

Orkney Islands Council

Supplementary Guidance – Kirkwall Urban Design Framework

Consultation Report

Consultation Period: 5 April – 17 May 2018

<u>Unique Reference</u>	<u>Respondent Type</u>	<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Response from Planning Authority</u>
IP1	Interested Person	1	<p>I have read through the draft Kirkwall urban design framework it is very comprehensive, very well presented and reflects many of the ideas expressed in the community consultation. One point concerning The Crafty, a former caravan site between the back of Lidl's and the housing estate.</p> <p>The Community Council was consulted on The Crafty a while back and we expressed a wish for this to be green space, with paths and a few small trees.(suggest rowans, birch).</p> <p>The site is small but the housing area behind is very dense and a green space here would provide a lung.The Crafty also butts onto an open badly drained area; this is in fact common ground ie held in common by the people of Kirkwall.</p> <p>Can The Crafty are be redesignated as a green space,with paths and a few small trees?</p>	<p>Action point 1: Points noted. The Crafty site is in the process of being transferred from OIC to OHAL for the development of housing, however there may be an opportunity to upgrade the underutilised open green space adjacent to the site as part of the development and this suggestion has been included in the revised KUDF (44).</p>
IP1	Interested Person	2	<p>Update Catties Maggies.The trees are in ; checked state of the Bridleway today with Christine Harcus . Chris Gee planet the trees yesterday 1/5/18.</p> <p>Can you also pass on to Draft Urban Plan people the following comments after discussion with Christine.</p> <p>"Don't see a specific mention of provision for horse riders in the plan. Three unconnected bridleways exist ie Berstane, Cattie Maggies, and the Crantit Trail;</p> <p>these are used by young riders (and older ones) but these riders are put at risk when crossing over between them. Also The Riding of the Marches is an annual event where they are used.</p> <p>Can the plan consult with the Riding Club and the Pony Club on this to incorporate a statement of future intent to improve provision for young and old riders. Can the plan and put in a statement of intent to consider ways to provide new bridleways and to link up existing bridleways."</p>	<p>Action point 2: Points noted, and reference to bridleways included in the KUDF (p26).</p>
IP2	Interested Person	1	<p>(My great-grandfather, Rev. William Beattie, d.1871,was Church of Scotland Minister of Evie and Rendall Parish.)</p> <p>For any human new to Orkney Islands, a primary 'observation' is NO TREES!</p> <p>In one line, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, plant trees! You will NEVER have too many!!</p>	<p>Point noted. The Urban Design Framework promotes the creation of Green Infrastructure including tree planting where appropriate.</p>

			I have visited Orkneys twice. Maybe, someday, Ill return to live there???	
IP3	Interested Person	1	<p>Do you think the Your Kirkwall community engagement exercise has been valuable? (p13)</p> <p>Yes, but too few people attend these meetings to give their views. I think that summaries of these plans should be published in the local press so that everyone has some idea of the proposals. This would help to avoid the backlash from members of the public who protest when the plans are carried out as happened with the Broad Street and Harbour Street developments. It is not easy to get access to this draft as it cannot be borrowed but can only be read in various places or downloaded off the internet. I would estimate that a minute percentage of Orkney's population will have read the document let alone studied it in detail and responded.</p>	<p>Points noted.</p> <p>The Council's consultation activities meet and exceed the requirements set out in the Planning Etc (Scotland) Act 1997 and the Development Planning Regulations, which state that the Local Authority must publicise its proposals and seek representations by a specified date.</p> <p>The Council undertook an extensive community engagement exercise over a period of months to feed into the preparation of these proposals. Public workshops were well attended with approximately 160 contributors at the November workshops and 58 participants at the January workshops. In addition to this, 322 people of all age groups participated in the community survey which underpinned the direction of travel with the preparation of the plan. A Youth Summit was attended by 55 young people and ongoing interaction via social media throughout the project, via 481 facebook likes and 122 twitter follows reached 72,829 users. This process was reported on by the Local Media throughout.</p> <p>The Council does not print copies of the resulting 100+ page document for environmental and economic reasons.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	2	<p>Has the Kirkwall context been described correctly? (p17)</p> <p>Yes, but the whole emphasis seems to be on walking in Kirkwall. People who come into Kirkwall for shopping or to work will not walk for the 20 minutes suggested in this document. It could and should be enforced for workers but if centre town shops are to prosper, adequate central parking near to shops and businesses is essential. Shoppers require to get parking near to the shops as they cannot be expected to carry bags of shopping for twenty minutes in Orkney's weather.</p>	<p>Points noted, and a revised parking strategy for the town forms part of the KUDF.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	3	<p>Do you agree with this SWOT analysis for Kirkwall? (p18)</p> <p>Why is a "High level of public sector jobs" a weakness?</p>	<p>Action point 3: Point noted. This is considered a weakness from the perspective that there is a high level of dependence on public sector employment, and text has been amended to clarify this in the document (p19).</p>
IP3	Interested Person	4	<p>Do you agree with this vision for Kirkwall set by the community during the Your Kirkwall community engagement exercise? (p20)</p> <p>I certainly think that Kirkwall, and the whole of Orkney needs more colour. Promotional pictures for places like Portree, Tobermory and John o' Groats always feature the colourful houses in these places. In Orkney all new houses appear to be white with black roofs and rain water goods. I have been told by a person who has just had a new house built that he was told that his choice of colour for doors and windows was either black or white! What nonsense! Let's have some variety.</p> <p>Out in Orphir, and all over Orkney, there are a fair number of new houses which just look like clones of each other and this appears to be stipulated by planners, although we were told at one of the community engagement meetings to discuss these plans that house owners could have any colour of house that they wanted! White houses look</p>	<p>Support noted, and more colour is a key theme of the KUDF.</p>

			<p>reasonable when they are new but they often become dirty looking after a number of years, necessitating painting. Orkney is colourful in summer with green fields and often blue seas and skies. However, in winter there is little colour and I am certain that this dull grey outlook is a predisposing factor to mental illness in Orkney. This appears to be accepted because on page 98 the report states: "Use Colour: consider the careful use of colour within a development, to lift the spirits and create distinctive places". Let's have a variety of colour of walls, roofs, and particularly doors!</p> <p>The new Gin Distillery building at the Ayre Road and the cottage extension in St Rognvald Street are two instances of dismal black buildings in the town.</p>	
IP3	Interested Person	5	<p>Do you agree with this strategy for Kirkwall's Future? (p25)</p> <p>Parking in central Kirkwall has to be increased or a "Park and Ride" system could be introduced so that extra parking is not needed. "Park and Ride" would work well for Orkney's largest employer, OIC. Workers from the West Mainland could park at Hatston and be bussed into Kirkwall and workers from the East Mainland could park in a new car park at the north east corner of the Bignold Park and walk down to their offices. Workers who need their cars during the day for their work could be given free parking at the OIC building but all other workers and the general public would have to pay for parking there.</p> <p>Hopefully parking at the Hospital/Health Centre will be solved when the Balfour is completed and opened.</p> <p>The proposal to provide a new path from Hatston to Wideford Hill is a very low priority. I cannot envisage passengers from liners wanting to walk or cycle to the top of the hill!</p> <p>Kirkwall does not have any serious "traffic issues". Around 9.00am, 1.00pm-2.00pm and 5.00pm there are some short delays but nothing that requires major alterations, but I do agree that a southern bypass would be advantageous. I often wonder whether OIC workers think that the town is always as busy as it is when they leave their offices. Most of the time there are no traffic problems in the town.</p> <p>A coastal path would be an asset but there is little need for a new Park at Craigiefield.</p>	<p>Points noted.</p> <p>Mixed views were expressed by the community about car parking in Kirkwall, however surveys conducted on the car parking in Kirkwall shows that it is not currently used to capacity. This data analysis informed the discussions with community during the workshops in January.</p> <p>The proposals for a coastal path from Hatston to the town centre and beyond to Carness emerged from the community.</p> <p>Support noted. The report concludes that there are no serious traffic issues in Kirkwall and that in the short term, resources should be focused on making improvements to key junctions rather than increasing the capacity of the network.</p> <p>Craigiefield Park is an idea which emerged from the community.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	6	<p>Do you think the Council should have design guidance to make new developments more locally distinctive? (p41).</p> <p>Guidance would be useful provided that it is flexible so that we are not forced to design every development to look the same with, for instance, all houses the same drab colours.</p>	<p>Support noted. Flexible design guidance which encourages the use of colour is included in the KUDF.</p> <p>Points noted re trees. Whilst shade from the sun is not a regular requirement in the Orkney climate, it is one of the benefits of trees.</p>

