to show and this makes the mapping busy.	Mapping has been revised to be clearer.
02/16	SNH	Consultation Question 8 Figure 5 does not relate the Priorities to what is shown on the map.	Agreed.	We have numbered the maps to relate this to the Priorities.
02/17	SNH	Consultation Question 10 (Western Sector) Table A includes projects that range from deliverable projects that could be monitored, to others that SNH questions in terms of deliverability and the role of planning.	Agreed.	The document has been revised to make sure those aims/actions that apply throughout are in the Themes section, while only the spatially specific remain in the Priority Areas.

02/18	SNH	Consultation Question 10 SNH welcome the prospect of involvement in strategic projects at Musselburgh Coast and Meadowmill/Cockenzie/Blindwells, but note they are not funders at Levenhall nor involved in Heritage Links.	Noted.	Remove reference to SNH in Levenhall funding and heritage links.
02/19	SNH	Consultation Question 12 (Countryside) Countryside: Priority 4 should refer to the setting of settlements generally not just those in Countryside Around Towns areas.	Agreed.	The wording will be changed accordingly.
02/20	SNH	Consultation Question 14 (Coast) SNH consider that the preamble to the Coast section prejudges the outcome of HRA. They also consider that there is an opportunity to positively manage recreation here.	Disagree. The paragraph clearly sets out that without HRA it is not clear there can be increased recreational use of the coast. The possibility of encouraging further recreation does depend on the results of the HRA. However, to avoid giving this impression the wording will be changed to reflect that of the recommendation for study in the LDP.	Wording changed to that in paragraph 5.29 of the LDP HRA.
02/21	SNH	Consultation Question 14 The caveat regarding actions being subject to the impact on the Firth of Forth SPA should reflect the Habitat Regulation Appraisal wording in the LDP.	Agreed.	The wording of the HRA caveat has been altered to accord with that in the LDP.
02/22	SNH	Consultation Question 16 (Nature Network) Designated sites are protected separately from their inclusion in the Green Network, and it should not be implied that this is dependent on the Green Network.	Agreed, although the Green Network includes existing assets such as designated sites.	Remove reference to designated sites in the Priorities, and reword the preamble to Nature Network.

02/23	SNH	Consultation Question 16 Remove reference to sufficient supporting habitat for the Firth of Forth SPA as this is covered by other LDP Policy.	Disagree. Although LDP Policy NH1 requires HRA for development where it would affect essential supporting habitat for the Firth of Forth SPA, this does not apply to loss of such habitat which is outwith planning control. Supporting retention of this habitat is therefore a legitimate green network priority.	No change.
02/24	SNH	Consultation Question 16 Figure 7 on page 38 appears to show woodland expansion within the pink-footed goose core area. Review may be required.	The woodland expansion area was large scale and indicative, however to be clear the boundary will be re-drawn to avoid overlapping the goose feeding area.	Alter the mapping of the woodland expansion area.
02/25	SNH	Consultation Question 17 (Evidence base) Unclear on the link between green networks and the study of recreational impacts at the coast; whether the study is wanted because the Green Network is seen as a solution to reducing pressure on the SPA. The guidance notes potential impacts on the SPA however recreational impacts on breeding birds of the SSSI are likely to be the greatest. Suggest the HRA of the LDP is used as a baseline to help screen proposals in or out.	While the Green Network could reduce pressure by increasing the attractiveness and availability of the recreational offer inland (e.g. improved dog walks) the main aim of the study is to protect the SPA as a Green Network asset by assessing capacity for recreation of different parts of the coast and meet the legislative requirement of HRA. The study would ideally assess impacts on breeding birds (as the Firth of Forth as an SSSI is also a Green Network asset) however this would be dependent on funding. The LDP HRA recommended the study on recreational pressures.	To clarify the link between the study and the Green Network aims the need for the HRA study will be moved to the Coast Priority section.
02/26	SNH	Consultation Question 17 SNH would like to see more information on the role of the working group before agreeing to join.	Agreed. SNH have had previous involvement in the Council's preparatory work for the Green Network.	No change requested.
02/27	SNH	Consultation Question 20 (Additional comments)	Agreed.	Mapping has been simplified.