			<p>There is mention on page 31 of having medium scale street trees to provide shelter and shading. How often do we need shading in Kirkwall?</p> <p>While I agree that measures should be taken to reduce vehicle speeds in the town, the proposal that “footway surfacing of contrasting colour must be used to demonstrate pedestrian priority” would be very confusing. Pedestrian priority must always be by means of a recognised crossing such as a Zebra Crossing to avoid confusion. A 20mph speed limit throughout Kirkwall should be seriously considered to make it safer for pedestrians and local residents who are sometimes affected by “boy racers”.</p> <p>Parking in Kirkwall is a problem. Many of the yellow lines have become obliterated and need to be renewed (eg in Palace Road) and the parking regulations must be enforced. Parking in the area surrounding the OIC Offices needs to be controlled. For instance, St Rognvald Street is a narrow street cars parked on the east side of the street make it almost impossible to exit/enter drives on the west side of the street. Parking on St Rognvald Street should be controlled so that parking is only on the west side of the street with no parking opposite private drives. The north east corner of the Bignold Park should be used for parking by council employees (and others) and the piece of waste ground within the triangle formed behind the houses on St Rognvald Street, Thoms Street and George Street, could also be used for parking. All the streets near to the Council Offices are full of cars belonging to OIC workers. In relation to parking on page 91 it states “Tackle non-residential parking including traffic management around Papdale Primary School to improve local roads for residents”. Exactly the same requires to be done for the streets around the Council Offices.</p> <p>On page 37 there is a statement “New development should support this by integrating sustainable transport principles, such as good connectivity, high visibility of cyclists, provision of cycle locking facilities, cycle lanes, access to key services and access to railway stations (sic) and main bus stops.” It would appear that this statement has just been taken holus-bolus from some publication not applicable to Orkney, and one wonders whether other statements about Orkney are equally inappropriate.</p> <p>As stated above I agree that designs should “bring some colour and life into new buildings”.</p>	<p>Action point 4: Points noted re footway surfacing. Please note this section of the document has been removed.</p> <p>Points noted. Car parking - and particularly the issue of illegal town centre parking - was raised as a key issue during the community engagement. The KUDF contains proposals to resolve these issues. However, it is important to note that on street parking enforcement is not within the control of the Council and is currently the responsibility of Police Scotland. Illegal parking has been an issue since Police Scotland's decision to remove traffic wardens 5 years ago. Following a recent Council decision, the Roads Department is currently going through the process of reviewing Traffic Regulation Orders for Palace Road, Harbour Street and Great Western Road and consultation will take place later this summer, where you will have an opportunity to make your views known. Implementation of any changes would then take place thereafter, subject to Council decisions. It will remain Police Scotland's responsibility to enforce illegal parking and updated TRO's will assist this process. Following this, Roads Department have a longer-term plan (over the next 3 – 5 years subject to staff resources) to review and consolidate TRO's across Kirkwall. This will include areas such as those you describe and consultation will be carried out where you will have an opportunity to make your views known. It is important to note that parking on St Rognvald Street is 'on street' parking which does not belong to the properties. Whilst we appreciate this can be frustrating for residents, there is no way of controlling parking unless and until a TRO is put in place for the street. There would be pros and cons to controlling parking on these streets and these issues can be fully discussed with residents and the general public at the consultation stage.</p> <p>Action point 5: Point noted and text has been amended to remove reference to non- residential parking around Papdale. This was an error in the consultation document, and the issue at Papdale is about road safety and traffic management at times of pick up and drop off pupils rather than non-residential parking (p78)</p> <p>Action point 6: Point noted and reference to railway station removed from document.</p> <p>Support for colour noted.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	7	<p>Have we fully captured the town wide design principles? (p41)</p> <p>Reports such as this one should always be written in simple, non technical language. Where technical terms such as “VENNELS” or “PASSIVHAUS” need to be used then a simple definition should be also provided.</p>	<p>Action point 7: Points noted and terms removed for clarity.</p> <p>Support noted, and affordability is a key criterion outlined in the Housing Design Principles of the KUDF.</p>

			It is important that housing is affordable. Design constraints have in the past made buildings more expensive.	
IP3	Interested Person	8	<p>Do you agree with the proposals and action plan for the Town Centre Focus Area? (p55)</p> <p>I am on School Place nearly every day as a pedestrian, and less often as a motorist, and I have never encountered pedestrian/vehicle issues in that area. I can only conclude that the report author was there at the "rush hour", which only lasts a few minutes at most.</p> <p>I do not understand the statement "in the next five years as ferry operations move to Hatston". Surely the ferries from the North Isles of Orkney will always use the Kirkwall terminal. Should this statement refer to fuel tanker ships moving to unload into new tanks at Hatston?</p> <p>See my answer to Q 6 for some views on parking. In addition I think that the parking at the Power Bowl site should be retained and then the new parking on Great Western Road would be additional spaces. The present Balfour Hospital site should incorporate flats for older people where they can live independently and be supervised by resident staff. (ie sheltered accommodation). Parking near to the town centre is important for businesses in the town centre.</p>	<p>Point noted and this idea for the road outside School Place emerged from the community.</p> <p>Action point 8: Point noted re ferries, and this was a typographic error which has now been corrected.</p> <p>Point noted and see above response. The Balfour Hospital site is identified for housing in the plan and could incorporate flats for older people, however the proposal to redevelop brown field land in the town centre has been carefully considered alongside the need for car parking. Given that the town centre car parks are not used to capacity and there is no requirement for additional parking.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	9	<p>Do you agree with the proposals and action plan for the Town Centre West Focus Area? (p63)</p> <p>As stated in Q8 the Power Bowl parking should be retained and sheltered housing should go on the present Balfour Hospital site.</p> <p>The proposal for buildings up to four stories high West of Great Western Road should not be allowed. This could restrict the view of the Cathedral from the Peedie Sea.</p> <p>I am pleased to note that pitched roofs are preferred but I think that this should be mandatory. There is a two storey, black coloured extension to a small cottage in St Rognvald Street, which looks entirely out of place – the Black Building reincarnated!</p>	<p>Points noted. See above response.</p> <p>The KUDF makes clear that the retention of views to the Cathedral are of fundamental importance.</p> <p>Support for proposed building forms noted.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	10	<p>Should the Council consider seeking financial contributions from developers to help overcome the flooding constraints to developing land in this Focus Area? (p63)</p> <p>No.</p>	<p>Point noted.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	11	<p>Would you support the suggested improvements to alleviate congestion and improve safety on the Pickaquoy Road? (p72)</p> <p>The proposed changes to the Peedie Sea area are very low priority. It is a pleasant walking area as it is and is safe to use.</p>	<p>Points noted.</p> <p>These ideas emerged from the community and are therefore included in the KUDF.</p> <p>Points noted re the Wideford Hill route. The report proposes facilities which would be required for this sort of cycling route.</p>

			<p>With regard to the projected Wideford Hill – Hatston path I have already stated that this is not necessary and is likely to be little used. The Report states “Integral to the route will be a signage and the provision of design elements, including shelter and cycling facilities, cycle parking and drying areas for shoes and clothes. What does this mean?</p> <p>Are walkers/cyclists expected to stop and dry off their clothes and footwear in a building en route? Walkers and cyclists should surely dress according to the activities that they are undertaking and if they have poor clothing surely they will want to return to their abodes as soon as possible to dry out.</p>	
IP3	Interested Person	12	<p>Do you agree with the proposals and action plan for the Peedie Sea and Pickaquoy Focus Area? (p74)</p> <p>I agree that a coastal path from Hatston Pier to Kirkwall is desirable but the path from the Hatston pier to Wideford Hill is not necessary. There is a proposal for an “energy from waste project”. Is this a proposal to burn our household waste at Hatston rather than send it to Lerwick for disposal? This would seem to be a logical step.</p> <p>It would be good to have the appearance of the Hatston area improved and I particularly welcome the introduction of planting and colour, together with buildings being of traditional style with pitched roofs.</p>	<p>Points noted. See above response.</p> <p>The energy from waste project is as you describe and has been publicised locally by the Council.</p> <p>Support noted for improving Hatston industrial estate.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	13	<p>Do you agree with the proposals and action plan for the Hatston and Seafront Focus Area? (p85)</p> <p>I agree that a coastal path from Hatston Pier to Kirkwall is desirable, and it would be good if this could be extended beyond Craigiefield right out to the point of Carness. I do not see the need for lighting. Walkers should plan their walks for daylight hours which are extensive in the summer months. I don’t think that any of the St Magnus Way is lighted and there are no complaints about it. If it is dark there are perfectly good lighted roads that can be used.</p> <p>I do not see the need for a new park at Craigiefield but I see that a local action group is developing it. Good luck to them.</p>	<p>Points noted and the coastal route is shown and described to link all the way to Carness in the KUDF.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	14	<p>Do you agree with the proposals and action plan for the Papdale Focus Area? (p93)</p> <p>The former Halls of residence should be demolished and replaced with housing, including sheltered housing.</p> <p>Papdale House was formerly three flats but I think that the very old part was demolished. It could be used as a single house or possibly converted to two flats with the addition of a downstairs kitchen.</p> <p>On page 90 there is a statement, “Tackle non-residential parking” in relation to Papdale East. On page 91 the statement reads, “Tackle non-</p>	<p>Points noted. The Papdale Halls, House and Farm are identified as opportunities for residential development in the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Points noted re Bignold Park, however no proposals to incorporate permanent car parking within the Park are included in the revised document. The document does not propose the creation of additional parking numbers of the town. Please note previous advice provided regarding consultation on TRO for this area in due course however.</p> <p>There are existing proposals for a community group to take over the maintenance and ownership of Bignold Park.</p>

			<p>residential parking including traffic management around Papdale Primary School to improve local roads for residents". As already mentioned a parking area could be developed in the north east corner of Bignold Park to provide parking for Council workers but it could also provide parking for school staff. In addition a safe area could be provided there for parents to offload their children who could then safely walk down to the school. A road would need to be constructed from the Bignold Park Road down through the Park to the lower north east exit and this would also be useful when the Bignold is in use for the County Show.</p> <p>The Bignold Park requires drainage and this should be carried out so that the park is walk-able throughout the year and less liable to be poached in wet summers.,</p>	
IP3	Interested Person	15	<p>Do you agree with the proposals and action plan for the Kirkwall South Focus Area? (p104)</p> <p>As already stated the Present Balfour hospital site should be used for a two storey sheltered housing complex.</p> <p>No matter how hard one tries it will be difficult to "bring some of the character of the town centre" to the area known as the K10 site. Even if it was easy to do why would one do it? A faux building scheme has no advantages. If it had then building concepts would not have changed over the centuries. New housing schemes should be the best of modern design not an imitation of a by-gone age.</p> <p>However, I welcome the statement, "Use colour: consider the careful use of colour within a development, to lift the spirits and create distinctive places."</p> <p>I welcome the proposals for "Arcadia Farm" but wonder how suitable the area and the soil is for growing vegetables.</p>	<p>Points noted, and the proposals for the K10 site do not influence the building types people choose, it guides how buildings should be positioned relative to the street, green spaces and other buildings to create similar characteristics to the old town. Energy efficiency and affordability are also identified as key aspects of any successful development.</p> <p>Support for Arcadia Park project noted and the soil profile is known and will be designed for.</p>
IP3	Interested Person	16	<p>Who do you think needs to be involved in making this plan happen? (p107)</p> <p>OIC mainly but also local groups and individuals.</p>	Points noted.
IP3	Interested Person	17	<p>What do you think needs to happen to drive forward delivery and sustain momentum? (p108)</p> <p>Note: This page outlines the questions asked within the draft Kirkwall Urban Design Framework and should be read in conjunction with the document.</p> <p>OIC must take the lead.</p>	Points noted.
IP4	Interested Person	1	<p>Wanting people who live within 20 minutes walk of town centre to walk to the shops. An admirable sentiment but hopelessly naive.</p> <p>Consider:</p>	Points noted.

		<p>*People are not going to walk 5 minutes, never mind 20 minutes, when weather is bad. Having 4 storey buildings alongside the roads to give shelter won't change people's weather sensitivity. Have the planners forgotten how fickle Orkney weather is?</p> <p>*Many car journeys are multi-purpose - not just going to Tescos, but also picking up or depositing kids, nipping up to Hatston, popping along a friend or relative. Hence taking the car is always the most convenient option, even for short trips.</p> <p>*Many people going to the supermarkets are buying several days of provisions. They don't want to carry a heavy load of shopping home when they have a car to do the lifting.</p> <p>The increasing number of large flat blocks that are being built (with more to come it would seem) in central Kirkwall will result in higher population density which in turn means more cars, like it or not. At rush hour Junction Road is already operating at its peak capacity. Stay clear of the Junction Road / Union Street junction at rush hour.</p>	<p>The 20 minute walk principle contained un the KUDF refers to the land which is allocated for immediate term development, with any land further from the town centre phased for the longer term.</p> <p>There are no proposals within the KUDF that will prevent people from having or using cars, however it was a widely expressed desire from the community that Kirkwall should not continue to expand further into the countryside, and that it should be easier to move about by foot and bike. The KUDF reflects these aspirations. With the forecast of an aging population, it is considered a good idea to locate new housing in close proximity to shops and services so that older people are well connected to the things they need.</p>
IP4	Interested Person	<p>2</p> <p>Air Pollution.</p> <p>Most of the air pollution comes from commercial vehicles. It is the oldish commercial vehicles that are the worst of all.</p> <p>Because of the wind the planners are unaware how bad the air in Kirkwall is. Junction Road is awful. Even Albert Street and Victoria Street can be awful if a delivery vehicle is temporarily stopped with its engine ticking over. There needs to be a rule that a delivery vehicle that is stopped for more than 20 seconds must turn its engine off.</p> <p>Many older private diesel cars are also very polluting. Kirkwall's main taxi company has cars with very high obnoxious emissions. I believe the MOT test is soon going to get more strict on vehicle emissions, but the Council could be doing more with its own powers for checking commercial vehicles.</p> <p>Nobody likes walking along the noisy air polluted main artery roads - like Junction Road, Wellington / High Street, Palace Road, Dundas Crescent, and Pedie Sea road. Even Broad Street is badly air polluted much of the time. It must be a daunting challenge for old people who are slow on their feet to get across these roads.</p> <p>Once upon a time the wind did blow much of the air pollution away, but now the foul air has a 360 degree source so you get it, whatever the wind direction.</p>	<p>Support noted. One of the aspirations of the community, as reflected in the KUDF, is to move towards greener and more active transport methods. It is also a key aspiration to create streets which are safer and better designed for pedestrians and cyclists whilst accepting that there will always be the need for motor vehicles given the dispersed nature of Orkney's population outwith the town.</p>

			<p>Lots of kids go to Glaitness School and the Pickoquoy centre. If your planners can read they should have noticed that medical agencies have reported that children's lungs are the most sensitive to traffic pollution.</p>	
IP4	Interested Person	3	<p>Green Network Strategy. I like this. There is huge need to put 'green' at the top of planning & development considerations. Take advantage of Kirkwall's existing green places. A picnic table or two in the Palace gardens, the Willows, even the cathedral cemetery. All these places have shelter from the wind and have a pleasant environment and would be a find place to have a coffee and a sandwich.</p> <p>Protect the remaining green areas (including the remaining private town centre gardens). These are being eliminated through in-filling. The old private gardens that lie behind the shops of Albert Street and Victoria Street are home to a lot of bird life. It is such a rich pleasure hearing bird activity when walking along the street. It is so sad seeing these old central green areas (even if privately owned) being built on.</p> <p>The Council should maintain a register of all existing town centre private gardens, their use and size. Kirkwall needs something like the 'Green Belt' protected zone in the south east of England. There should be no more development permitted in these green areas of central Kirkwall.</p> <p>Rain water drainage is a problem for central west Kirkwall. All the more reason to preserve the remaining central garden and green areas for soakaway support. Of course developers should be asked to contribute to OIC coffers for anything that adds to the surface water capture. Why not have a 'Development Tax' for central areas of Kirkwall.</p> <p>Consider having a minimum ratio for green to concrete for new developments in this area (including old Balfour Hospital site).</p> <p>The report talks of prioritising brownfield site developments. The problem here is definition of 'brownfield'. Its one thing to redevelop an existing building but swalling up surrounding gardens in the project is unjustified extension of the brownfield idea.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Council's Open Space Strategy Supplementary Guidance contains an audit of all Open Spaces within Orkney. This is used at the Planning decision making stage where any proposals seek to build on recognised Open Space.</p> <p>Opportunities for development out with Kirkwall must comply with the housing in the Policies of the Local Development Plan and in particular Housing in the Countryside Supplementary Guidance, which ensures our settlements are consolidated.</p> <p>Support noted. The KUDF outlines the importance of green space to the management of surface water, and the preparation of a Surface Water Management Plan is identified which will be carried out by OIC Engineering. Support for the establishment of developer contributions is also noted.</p> <p>As part of the planning application process, all proposals have to demonstrate that surface water is treated as part of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS). This ensures that surface water run off is managed in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Brownfield land does not relate to garden ground.</p>
IP4	Interested Person	4	<p>The green Crafty. The Crafty had only one mention in the consultation and that was for extra parking or housing at the old caravan site. It would seem the planners are unaware there is a green Crafty the size of a football pitch behind Matches Square, Firths Square, and the Women's Refuge. This never got mentioned.</p> <p>There are ditches in the green Crafty that play an important part in the surface water drainage for central south&west Kirkwall. The water it captures comes from Main Street & Wellington Street. The ditch water flows into the peedie Sea (or used to). The ditches suffer a continual</p>	<p>Action point 1: Points noted. The Crafty site is in the process of being transferred from OIC to OHAL for the development of housing, however there may be an opportunity to upgrade the underutilised open green space adjacent to the site as part of the development and this suggestion has been included in the revised KUDF (p44).</p>