		The maps are complex and difficult to read.		
02/28	SNH	Consultation Question 20 Queries the benefit of including SIMD information on the map.	Addressing inequalities is the Council's main priority therefore it is important to show where such areas are.	SIMD information will continue to be included though mapping has been simplified to make sure it is clear where these are.
02/29	SNH	Consultation Question 20 Listing recreational destinations (p8) in the main body of the document gives the impression that recreation is the key purpose of the Green Network, and should be in an Annex.	Agreed.	The recreational destinations will be shown by points on the existing asset maps but identifying them by name will be included in an Annex.
02/30	SNH	Consultation Question 20 P5 – references to requirement for HRA would be better in the introduction to the Delivery section.	Agreed.	Move reference to HRA on p5 and p6 as noted.
02/31	SNH	Consultation Question 20 SNH query whether threat from recreation pressure is listed as a threat to the SPA and ask for this to be removed if not.	Recreational pressure is listed as a threat in the SPA documents, and was listed as it is relevant to the Green Network aims. However there are others, and this wording singles out this threat which is unnecessary here.	Wording changed to refer to requirement for protection.
02/32	SNH	Consultation Question 20 Recommend that all priorities in the Priority Tables are numbered.	Agreed.	The priorities in the Priority Tables have been numbered.
08/1	Historic Environment Scotland (by letter)	Welcomes the undertaking in the strategy to respect cultural heritage features, and the identification of Historic Environment Scotland as a partner where cultural heritage is a key consideration.	Noted	No change requested
03/01	John Muir Birthplace Trust (ANON-A5C4-VHP2-D)	Consultation Question 1,2 (Objectives/Actions)	Noted. Agree that this could fit in more than one theme, but this is also true of	No change.

		Supports the objectives and actions. 'Community engagement' and/or 'voluntary/charity sector' could be added to more than just A Place to Belong theme.	many others. The aim is to put each 'action' in the most relevant theme.	
03/02	John Muir Birthplace Trust	Consultation Question 4 (Delivery checklist) Supports incorporation of the Green Network Principles. Would like see some mention of John Muir including relevant quotes.	Agreed	Material on John Muir (including quotes) added.
03/03	John Muir Birthplace Trust	Consultation Question 5 (Delivery checklist) Encourages involvement of local community groups and volunteers in helping to monitor/support developments.	The community/organisations can comment on planning applications which can influence development, and also bring matters to the attention of planning enforcement. The Council supports some groups in community action and encourages involvement with green network assets on a case by case basis. This is already covered under Theme 4.	No change.
03/04	John Muir Birthplace Trust	Consultation Question 7 (Information provision) Information could be presented by interactive web based resources rather than just maps e.g. Google map overlays, virtual reality visualisation.	It is not possible to insist on the provision of interactive material, however, the Council would support this if provided.	No change.
03/05	John Muir Birthplace Trust	Consultation question 8 (Delivery) The priority areas are appropriate. CSGN and John Muir Partnership Group are suggested for inclusion in the list of key partners and Funding.	Agreed.	CSGN and John Muir Partnership Group have been included as partners.
03/06	John Muir Birthplace Trust	Consultation Question 9 (Western Sector) Protect the John Muir Way from potential industrial development pressures.	Coast Priority identifies the retention of the John Muir Way as a key priority. Determination of planning applications is based on the Local Development Plan	No change.