			<p>build up of weeds and silt and have to be periodically cleared out by the Council. But this does not happen frequently enough and the grassy Crafty gets very boggy. When I was a boy these ditches were cleared out once a year. If this was attended to reliably this area could be made into a very nice wet woodland park with long grass, biodiversity and nature interest activity. This would not be an expensive project and would be low maintenance (no more than it should have at present).</p> <p>Put in a path or board walk from the Matches Square end to old caravan site and back lane out to supermarkets - means people could get off noisy Junction Road quicker when walking to the supermarkets or Glaitness school, or Pickaquoy centre.</p> <p>It could be made into a nice stopping point for people walking out to the supermarkets. A picnic table or two would be useful too.</p> <p>The public right of ways from Junction Road into the green Crafty are being 'challenged' by recent occupiers. The Council should ensure these access lanes are not blocked.</p>	
IP4	Interested Person	5	<p>Old Balfour Hospital site redevelopment. The survey made no mention of how pleasant pedestrian access was going to be supported from this development (and the surrounding area) to the Pickaquoy Road amenities. The Council needs to look at this with some urgency if it wants to encourage more walking. This would establish one or two new pedestrian lanes to link up with existing paths at the back of supermarkets. This would save pedestrians having to walk along noisy and smelly Wellington Street and Junction Road.</p> <p>As mentioned earlier, the Council should insist on a minimum ratio of green to concrete for this site in order to maximise rain water capture and promote open space.</p>	Points noted. Improved path connections to and through the area to encourage walking and cycling is included in the KUDF already.
IP4	Interested Person	6	<p>Grt Western Road & Pickaquoy Park projects.</p> <p>A Peedie Sea park sounds a good project. Would make a nice orbital walk round it and back in via Eyre road and back of power station. I am sceptical about the Otter residence though. There is a contradiction between more people and dogs and resident Otters. Get the trees and bird life in though.</p> <p>Four storey houses for Western Road? I prefer looking at the cathedral. The survey talks about a "framed view" of the cathedral. Not a chance with 4 stories. 3 just might be OK.</p> <p>Moving towards a high density town centre population will have consequential impact on car ownership/parking and traffic levels.</p>	<p>Support noted for Peedie Sea Park proposals.</p> <p>The height of development has been considered by the team writing the KUDF, however the need for views to the Cathedral to be retained is also included throughout the KUDF already and this will be assed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The impact of any new development will result in a consequential impact on car ownership, parking and traffic levels. With an aging population forecast, it is considered most sustainable to develop this new housing in central locations where cars are less likely to be relied upon.</p>

IP4	Interested Person	7	<p>Kirkwall SWOT. SWOT is a good management tool but only if all elements are addressed with equal energy and imagination. In my view the report failed to address the WOT.</p> <p>I don't think it sufficiently emphasise the tourist importance of Kirkwall's astonishingly unique historic town centre and old shopping streets. Didn't see the threat to this atmosphere from smelly noisy over-fast traffic. There has got to be speed resistance measures brought in for the old pavementless streets. There are too many wheely bins standing around in some places 7/24.</p> <p>A lot of talk of 4 storey tenements for Grt Western / Pickaquoy roads without addressing traffic and car ownership issues.</p> <p>Didn't highlight the negative impact of air pollution (vehicle & chinmey).</p> <p>It did mention "over tourism" as a threat. But the Kirkwall project review makes no reference to the problem. I strongly believe that the high number of cruise liner tourists serve as a deterrent to longer-stay tourists (who are more beneficial to the wider economy). Who on earth would want to visit Skarra Brae or the Italian Chapel when there are 3 busloads queued up to get in.</p>	<p>Action point 9: Points noted about Kirkwall specific issues and text added to SWOT to reflect these points (p19).</p>
IP5	Interested Person	1	<p>In my view, the communities engagement exercise has been valuable, and the Draft Framework is useful and informative, and has captured the context of Kirkwall correctly.</p> <p>I broadly agree with the SWOT analysis, the Vision, the Strategy and the Design Principles presented, and have some suggestions to add to that:</p> <p>Curtail town centre vehicular traffic by enforcing present traffic restrictions in Bridge Street, Albert Street and Victoria Street – I have been constantly lobbying Police Scotland on this issue</p> <p>Reduce vehicular traffic on Broad Street by introducing further restrictions</p> <p>Consider Park and Ride arrangements for traffic from both West and East Mainland districts</p> <p>Consider constructing a bypass via Foreland, Orphir Road, Bloomfield, Sunnybank and Finstown/Stromness Road</p> <p>Consider supporting “rickshaw” type enterprises, particularly for elderly and infirm, to operate from the town centre car parks to the shopping street and supermarkets, perhaps with electrically-driven bikes powered by hydrogen?</p>	<p>Points noted.</p> <p>As you point out, enforcement of traffic restrictions is a Police Scotland matter, and is not something that the Council can do something about directly. That said, the Your Kirkwall community engagement has resulted in a plan reflects a community view that something needs to be done about traffic enforcement in the town, and this will be fed to Police Scotland formally through the Community Planning Partnership.</p> <p>Park and ride has not been considered necessary following analysis by traffic engineers of the level of traffic and car parking in the town.</p> <p>The KUDF does not propose a bypass road to the south of the town in the short to medium term as traffic levels do not necessitate this new infrastructure – the network is operating comfortably within capacity and minor improvements to key junctions are proposed to address the issues a key locations which were raised through the community engagement. The KUDF does not preclude the development of a by pass in the longer term if traffic levels exceed the capacity of the road network and a business case can be made.</p> <p>Points noted regarding rickshaw type development, but this is beyond the scope of the KUDF.</p> <p>Some of the ideas expressed in relation to museums already form part of the KUDF, for example at the current Power Station building. A range of land uses are supported for the Oil Tank site, and reference to uses compatible with tourism and leisure are noted within the KUDF.</p> <p>Support noted for housing design guidelines.</p>

			<p>In Focus Area 1 at St. Catherine's Place, Harbour Street and Bridge Street, where the dangerous and unsightly tanks now desecrate the area, should consideration be given to a new museum? Whilst Tankerness House has provided, and continues to provide, an excellent facility for Orkney, its shortcomings are now becoming evident, and in my view, given the importance of history and heritage to Orkney, we should now be looking at a new museums strategy fit for the 21st century. Perhaps the Power Station could be incorporated into that strategy to record and display Orkney's contribution to energy production and research through the 20th century and into the 21st?</p> <p>New housing, including the Balfour redevelopment site, should follow traditional types of housing, whilst ensuring the buildings are energy efficient and contribute to developing and sustaining mixed communities</p> <p>Whilst the desire to increase tree planting and the creation of green spaces is commendable, such spaces should not follow the urban designs found in larger conurbations but should reflect Orkney's landscape</p> <p>The desire to clean up and "standardise" Hatston is also commendable, but should not dominate any future plan – Hatston is first and foremost a working space, not a sanitised corridor designed for cruise ship passengers to pass through on their way to and from their ships</p> <p>Seriously consider whether Kirkwall's built boundaries are now coming close to capacity and rethink the spread of "kit" houses that blight Kirkwall's edges</p> <p>I hope these suggestions will be considered in the positive light in which they're intended.</p>	<p>Points noted regarding tree planting and green space.</p> <p>Points noted regarding Hatston.</p> <p>Support noted regarding Kirkwall's boundaries, which are proposed to be consolidated through the KUDF as informed by the community aspirations for the town to be consolidated rather than continuing to grow outwards.</p>
IP6	Interested Person	1	<p>Yes, I don't think anyone can say that there was no opportunity to have their say and put forward their ideas. Concerns appear to have been taken on board and it is very positive to see the younger generation getting a strong voice as they are the future residents and workers of the town.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
IP6	Interested Person	2	<p>The context is clear enough, but for clarity and style I would rather see – at Page 16 - the college referred to as 'Orkney College UHI', and also no trade names such as Tesco appear, and instead refer only to 'supermarkets'.</p>	<p>Action point 10: Point noted and text amended to reflect the correct title of Orkney College UHI and to remove names from the supermarkets (p16).</p>
IP6	Interested Person	3	<p>Is there room for mention of changing energy generation/storage/management in here? There are references in the consultation to the phasing out of need for the Kirkwall Power Station, but apart from mentioning EV charge points and electric bikes, there is little reference to how the potential for solar PV and battery storage and</p>	<p>Action point 11: Points noted and SWOT amended to reflect the points raised (p19).</p>

			other changes to how domestic and non-domestic properties in the town will receive/manage their electricity. It may be that this is already accounted for, but there is no explicit mention of whether the existing infrastructure will be able to support this, or whether there are plans to strengthen the local network to allow for such developments.	
IP6	Interested Person	4	Do you agree with this vision for Kirkwall set by the community during the Your Kirkwall community engagement exercise? Broadly agree, and especially keen on more colour and enhanced greenspace.	Support noted.
IP6	Interested Person	5	Broadly agree, but slightly puzzled/concerned at the proposal for a park at Craigiefield. This is a relatively exposed piece of coastline and agricultural land and while folk do walk round the outskirts of Kirkwall it doesn't immediately strike me as a 'go to' place for recreation. Having helped collect 15 bags of rubbish and seaborne debris along that shoreline for Bag the Bruck this year – and seen evidence of fly-tipping - I suspect maintaining it as an attractive place to walk/play etc will be a full-time job. Perhaps this land, if not to be developed for housing, would lend itself to a small community wind turbine – mirroring the turbines already sited at Hatston Industrial Estate on the opposite shore of Kirkwall Bay, or perhaps to a ground-mounted community solar PV array – something to make a statement about Kirkwall embracing renewable technology?	Points noted. The aspiration for a park at Craigiefield Park came from a local community group who wish to take over maintenance of the space and create parkland for the public to enjoy. This is based on the number of walkers who enjoy the route past the fields and along the coast back into town. Action point 12: There is nothing to preclude energy generation from being part of a mix of ideas for this location and reference to this opportunity has been added to the KUDF (p71).
IP6	Interested Person	6	Yes – maintenance of town character is necessary.	Support noted.
IP6	Interested Person	7	Yes, and mention of energy efficiency, promotion of renewable energy and minimising fuel poverty is welcome when talking about future housing – new, restored and converted – although it would be good to know that any infrastructure issues have been/are being addressed. Also, there is no explicit mention of the potential for district heating schemes.	Action point 13: Points noted and the document has been updated to reflect the potential for district heating (p28).
IP6	Interested Person	8	Yes, but I feel that this action plan would be strengthened by including reference to ensuring that adequate electricity infrastructure will be in place to allow for changing generation/storage/usage patterns.	Action point 14: Points noted and text has been amended to clarify this point (p41).
IP6	Interested Person	9	Yes, but see answer to 8 also.	Points noted and see above response.
IP6	Interested Person	10	Yes.	Support noted.
IP6	Interested Person	11	It certainly has potential to remove the bottleneck situation around Junction Road/Great Western Road junctions, but what is shown on page 72 appears to shut off vehicular access to business and residential developments at the south end of Great Western Road?	Points noted. The proposal is that Great Western Road should remain as a road but be closed off at the southern end (at Pickaquoy Road) thereby maintaining access. Various options were tested and the option shown achieves the optimal solution. Moving pedestrian crossings and introducing other roundabouts do not relieve the conflicts caused by the combination of very close junctions and traffic movements.

IP6	Interested Person	12	Yes.	Support noted.
IP6	Interested Person	13	Broadly, but the concerns about the Carness path and Craigiefield Park outlined in my answer to Q8 are relevant here. It feels like the wrong kind of development for this area.	Points noted.
IP6	Interested Person	14	Yes, anything to rejuvenate the Bignold Park and make it a more relevant and welcoming recreational space year-round can only be positive.	Support noted.
IP6	Interested Person	15	While the Balfour redevelopment for housing seems entirely logical, I'm not entirely convinced of the sense in developing some of the lower lying areas out towards Crantit and Scapa. First instincts are that it is already wet across much of this area, and our weather patterns do not suggest that we are going to get any drier anytime soon. Is this really the best direction to be developing Kirkwall given the existing flooding issues?	Points noted. Whilst concerns about the impact of surface and coastal flood water on this land are noted, these land allocations were included in the Orkney Local Development Plan 2017. The LDP was reviewed by SEPA and no objection was lodged. A development brief has been prepared for the allocations which, in line with SEPA advice, establishes the requirement for a detailed flood risk assessment to be carried out prior to any development, and for buildings to avoid identified areas of flooding.
IP6	Interested Person	16	The successful projects – that don't already have a commercial aspect – are going to be the ones that can attract sustained community support, probably with a lead organisation supported by partners. On Page 107 it mentions 'constrained council budgets', but 'communities' (who makes up communities?) are similarly hardly awash with extra cash. Some of the ideas around community renewable as a generator of funds (as well as electricity/hydrogen etc) could help kick-start some of the projects, but I would personally want to see fuel poverty being tackled at a county-wide level before too many recreational schemes had vast sums of public money spent on them.	Points noted. The ideas for community wind turbines at Craigiefield are supported. Ultimately, any recreational projects which progress will prevail because the community wish to drive forwards. This document provides support for initiatives that we have been told people want to take forwards. Action point 15: text has been added to the collaboration section to outline the potential for community renewable energy to be a generator of funds to help kick start projects (p94)
IP6	Interested Person	17	Fundamentally what is needed for many of the smaller projects listed in the consultation action plans is community/neighbourhood buy-in. It is easy to sit in a warm room and draw up a wish list for your home town, but quite another to get folk to turn out to make these dreams a reality. There is a definite role for a strengthened community council and/or community development trust (with income from renewables?) to help drive some of the projects forward over time. However, some projects are going to need real localised leaders from the neighbourhoods/organisations that want to see improvements made on their doorsteps. Developing a feeling of ownership of many of the spaces/areas to be improved requires ownership/responsibility to be devolved.	Action point 15: Points noted and text has been added to the KUDF to reflect this advice (p94).
IP7	Interested Person	1	Rather belatedly, I looked last night at the proposed 'Your Kirkwall Urban Design Framework'. This followed an Orkney Field Club event at Muddisdale as part of the Orkney Nature Festival, when I reminded myself just how very special this woodland has become. I was, therefore, rather shocked to see that it was proposed to create a mountain bike skills area there. Muddisdale wood is a real haven for peaceful activities - walking, running, mums and dads with young children, bird watching, dog	Action point 16: Points noted. Mountain biking tracks were requested by many young people during the community engagement and Muddisdale was seen as the most suitable place due to its relationship to Wideford Hill. That said, the KUDF has been revised to soften the form of words, and it is appreciated that there may be alternative uses for this space (p59).

			<p>walking and I always recall an elderly naturalist saying to me with real emotion how important areas like Muddisdale were to him because he could get there in his buggy and be close to wildlife. It is a lovely, peaceful area, full of birdsong, and changing it into an active and noisy recreational area would be destroying a very important urban edge habitat (for people and wildlife). I may be wrong but I think at present this is not meant to even be a cycle route and I hope that would continue. People, of all ages, need areas of peace like this that they can access from the town on foot, especially as more housing has been built recently in the areas around it. It's also a lovely, very safe resource for schools to use.</p> <p>I very much hope that this proposal will find another, more appropriate, site. What is immediately urgently needed at Muddisdale is simply more benches so that people can enjoy sitting there, listening to birdsong, in their lunch break etc.</p>	
IP8	Interested Person	1	Yes.	Support noted.
IP8	Interested Person	2	Yes.	Support noted.
IP8	Interested Person	3	<p>Broadly. I think tourism might be better reflected by: Weakness – Economy & Community not set up to maximize opportunities and benefits of bulk tourism. Opportunity – Sustainable tourism planning</p>	Action point 17: Points noted and text amended to reflect this (p19).
IP8	Interested Person	4	Yes.	Support noted.
IP8	Interested Person	5	Absolutely. As someone who walks around Craigiefield/ Orkney College, I particularly like the concept of a Park, and off-road, safer walking. The 60-mph single track road (Craigiefield Road moving NW-SE) is particularly dangerous but popular with walkers.	Support noted.
IP8	Interested Person	6	Yes.	Support noted.
IP8	Interested Person	7	<p>Broadly. Please retain pavements in developments, as shared surfaces and small kerbs do not work in practice here.</p>	<p>Point noted. Street design is influenced by the Scottish Government's policy statement titled 'Designing Streets'. This document requires local authorities and designers to make a step change from considering the design of roads to follow standards and rather enabling them to be designed to suit their context. This means that roads, or streets, need not be the same everywhere but be designed to be suitable to the place. It does not necessarily mean that there can not be footways, but generally there is a move to considering the space between buildings as being the public realm, and a place where motor vehicles do not have priority over other road users. Where a scheme is found to work, it will be because it has been designed well and the policy has been interpreted and implemented properly. There is a learning curve for road designers to achieve best practice, and the KUDF continues to aspire towards this.</p>
IP8	Interested Person	8	Yes. I support the Youth Café having extended hours, brownfield redevelopment as a preference and I like the coastal path.	Support noted.