			unless material considerations determine otherwise.	
03/07	John Muir Birthplace Trust	Consultation Question 12 (Countryside) In the Countryside section, acknowledge the importance of the John Muir Way.	This is mentioned in Coast but could be included in Countryside also.	Include a reference to the John Muir Way in 'Countryside' Green Network Priority.
03/08	John Muir Birthplace Trust	Consultation Question 14 (Coast) The John Muir Birthplace should be mentioned, as should the John Muir Link. No mention of Dunbar Train Station though North Berwick's is.	The John Muir Birthplace was omitted as it is 'inside'. However, given its strong links to the outdoors as an exception this should be included. The John Muir Link is mapped as an existing asset and reference to it should be added to the text to Coast Green Network Priority 1. Dunbar Train Station should also be added as this also gives access to the coast.	Include John Muir Birthplace on the list of recreational destinations. Reference to the John Muir Link has been added to Coast Green Network Action 2. Dunbar Train Station has been included in Coast Green Network Action 6.
03/09	John Muir Birthplace Trust	Consultation Question 18 (Inclusion) The guidance will have some positive outcomes on equality and those in or vulnerable to poverty.	Agreed	No change requested.
05/01	Scottish Geodiversity Forum (ANON-A5C4-VHPU-G)	Consultation Question 1 (Objectives) Supports the objectives. Geodiversity should be listed in the title for 5 "A Place for Nature"	Agreed. The subtitle was taken from CSGN but could be adapted to East Lothian specifically; this clarification is helpful.	Add 'geodiversity' to the subtitle of Theme A Place for Nature
05/02	Scottish Geodiversity Forum	Consultation Question 2 (Actions) A useful additional action in section 5 would be to sign Scotland's Geodiversity Charter; it's vision is "that Scotland's geodiversity is recognised as an integral and vital part of our environment, economy, heritage and future sustainable development, to be managed appropriately and safeguarded for this and	Consideration will be given to this generally however this is a wider Council decision and this is unlikely to be done in time for inclusion in the Green Network Strategy.	No change.

		future generations." East Lothian Council is already doing this, and should be a Charter signatory.		
05/03	Scottish Geodiversity Forum	Consultation Question 4 (Delivery checklist) In the "grounded in nature" and "Locally distinctive and respectful of the past?" section, landscaping should not just be about tree planting and cultural heritage, but also an awareness of the landscape shape of East Lothian and the important role that geodiversity has in creating a sense of place.	Agreed. The 'grounded in nature' section contains a reference to conservation of designated sites which would include sites designated for their geodiversity interest. A further reference to 'Locally distinctive and respectful of the past' could be added.	Respect for geodiversity features has been added to the 'Locally distinctive and respectful of the past' section.
05/04	Scottish Geodiversity Forum	Consultation Question 17 (Evidence base and working group) Supports the suggested coordinated approach through a Green Network Working Group, and the consideration of ecosystem solutions to problems. Lothian and Borders GeoConservation and the Scottish Geodiversity Forum would be very happy to be involved in a working group.	Noted: this section says key stakeholders will be involved and that would include such groups such as this.	No change requested.
09/01	Esk Valley Trust (letter)	Overall, supports the objectives of the strategy	Noted	No change requested
09/02	Esk Valley Trust	The Strategy should include mention of the North Esk Way	Agreed. The riverside link to Midlothian was included but not named and it is helpful to name this specifically.	Reference to the North Esk Way has been made in 'Western Sector' preamble and the 'Musselburgh Outdoors' Action
09/03	Esk Valley Trust	Green Networks don't stop at the boundary of East Lothian. It would be good to see specific action to work closely and strategically with Edinburgh, Midlothian and	Agreed; this is already included in the Implementation section and partners listed in delivery of specific actions including cross boundary links.	Midlothian and Scottish Borders Council have been added as partners in some of the actions.

		the Borders to achieve the goals of the strategy.		
09/04	Esk Valley Trust	East Lothian has some of the best farming land in Scotland and the use of agricultural land should be safeguarded for growing biological goods.	Agreed. The value of fertile land is noted in the 'Nature Network' section. Location of development is a matter for the Local Development Plan.	No change
09/05	Esk Valley Trust	Welcomes promotion of adoption of best practice to achieve sustainability objectives in farming.	Noted	No change requested
09/06	Esk Valley Trust	Within the section information provision, 'encouragement' of developers to provide information is not strong enough; they should be *required* to do so.	Information that developers are required to provide in support of a planning application are set by statute; developers cannot be required to provide more than this.	This section has been deleted following other comments.
09/07	Esk Valley Trust	The aspirations for growth fall foul in part of the current tendency to be seen to be leading, or the most sustainable. It would be refreshing to see statements that are less competitive and more absolute e.g. 'East Lothian achieves a truly sustainable local economy'	Noted. These objectives came from the Economic Development Strategy. The Green Network aims to support these aims but they are not within the control of this strategy.	The objectives of the Economic Development Strategy have been separated out from those of the Green Network.
04/01	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)(ANON-A5C4-VHPH-3)	Consultation Question 1 (Objectives) Need to consider the East of the County. Dunbar is under considerable pressure from new housing that is being developed without sufficient infrastructure. It should not lose out to the west of the county. Green issues need to be a priority across East Lothian.	Agreed. Although the eastern area is included in Coast and Countryside, it should be clear the urban eastern areas should also be included.	Take 'Existing Urban Areas' from Western Sector and make this a priority of its own, to make it clear eastern settlements are included
04/02	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 2 (Actions) Actions: Need to strongly control factoring of play parks/open spaces in new estates. There are many issues e.g. open spaces being sold off by the factors without the local residents knowing.	Where schemes are not maintained as required by planning condition, this is an enforcement issue and should be addressed through this route. Ownership of open space in itself is not a planning issue.	No change.

04/02	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 2 Need to ensure that public transport to new estates is considered right at the beginning - not as an add-on at the end.	This issue is addressed through the Transport policies of the LDP.	No change
04/03	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 2 Need to ensure safe cycle and footpaths - some roads are in poor repair which deters walking/cycling. Need to ensure working street lights.	Safe cycle and walking routes are addressed through the Green Network Strategy by reference to implementation of the Active Travel Improvement Plan. Maintenance is a matter for Roads Services.	No change.
04/04	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 7 (Information Provision) It needs to be simpler for people to understand	This section was felt to be unnecessary and has been removed.	This section has been removed.
04/05	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Add Dunbar which is under considerable pressure from housebuilding without sufficient infrastructure; habitat is under threat.	Dunbar is added as (04/01 above). Infrastructure will be provided for new development via the Developer Contributions Framework and where relevant condition on planning consent.	As (04/01) above.
04/06	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 12 (Countryside) There should be no further development in the countryside outwith the LDP.	Applications for development in the countryside will be determined in accordance with the LDP unless material considerations dictate otherwise.	No change.
04/07	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 14 Need to protect the coastline. There have been issues in Dunbar with erosion of the East Beach.	Coastal management issues including erosion are considered through East Lothian's Shoreline Management Plan.	A reference to the Shoreline Management Plan has been added to the document.
04/08	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 16 Need to be clearer about habitat around Dunbar.	Separate maps will be produced for each habitat so it is easier to see what is suggested for each area.	Mapping has been simplified.
04/09	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 17 Need to work closely with community groups involved with nature and green issues.	Agreed, this section says key stakeholders will be involved and that would include such groups.	No change.

04/09	Member of the public 1 (Dunbar resident)	Consultation Question 17 Surprised John Muir is not mentioned.	The John Muir Way is mentioned, and the John Muir Birthplace will be added. Quotes from John Muir are added.	As (03/02).
06/01	Member of the public 2 (Haddington) (ANON-A5C4-VHPT-F)	Consultation Question 1 General support for the objectives but they are not SMART.	Agree. Some of the objectives should be re-worded so they clearly relate to what the Green Network can achieve, rather than re-stating Council objectives from other strategies which are to be achieved through multiple strands of work.	Made it clear that it is the Green Network contribution towards the items listed which is the objective of the strategy.
06/02	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 'Outdoor oasis sites' need to have attractive places to sit.	Agreed.	Add that oasis areas should include somewhere to sit.
06/03	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 Wildflower seeds should be of local origin (biologically)(Theme 1.3)	Agreed.	Add that wildflower seeds should be of local origin to reinforce local biodiversity character and avoid introduction of species not local to the area.
06/04	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 There should be short (1.5 -4 miles) off-road walking routes preferably circular, with parking spots, and linking green spaces &c.	Agreed. Core paths have been agreed through the core path plan and this does provide some such paths. However there is scope to improve this.	Add aspiration for more short routes especially circular routes, to section 3.1. Add 'recreational destinations' to the list at the end of this section.
06/05	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 Where woodland is planted native trees of local seed origin should be used.	Agreed.	Add note to new 'Guidance for Developers' section recommending use of local seed of native species for woodland.
06/06	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 Dead and dying trees are important for wildlife and should be retained in suitable places.	Agreed. This is included in Nature Network priorities.	Wording has been altered to emphasise the point.