IP8	Interested Person	9	Yes, however I understand that the Powerbowl building is used as a museum store and may not necessarily be available for redevelopment?	Support noted. The former Powerbowl building is a Council store, but these arrangements can be reviewed.
IP8	Interested Person	10	No – I think that a larger fund (e.g. Scottish Government Infrastructure fund) should take care of this. It will already be expensive to develop here compared to a greenfield site	Points noted. You may be aware that the Planning System in Scotland is currently being reviewed. The 'Stage 1 report' on the Planning Bill does not support the idea of a centralised fund being collected and distributed nationally by the Government, instead steering toward a model where contributions are collected and spent locally. It is difficult at this time to see where the infrastructure levy is going. Either way, contributions will need to be collected locally, the question is whether it is from all developments at a fixed level or on a case by case basis depending on the nature of the need as per the current system where upgrades are essential to make a proposal acceptable in planning terms.
IP8	Interested Person	11	Unsure – a roundabout and re-siting of the Pedestrian Crossing may be more effective?	Action point 18: Points noted. A detailed design exercise will be carried out before any changes are made. The ideas suggested in the KUDF are only the beginning of this process.
IP8	Interested Person	12	Yes.	Support noted.
IP8	Interested Person	13	Yes. As someone who walks around Craigiefield/ Orkney College, I particularly like the concept of a Park, and off-road, safer walking. The 60-mph single track road (Craigiefield Road moving NW-SE) is particularly dangerous but popular with walkers.	Points noted.
IP8	Interested Person	14	Yes.	Support noted.
IP8	Interested Person	15	Yes.	Support noted.
IP8	Interested Person	16	OIC, Community Planning Partnership, Orkney Housing Association, Private landowners, private developers, community groups, individual members of the community.	Action point 19: Points noted and text added to KUDF.
IP8	Interested Person	17	What do you think needs to happen to drive forward delivery and sustain momentum? (p108) Strategic leadership, budget, regular updates.	Action point 20: Points noted and recommendation taken forward to establish a steering group.
IP9	Interested Person	1	I am very impressed with the extent of the consultation exercise undertaken and the wide variety of people reached including the younger generations as it will be them that have to live with our decisions.	Support noted.
IP9	Interested Person	2	Whilst I accept that many people shop at Tesco, I do not think it should be specifically mentioned as one of the town's facilities as there are many smaller local shops that are equally important (and provide better services!). I agree one of the main constraints to development in Kirkwall is flooding. It has been recognized as such since well before the 'great flood of 2006' but still there has been no resolution to this issue.	Action point 10: Points noted and reference to Tesco has been replaced by reference to supermarkets. Points noted regarding weather, and the proposals are not blind to this. Ideas are suggested for how shelter can be enhanced and transportation aided by electric bike, as well as facilities to make routes more useful in these conditions.

			Unfortunately Orkney's main hindrance to use of greenspaces, walking and cycling is the wonderful weather!	
IP9	Interested Person	3	Yes I broadly agree with the analysis. Glad that cruise tourism is highlighted in all 4 categories as over provision will spoil the peace and tranquility that people come to see in the first place. Personally I am not convinced that the mass cruise liner mentality is the correct way forward but it does bring trade to the community. A fine balance is required.	Support noted.
IP9	Interested Person	4	Yes, I agree with the vision. It is Kirkwall's very diversity between old and new, rural and urban that makes it special. Traffic management and an over reliance on cars needs to be addressed by encouraging walking/cycling but still allowing local town centre businesses to function.	Support noted.
IP9	Interested Person	5	Yes, I generally agree with the strategy but I feel part of the attraction of Kirkwall is that you are not far from the rural/farming areas. The existing routes around Craigiefield and Scapa means you can access farmland very easily. I think areas such as these need to be retained for agricultural use as this is the main heritage of Orkney. Being able to walk for 10 minutes from the town centre and feel that you are in the country surrounded by green fields and cows is very special. Formalising these areas into planned greenspace and play parks etc will ruin this as well as effectively increasing the boundaries of the town. I whole heartily agree that a one-way system should be introduced at Great Western Rd/ Junction Rd. This would enable on-street parking and reduce traffic congestion at the Pickaquooy Rd roundabout.	Points noted. The town boundary is established in the Local Development Plan 2017, and the land at Craigiefield is within the town boundary. However, a common theme from the Your Kirkwall community engagement which informed the KUDF was a desire for the town to be consolidated and not to continue growing out into the countryside, because people valued being able to walk out into the countryside like yourself. This is why the KUDF promotes development within a 20 minute walk of the town centre. Support for one way system noted.
IP9	Interested Person	6	I do think there needs to be some guidance but not so restrictive to prevent development. My concern with encouraging planting is that there is insufficient funding for on-going maintenance of such areas. These may look nice for several years after construction but deteriorate very rapidly without regular maintenance. Who is going to pay/undertake this? Similarly the planting/retaining of certain trees must be considered more carefully as they cause damage to buildings and make paths green and slippery in autumn/winter. The idea of shared surface is good in theory but does not appear to work in practice. Pedestrians have no visual 'safe area' and drivers do not take pedestrians into consideration when driving through such areas or parking. The lack of road kerbs in the recent snow highlighted issues as drivers did not know where the road edge was and often skidded into pedestrian areas or front gardens without kerbs to stop them. Building on the boundary line to replicate some of the existing buildings is fine but again it is the ongoing maintenance that can cause issues. From experience OIC Roads Department do not like you erecting scaffold or blocking footpaths. This can cause issues for painting, gutter cleaning etc. This also increases maintenance costs as permits now	Support for design guidance noted. Action point 21: Text added to outline that the provision of ongoing maintenance will be difficult for the Council to provide and that community ownership is likely to be key to the success of any greenspace projects. The Settlement Statement for Kirkwall which will be reviewed following adoption of the KUDF will also include a requirement that a maintenance plan is put in place at the planning application stage of any development proposal (p27). Observations about shared surfaces and building lines are noted. Please note that a range of different approaches to how a building or its curtilage meet the public realm or street are outlined in the KUDF and buildings addressing the heel of the kerb is only one potential solution. Regarding shared space, street design is influenced by the Scottish Government's policy statement titled 'Designing Streets'. This document requires local authorities and designers to make a step change from considering the design of roads to follow standards and rather enabling them to be designed to suit their context. This means that roads, or streets, need not be the same everywhere but be designed to be suitable to the place. It does not necessarily mean that there can not be footways, but generally there is a move to considering the space between buildings as being the public realm, and a place where motor vehicles do not have priority over other road users. Where a scheme is found to work, it will be because it has been designed well and the

			cost a considerable amount. Lack of maintenance of buildings is an issue that needs to be considered as there are many buildings in Kirkwall that require expensive overhauling.	policy has been interpreted and implemented properly. There is a learning curve for road designers to achieve best practice, and the KUDF continues to aspire towards this.
IP9	Interested Person	7	Yes, generally, but buildings gable on to streets and narrow closes are from an era without the motor car. While we are trying to reduce the reliance on the car we cannot ignore it either. Access issues for maintenance in narrow closes also causes issues and increases costs often resulting in works not being done.	Points noted. There is nothing within the KUDF to preclude the use of motor cars and they will be part of new development. The document promotes a more balanced approach to accommodating car parking within new development in the town centre.
IP9	Interested Person	8	I agree with the six areas highlighted for re-development but am surprised there is no mention of the old Jewson's yard on Junction Rd. This is a significant area that requires redevelopment but is not mention at all in the plan. Redevelopment of these areas must be planned in the long term and not just on an ad hoc basis as one developer decides to undertake a development.	Action point 22: Points noted and reference to development opportunities on the Jewson's Yard site have been included in the revised KUDF (p45).
IP9	Interested Person	9	I broadly agree with the proposals	Support noted.
IP9	Interested Person	10	Yes I think developers should contribute towards solving the flooding issues but not to the extent it makes development uneconomic. This may result in OIC having to fund these works without any contributions from developers if it enables development for the good of Kirkwall.	Point noted. The Developer Contributions & Good Neighbour Agreements Planning Policy Advice allows for the developer to demonstrate where developer contributions would make a development unviable.
IP9	Interested Person	12	Yes. This area used to be the town dump and all sorts of things are buried under here which would need to be investigated and cleared if need be.	Points noted.
IP9	Interested Person	13	In principle I agree something needs to be done to improve the Hatston area but do wonder how the hard pressed businesses will take to paying for tidying up the area. Not sure that a timber walkway along the shore is a good idea. I would think a proper land based pathway would be more economical and less problematical given the Orkney weather.	Action point 23: Points noted. The design of any coastal footpath will be considered at the project feasibility stage. The role of the KUDF is to identify the aspiration for a link. Text has been amended to reflect this by describing the solution as walkway/boardwalk (p63).
IP9	Interested Person	14	Yes. The Bignold Park needs to be properly drained to allow use for sports etc	Point noted.
IP9	Interested Person	15	Yes, but see my comments about maintenance of these areas in 6 above. Before any further development in the area the issues with flooding need to be carefully addressed as this area is low lying and historically wet and boggy.	Points noted. The Kirkwall South development brief has been prepared for the land allocations and identifies the need for a detailed flood risk assessment prior to the design of any development taking place. This will identify areas at risk of flooding, which new development will be required to avoid.
IP9	Interested Person	16	All Kirkwall residents, businesses, community groups and clubs and OIC	Action point 24: Points noted and text added to KUDF.
IP9	Interested Person	17	Using this document as a starting point, a robust overarching development brief for Kirkwall needs to be drawn up and enforced to control any future development of Kirkwall.	Action point 25: Points noted. Following the adoption of the Your Kirkwall KUDF, revisions will be made to the Kirkwall Settlement Statement Supplementary Guidance. Text has been added to clarify this point. The Settlement Statement will set the Planning context for the town, and identify where development briefs are required for individual sites (p29)
IP10	Interested Person	1	Yes good to engage with school children but some adults didn't even know about consultation would be good to involve sports clubs.	Points noted. Sports clubs have been involved in the process. The Council's consultation activities meet and exceed the requirements set out in the Planning Etc (Scotland) Act 1997 and the Development Planning Regulations, which state that the Local Authority must publicise its proposals and seek representations by a specified date.