06/07	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 Encourage farmers to improve hedges for wildlife and set aside areas for habitat for plants, small mammals, birds and insects important for pollination.	Agreed. Mentioned in Nature network though could be clearer that benefits are not just to birds.	Re-word to make clear the benefits are not just to birds. Insert section specifically on pollination.
06/08	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 If you wish to encourage more use of recreational destinations it is important enough parking is provided and access routes are maintained.	Noted. Maintenance of access routes will be carried out under the Core Path plan. Parking is provided at most of the recreational destinations where appropriate.	No change.
06/09	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 Can suitable areas of our towns be adapted replacing hard landscaping with green spaces?	Agreed, this is intended by creation of 'oasis' spaces.	Additional detail added to Urban Action 2.
06/10	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 Agree geodiversity should be protected but not sure how it can be enhanced? More should be made of geodiversity in appropriate places.	While the geodiversity itself has been formed by earth processes and is beyond the scope of the Green Network to improve, geodiversity sites can be enhanced by creating or improving exposures. Selection of Local Geodiversity Sites took potential for access into account. Interpretation would also enhance these areas.	Split 5.1 into biodiversity and geodiversity as the appropriateness of access to each type of site is different, and to bring attention to each. The Local Geodiversity Sites have been added as an Appendix; interpretation has been added as an action.

06/11	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 3 Questions what is meant by 'active travel' 'mobile business' 'city tree'.	There is scope for further clarity – a glossary/table of abbreviations would be helpful.	Glossary and Table of Abbreviations added and some 'jargon' removed.
06/12	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 4 It is not clear that the checklist is for developers, and it does not sit well here. What do the pictures add?	Agreed the purpose of this section could be clearer. It is intended as guidance for developers to check how their proposal conforms to Green Network principles. The pictures link to the Green Network principles; the link could be made clearer.	This section has been altered (see comment 02/13) and expansion on purpose of the CSGN principles.
06/13	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 5 The checklist is long – it needs to be shorter or no developer will use it. There is some repetition e.g. A, L and P and E, F and Z. Would it be better to link it to the 5 themes and their objectives in some way?	The list needs to be comprehensive. This is likely to be prioritised as per SNH comment 02/13. There is some repetition and the list will be sharpened to avoid this. It is useful to use the Green Network principles for this list as it helps show how developers comply with these.	This section has been revised.
06/14	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 6 & 7 Unsure if the information will help the public understand development proposals. The information requested of developers is not in the right place in the document and feels unfinished.	Agree, other comments have also been that respondents are uncertain that this information will be useful and there has been no support for its inclusion. Therefore it will be removed. Information will be sought through the new Guidance for Developers instead.	Section on Information Provision removed.
06/15	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 8 (priority areas) Western Sector is important due to development there. Countryside, Coast and Nature Network have some overlap but hard to separate. Evidence Base and Working Groups is a strange title.	Agreed.	The Evidence Base and Working Groups title has been changed to 'Implementation and Monitoring'
06/16	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 9 (Green Network projects in the Western Sector) Support for these projects.	Noted.	No change required.

06/17	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 10. Levenhall may be valuable for birds but its grassland has not yet developed any biodiversity. Management of the site should also take this into account.	Agreed. Add need to manage site for biodiversity generally.	Add biodiversity management into Musselburgh Outdoors 5.
06/18	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 13 and 14 (Coast) Support for Green Network priorities in 'Coast'. The quality of the natural environment must be respected, which is particularly important for Aberlady Bay. Suggests promoting other areas less important for biodiversity.	Noted. The Council is pursuing management of Aberlady Bay for biodiversity including seeking restricting dogs in this area.	No change required.
06/19	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 14 The A198 is a fine route but can it be improved sufficiently for safe cycling?	Noted. This will be addressed at project level.	No change required.
06/20	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 15/16 (Nature Network) Supports the priorities. There should be more promotion of ordinary spots, rather than 'tidying' them up.	Noted.	No change required.
06/21	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 17 (Evidence base and working group) It is vital to monitor Green Network progress, though difficult.	Noted.	This section is being altered as a result of other comments.
06/22	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 18/19 (Inclusion) Considers there will be positive impacts for all groups. It will have a positive impact on those vulnerable to falling into poverty. Poverty is distressing and the Green Network will provide many ways to alleviate this.	Agreed.	No change required.

06/23	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 20 (Additional comments) Where there are semi-rural paths on the outskirts of town is 'swallowed up' care should be taken to leave it with a wide enough corridor to prevent the feeling of being hemmed in by buildings.	Noted. Development Briefs have been prepared for larger housing sites following public consultation. Design of housing estates has many issues to balance and this may not always be appropriate.	No change.
06/24	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 20 (Additional comments) The network of roads and lanes has not been built with walker and cyclists in mind. Would like more informal paths beside or near roads.	Agreed. This is being progressed through the Core Paths Plan, referenced in the document.	Add reference to aspiration to form more off-road paths adjacent but separated from roads.
06/25	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	The earlier introductory pages are confusing and could do with tightening up and removal of repetition.	Agreed.	Introductory section re-ordered to improve clarity and flow.
06/26	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	CSGN principles – do the pictures enhance the information here.	The pictures demonstrate the principles and add interest. Further text would be useful to explain the principles.	Some further explanatory text on the principles has been added here.
06/27	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	The nine SESPlan objective aren't linked to anything.	The SESplan themes are linked to both CSGN and SPG themes, this has been clarified.	The SESplan theme symbols have been added and some explanation included.
06/28	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	SESPlan strategic priorities should be in with the priority areas.	SESPlan priorities are stated at the beginning as this is a higher level plan to which this guidance should conform. However the links to SESPlan priorities should also be made clear in the 'actions'.	SESPlan priority actions clearly identified in the 'Western Sector' action.
06/29	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	The East Lothian Green Network page is too long.	Agree. This could not only be shorter but clearer.	The page has been separated out into 'LDP' and 'Strategy', and some of the text has been moved to the Introduction and Delivery sections.

06/30	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	The terms 'active travel' and 'city tree' are not understandable.	Noted.	Definitions have been added to the glossary.
06/31	Member of the public 2 (Haddington)	In the fifth theme 'A place for nature' you again (as in the second theme) split the list of 'what you would like to see' and 'how you aim to do it' into sections with subheadings but numbering the following paragraphs consecutively, whereas in the first, third and fourth themes they are all listed and dealt with together. Is this deliberate?	Agreed that this is a bit confusing.	'What we would like to see' and 'How we aim to do this' have been put into tables for clarity.
07/01	Member of the public 3 (ANON-A5C4-VHPY-M) (Haddington)	Consultation Question 1 Too much Newspeak.	It is unclear where the respondent sees this occurring and exactly what changes are sought.	Themes and objectives have been more clearly separated and defined.
07/02	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 1 Would prefer Themes to be re-ordered, with 'a place to feel good' first and 'a place for growth' coming last. The SPG should recognise that growth is the problem as well as the solution.	The ordering reflects that of the CSGN. The themes are not hierarchical and have equal weight whichever order they are shown. The numbering of themes will however be removed to avoid the impression of priority.	Theme numbering removed.
07/03	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 (Actions) Add to Aim 1 (page 14/15) "The use of historic Rights of Way will be promoted and the routes themselves preserved and recorded, with landowners encourage to keep them open and to improve them". The Council are being short-sighted in not fully asserting existing rights of way; historic routes such as droveways are important.	East Lothian Council has a statutory duty to assert Rights of Way and landowners are required to keep them open. Agree that historic routes are important for cultural association even if not well-used. Changes have been made in response to comment from the John Muir Trust.	Emailed comment to relevant Council team. Added text to Aim 1 of 'A Place to Belong' – "..and asserting historic rights of way"