				The Council undertook an extensive community engagement exercise over a period of months to feed into the preparation of these proposals. Public workshops were well attended with approximately 160 contributors at the November workshops and 58 participants at the January workshops. In addition to this, 322 people of all age groups participated in the community survey which underpinned the direction of travel with the preparation of the plan. A Youth Summit was attended by 55 young people and ongoing interaction via social media throughout the project, via 481 facebook likes and 122 twitter follows reached 72,829 users. This process was reported on by the Local Media throughout.
IP10	Interested Person	2	Yes	Support noted.
IP10	Interested Person	3	Recreational facilities are a strength but during winter periods hall space is at capacity to continue with promoting healthy lifestyle and more people being more active more often facilities would need to be looked at. And regeneration of peedie sea would be fab for the community.	Support for Peedie Sea park noted
IP10	Interested Person	4	Yes	Support noted.
IP10	Interested Person	5	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	6	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	7	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	8	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	9	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	10	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	11	Yes can become difficult to get onto pickaquooy road when coming out of supermarket or picky centre car parks.	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	12	Yes but more for recreation and sport (ideas located on picky ground or old powerbowl) Indoor 3g pitch 60/40 similar to Shetland next to hockey pitch at Picky also a suggestion to add a strength and conditioning suite in same building. 4G pitch used for rugby and football in picky outfield (something picky are looking into) Indoor bowls/ multi sport facility either on picky grounds or near power bowl. (question is who would maintain and manage building) Extension to picky to create more changing room space another 4 court badminton hall and possibility for space for specific gymnastics hall. (changing rom space is a new issue that's been highlighted)	Action point 26: Points noted and text has been amended to reflect these aspirations p53).

IP10	Interested Person	13	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	14	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	15	Yes	Support noted
IP10	Interested Person	16	For the public to get behind the project and for them to fully understand the project.	Point noted.
KA3	Key Agency	1	<p>We understand that the KUDF is a strategic planning and urban design document which aims to guide development and change in Kirkwall over the next 20 years. We welcome that the framework has been prepared with the local community who have helped to inform the priorities and design principles within the KUDF.</p> <p>Historic Environment Scotland welcomes that the vision of the framework includes the historic environment with the heritage of Kirkwall being a key feature of the vision. We welcome that the community and Council recognise the importance of heritage to Kirkwall's sense of place and to good place making. We welcome the references throughout the draft framework to the historic environment and cultural heritage of Kirkwall and the desire to work with the existing built heritage to conserve and enhance it while creating better places to live, work and visit.</p> <p>We note that there is an aspiration to improve signage and wayfaring throughout Kirkwall and also to focus on traffic management and reducing the demand for car commuting by promoting active travel. We welcome these ambitions and would recommend that sensitive careful design should be promoted to ensure that any new signage or road junctions and crossings etc. are an improvement rather than an increase to avoid cluttering the sensitive streetscape in Kirkwall, especially in the conservation area, and potentially causing unanticipated adverse impacts.</p> <p>We strongly welcome that protecting the historic environment is built into the design process as illustrated on page 28 of the framework document and that this is a key design issue for both neighbourhoods and buildings. You may wish to consider including this as a key design issue for streets as well. Overall, we welcome the design principles but note that there is little direct reference to the historic environment within the 5 principles and you may wish to consider this to ensure that there are no unanticipated adverse effects on the historic environment from any proposals.</p> <p>We note that there is an aspiration as part of the promotion of active travel and the Hatston and Seafrost Focus Area to create a new pathway between Hatston and Wideford Hill, taking in Wideford Hill, chambered cairn (SM 90315). This scheduled monument is also a Property in the Care of Scottish Ministers cared for by Historic</p>	<p>Support for community engagement process noted.</p> <p>Action point 27: text added to clarify expectations of any new signage (p26)</p> <p>Action point 28: text added to refer to the need to consult with HES at an early stage where any proposals affect the chambered cairn (p59)</p> <p>Support for document noted.</p>

		<p>Environment Scotland and we would therefore recommend that Historic Environment Scotland should be involved at an early stage in any discussions for proposals which may have an effect on the scheduled monument or its setting.</p> <p>Overall, we welcome that the draft KUDF takes into account and celebrates the high quality of the historic environment in and around Kirkwall and aims to promote protect and where possible enhance the cultural heritage of the town. Together with the LDP policies and existing supplementary guidance we consider that this will help deliver development which is sensitive to the historic environment. I hope that these comments are helpful, but if you have any questions or would like to discuss anything in this letter further please do not hesitate to get in touch on the details given above.</p>	
KA12	Key Agency	<p>We support the emphasis put on a strong design led approach encompassing themes such as placemaking, greenspace and active travel throughout the draft Framework. Although lengthy, the draft Framework provides a good explanation of what the Council envisage for each of the focus areas and for Kirkwall as a whole.</p> <p>We acknowledge the not inconsiderable amount of work achieved by the Council in both setting up the Your Kirkwall Project, but also ensuring that the outputs of this project have been effectively taken forward into the draft Framework.</p> <p>The draft also sets out how it has been informed by the aspirations of the community identified via the various public engagement exercises that have been carried out. In addition it provides detailed outcomes for different projects to illustrate how these more strategic themes can be translated into reality on the ground for the local community. This is useful context.</p> <p>We welcome the intention to inform the implementation of the draft Framework using a landscape / greenspace Framework for the overall strategy, supplemented by landscape Frameworks for specific project areas (eg Haston Industrial Estate, Crantit and Arcadia). As a general rule we encourage the introduction / enhancement of greenspace and natural features, because of the benefits they provide to people and nature. However, as recognised on page 48, built heritage contributes to the landscape of Kirkwall, creating a distinctive place. Our advice is that this will require careful consideration and balancing with the desires of the community, to ensure that the distinctiveness of Kirkwall is retained / enhanced. For example, whilst an increase in woodland and trees within an urban landscape can do much to enhance townscape character, within an Orkney and Kirkwall context this should be carefully balanced with the distinctive built and hard landscape that defines many of Kirkwall's streetscapes.</p>	<p>Support for approach set out in KUDF noted.</p> <p>Support for landscape/greenspace framework noted.</p> <p>Action point 29: Points noted regarding the need to balance the aspiration for greenspace with that of distinctive built form and this is reflected in the KUDF which identifies the need for key views to the cathedral to be retained (p52). Text has also been added to explain the need to protect and enhance the historic environment under the 'better streets' heading (p24)</p> <p>Action point 30: Reference to green space under the digital section has been removed (p22), however the importance and role of green infrastructure has been made clear in the updated document (p26 and 27).</p> <p>Action point 31: Points noted and KUDF has been revised to provide a green infrastructure plan which relates to the active travel network plan. These will be carried through into a revised Kirkwall Settlement Statement Supplementary Guidance which will be used alongside the KUDF in planning decision making. This will ensure that these environmental improvements are delivered through planning applications on a site by site basis (p26). Green infrastructure network incorporating green networks, open space and active travel routes is also referred to (p27)</p> <p>Action point 32: Clear links explaining how strategy relates to SWOT included in revised KUDF (p19 - 30).</p>