07/04	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 (Actions) Add text to Aim 3 (page 16) "Opportunities for cross boundary access will be identified and exploited in collaboration with neighbouring local authorities". Droveways over the Lammermuirs are the prime example, Costerton and Humbie drove road or access along the Tyne also given as examples.	Agreed. This is important in connecting the CSGN as a whole, and beyond, and there is a need to assert rights of way and improve links between local authority areas.	Add text to 'A Place to Feel Good' Aim 1: "Assert rights of way and improve recreational routes between local authority areas." Add text to Countryside 1 (Tyne); '…to connect with paths in Midlothian'.
07/05	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 (Actions) Insert a new aim "Core and local paths are not just for physical activity but for moving safely in towns on such tasks as shopping or taking children to school. Provision will be made throughout the network to avoid conflicts of priority between pedestrians, cyclists and motorists". 'Multiple use' can be a euphemism for incompatible uses. There is conflict of interest between pedestrians and cyclists, which can and does cause accidents.	The SPG does not mention 'multiple use' but instead uses the term 'multifunctional'. This intends having multiple green network benefits rather than providing for multiple users (although it may also do this). This could be clearer. The Land Reform Act provides for access and where users rights are protected they cannot be restricted from using core paths.	Change the term 'multifunctional' to 'multiple benefit' where this clarifies the meaning and add 'multifunctional' into the Glossary.
07/06	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 2 (Actions) Page 19 Aim 1, add "where appropriate, taking care to minimise conflicts of interest between wildlife and human beings".	Aim 1 has been split as a result of comment 06/10. Management of conflict between wildlife and human beings is important, but is part of conservation of biodiversity. There is no need to add this separately.	No change.
07/07	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 4 (Delivery Checklist) Add to 'Grounded in Nature': "does it avoid conflicts of interest between access and wildlife" and "does it avoid conflicts of interest between pedestrians and cyclists".	Agree that these are valid considerations however they related to implementing other LDP policies on protection of wildlife and provision of safe access rather than creation of the Green Network.	No change.

07/08	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 4 (Delivery Checklist) Add to 'At Scale': "are historic rights of way being asserted and used to best advantage?" and "is the right to roam being respected?". The Scottish tradition of free access (favouring the citizen) is being threatened by 'managed' access (favouring the rich).	Agree that a check on retention of rights of way and maximising their value is useful, though sometimes the good planning of the area may require them to be extinguished or re-routed. Respect for the right to roam is a statutory provision and not a matter for the creation of the Green Network. Where the SPG mentions 'managed' access this is with reference to the need to discourage access to sites designated for biodiversity in particular the Firth of Forth SPA, to avoid adverse impacts on the site.	Add reference to asserting of rights of way.
07/09	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Green Network Priority Areas: Countryside – Expand last sentence "…improved, particularly in remote areas, where a good range of historic paths remains but where limited use and landlord hostility have put an important public asset at risk." Apparent lack of demand of demand is a reflection of lack of opportunity.	Disagree. Access to the countryside is as if more important around settlement as this is where the majority of people are.	No change.
07/10	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	An obvious need for a direct core route is between Haddington and Gifford through Lennoxlove and Colstoun woods. Another opportunity lies between Pathhead/Glenkinchie/Pencaitland/Railway Walk/the Saltouns.	Agree; the need for a link between Haddington and Gifford is identified on Figure 4. Agree that paths such as to Pathhead – the Saltouns are important, and recent improvements have been made here. This is included in A Place to Belong Aim 4 and A Place to Feel Good, 1.	No change required.
07/11	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Page 27 – under inclusion insert new point "Identify and mitigate any clashing priorities between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles".	The Council is aware this is an issue. Use of core paths is governed by statute and different users cannot be barred from using them.	No change

07/12	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Page 31, Tyne. Include Midlothian Council in the 'Partners' Column.	Agree	Midlothian Council added as a partner.
07/13	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 7 (Information Provision) The section on Layout and Connections is more readily understood than those of Functions and Details. This might helpfully be divided into two parts, introduced by "As a matter of good practice, developers should normally provide, as a minimum, the following information to allow understanding of how their proposals support the Green Network" and other drafting suggestions.	Agreed.	Incorporated suggested wording into this revised section.
07/14	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 7 (Information Provision) Concern over the lack of permeability between developments which affects social equality. This should be addressed here.	Agree.	Wording added to Delivery Checklist 'Connected' and A Place to Feel Good Aim 1.
07/15	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 8 Expresses surprise the country town (Haddington) is not included in the priority areas.	SESPlan has identified the western sector as a Green Network Priority Area, reflecting levels of change here, which is why it has been included. Action on urban areas generally has been included to reflect this and other comments.	A separate priority has been added for urban areas.
07/16	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 12 Priority given to populated areas and areas of disadvantage may be damaging where these priorities are concerned. The more built up the main settlements, the greater need to protect unspoilt areas and promote them as an asset for all.	Disagree. Countryside and coastal priorities are balanced with focus on urban areas. A balance is needed between protecting unspoilt areas and promoting access, which the SPG recognises.	No change.

07/17	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 13 The development allowed on unspoilt coastal sites is a disgrace. Cites Craigielaw and Archerfield and threat of similar at North Berwick, Tantallon and Whitekirk. ELC seems powerless to defend its own policies.	No change suggested.	No change.
07/18	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 15/16 (Nature Network) Gives the impression agricultural production and nature conservancy are incompatible, which is not the case. Suggests introducing a new section headed 'Farmlands'. This could make a much more forthright case for farmland biodiversity, in line with government policy.	Agree. This section has been expanded.	Nature Network section 'Farmland Birds' combined into 'Grassland and Farmland'.
07/19	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 17 Support for working groups.	Noted.	No change required.
07/20	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 18 (Inclusion) The Green Network is profoundly important in terms of age (old and young), disability, pregnancy and maternity. Less so for others.	Noted.	No change required.
07/21	Member of the public 3 (Haddington)	Consultation Question 19 (Poverty) There will be a positive impact on people in or vulnerable to poverty. A strength of this SPG is the way it makes clear that the benefits it envisages are there for everyone.	Agreed.	No change required.

ANNEX 1: Consultation Questions

Green network Objectives and Actions

1. Are the objectives ("What we would like to see") the right ones? Are there any you would add or remove and why?
2. Will the actions ("How we aim to do this") help the Green Network achieve the objectives? Are there any actions you would add or remove and why?
3. Any other comments on this section?

Delivery Checklist

4. Is there anything that should be added to or removed from the Delivery Checklist?
5. Is this a suitable way of checking the extent to which development supports the Green Network? Can you suggest any better ways this might be done?

Information Provision

6. Will the information requested help the public understand development proposals and how they contribute to the Green Network?
7. Is there a better way for developers to present this information? If so what would it be?

Delivery

8. Are these the right priority areas? Are there any you would add or remove and why? (You will have a chance to comment on the areas in detail later in the survey)

Western Sector

9. Are the Green Network projects identified in tables A, B and C the right priorities?
10. Are there any changes you would suggest and why?

Countryside

11. Are the right Green Network priorities identified for Countryside?
12. Are there any changes you would suggest and why?

Coast

13. Are the right Green Network priorities identified for Coast?
14. Are there any changes you would suggest and why?

Nature Network

15. Are these Green Network priorities identified under Nature Network right?
16. Are there any changes you would suggest and why?

Evidence Base and Working Group

17. Do you have any comments on the evidence base and working groups section of the guidance?

Inclusion

18. Do you think this guidance will have any positive or negative impacts on any groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 and if so what? These groups are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation
19. Do you think the guidance will have any impact on those in poverty or vulnerable to falling into poverty?

Additional comments

20. Should you wish to provide any additional or general comments on the Green Network Strategy Supplementary Planning Guidance, please use the space below.