			<p>We consider that implementation of the vision should contribute positively to placemaking and biodiversity, by creating/enhancing an attractive place for both people and nature. We particularly welcome the reference to green infrastructure on page 20 of the draft Framework (however our advice is that this would be better placed under the 'greenspace' heading, rather than 'digital').</p> <p>Green infrastructure should play an important role in addressing the current surface water issues described on page 17 of the draft Framework. If well planned and implemented, green infrastructure could also contribute to the community ideas presented on page 14 of the draft Framework, such as “<i>more nature, greenery, flowers and trees</i>”, “<i>more opportunities for recreation and play</i>”, “<i>improve the quality of footpaths</i>”, “<i>introduce more colour</i>” and “<i>use brownfield gap sites before growing town outwards onto greenfield sites</i>”. We recommend a coordinated approach is taken covering all of the proposed projects, to look for opportunities to integrate green infrastructure alongside active travel and green / open space creation or improvements. This would deliver multiple benefits for people and nature. For example, increased resilience to flooding, attractive places to live and habitat for wildlife.</p> <p>The strategy appears well reasoned and relates to the community ideas presented on page 14 of the draft Framework. It could be made even better by providing clear links between how the strategy responds to many of the issues raised in the SWOT analysis undertaken. For example, how conflicts from the increase/over reliance/seasonal nature of cruise shipping and over tourism are managed.</p>	
KA12	Key Agency	2	<p>All of the sub-strategies will be beneficial for nature as well as people. For example, maintaining Kirkwall as a place that has facilities within walking distance, reducing reliance on the private car and encouraging active travel should all reduce emissions, which will contribute to tackling climate change.</p> <p>Providing better connected functional greenspace should create attractive and useable places for people that can also provide a home for nature. Our advice is that it would be beneficial for the KUDF to encourage paths and cycleways to be designed to incorporate green infrastructure and create connections within the green network. This would provide more attractive routes for people, as well as providing places and connections for nature.</p>	Support noted and please see above response (p26).
KA12	Key Agency	3	<p>Sub-strategy 5 on page 24 identifies the need to consider “<i>the capacity of greenspace to assist with water management</i>”. We recommend that this should also include consideration of the opportunities for green infrastructure (needed to address water management) to be combined with and so enhance the green network. Green infrastructure and SUDS can also form part of the streetscape, for example rain gardens, permeable paving, etc.</p>	Action point 33: Points noted and text amended (p27)

			Integration of green infrastructure and the green network would provide wider benefits, for example by creating attractive routes for people as well as nature to move along, providing shelter for people moving around the area (eg as shown in by the hedging in the photograph on page 31 of the consultation document) and distinctive natural focal points within the landscape. Sub-strategy 8 would also benefit from consideration of opportunities to enhance the green network for the same reasons.	
KA12	Key Agency	4	Whilst better and improved pedestrian / street / focussed lighting is important, there should also be an overlying emphasis on avoiding and reducing light pollution, as this can have negative effects on people and nature. For example, instead of introducing brighter lighting, the aim should be to have focussed directional street lighting that meets people's needs but avoids a flood-light effect that can have a detrimental visual effect and is recognised as impacting on bird behaviour. Alternative innovative solutions to lighting requirements should also be explored, for example motion triggered lighting, glow in the dark paving, etc	Action point 34: Points noted and some text has been added to clarify the importance of suitable lighting to better streets (p24). Further detail will be provided in the Kirkwall Settlement Statement, which will be revised following adoption of the Your Kirkwall document.
KA12	Key Agency	5	We support the five town-wide design principles set out on pages 29 - 41 of the consultation document: We welcome the promotion of active travel and the recognition of green networks under the 'walkable town' principle. Integration of green infrastructure with green networks, paths and cycleways is beneficial to both people and nature. We recommend that the Design Framework includes explicit reference to this to ensure that all opportunities for multiple benefits are explored and taken where possible.	Points noted. These points are addressed above.
KA12	Key Agency	6	With regard to the 'enhance greenspace' principle, we welcome the emphasis on the role that nature has to play, and that green networks have been recognised. We recommend that explicit consideration should also be given to whether some areas of greenspace could have a main purpose of public recreation, and also a function of natural flood water storage at times of flood events.	Points noted and addressed above.
KA12	Key Agency	7	We welcome the emphasis on active travel in the 'easier movement' principle. This should reduce reliance on the private car, reducing emissions that contribute to climate change. Again we encourage the consideration of multiple benefits, through the integration of green infrastructure, green networks and paths/cycle routes. (We have no comments on road junction design as this is outwith our area of expertise.)	Points noted and addressed above.
KA12	Key Agency	8	We welcome the promotion of placemaking qualities in the 'better streets' and 'better neighbourhoods' principles, recognition of green infrastructure and green networks. This should enhance existing areas and create attractive places for nature and people to live, work and visit.	Support noted.
KA12	Key Agency	9	As flooding is a significant constraint to development, our view is that it is sensible to seek developer contributions. This would allow the Council to coordinate the approach to flood management over the whole area, ensuring that measures are integrated and complementary. This is likely to achieve greater benefits by highlighting the issues and opportunities	Action point 35: Support for developer contributions noted. The first step in any process to resolve surface water flooding will be the preparation of a surface water management plan which is identified as a key action in the KUDF (p27). This will provide a costed solution and the Council can then consider how it is funded.

		<p>for the wider area, allowing previously unseen connections to be made. (The alternative is an uncoordinated piecemeal approach that relies on developers to provide solutions for their individual development. Such an approach is unlikely to result in integration with measures proposed by other developments or allow opportunities in the wider area to be recognised.)</p> <p>We consider that the aspirations for the focus areas relate well to placemaking principles and should also provide opportunities to safeguard or enhance biodiversity. We welcome the recognition of the benefits to people and nature that greenspace can provide - the Arcadia Farm project is a good example of this - and the incorporation of greenspace and active travel into the wider placemaking objectives. However, we feel more consideration could be given to the approach and role of landscape design in relation to new development and communities. For example, at Hatson and Seafront we would encourage a vision for the area using high quality built design as illustrated in the photographic examples on page 79. The creation of a landscape framework should help to set a context for the area, which considers built and natural features together. For example, the proposed use of avenues, which implies a uniformity of tree growth to achieve the desired effect, may be unrealistic in the harsh climate of Orkney. Further consideration may be required to ensure the desired design effect is achievable and / or natural alternatives identified to ensure the design is successful in the longer term.</p> <p>We welcome the intention to review the greenspaces and play areas across Kirkwall, and the linkages between them through improved walking and cycling networks. Where possible, we encourage the integration of green infrastructure (eg SUDS ponds, vegetated ditches, etc), green networks and active travel routes to achieve multiple benefits for people and nature. For example, incorporation of SUDS ponds into greenspaces and natural drainage alongside paths should increase resilience to flooding, as well as providing habitat for wildlife and attractive places for people. We recommend that the results of the review are used to inform other plans or strategies for the focus areas, such as the proposed masterplan for the Peedie Sea Park (as well as the proposals for Wideford Hill), to ensure linkages to the wider area are optimised.</p> <p>We note the intention to carry out further survey work for otter for proposals at Peedie Sea. While we encourage this, our advice is that survey work has a shelf life, particularly for mobile species such as otter that may change their pattern of use of an area between seasons / years. It is likely that initial survey work used to inform proposals would need to be repeated at the time of any planning application (or prior to works starting, should a planning application not be required) to ensure that otter use of the area has not changed in the intervening period.</p>	<p>Points noted, it is the intention of the KUDF to identify the role of landscape design.</p> <p>Support for review of green spaces and play areas and walking and cycling routes noted.</p> <p>Points about surface water management noted and these will be considered in more detail at the design stage of any green space or green infrastructure project.</p> <p>Action point 36: Points noted regarding Habitats Regulations Appraisal. The Council has undertaken this process and the HRA accompanies the final UDF.</p>
--	--	---	---

			Our advice is that a Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) will need to be prepared to accompany the final Design Framework. The draft Framework identifies the proposed North Orkney Special Protection area (pSPA) as an issue that will require consideration for the new coastal path connecting Haston pier to the town, through the town and on to Carness. The pSPA will also need to be considered for the new park to the east of Kirkwall at Craigiefield Road and along Carness Road. We would be happy to advise you on your HRA in due course.	
KA11	Key Agency	1	<p>Yes, many of the ideas relate to issues in our remit and are in line with our expectations/requirements for development, for example active sustainable travel, creating more open space and using brownfield sites before considering greenfield sites.</p> <p>We also welcome that "At the same time as the two stages of community engagement were happening, the team was also undertaking background research into population change, strategic policy aspirations and constraints (for example, Scottish Government national planning policy on the protection of natural environments) and technical constraints and opportunities (for example, drainage and potential funding for future project implementation)."</p>	Support noted.
KA11	Key Agency	2	<p>Yes, we agree that the context has been described accurately. We welcome the acknowledgement on page 17 that a number of key gap sites and strategic sites in the town cannot be developed without managing surface water flooding, and that surface water flooding is the key constraint to the redevelopment of the Town Centre West area.</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>In general improved surface water management would be of benefit within Kirkwall especially around the Peedie sea area and Bignold Park. There are constant backed up drains during heavy rainfall outside the Co-op area of the town.</p>	Support noted.
KA11	Key Agency	3	<p>In general yes, you may wish to consider whether flooding would be usefully added to the list of threats.</p> <p>We have nothing to add in relation to economy but agree with the community ideas on page 14 that there is a need for "more nature, greenery, flowers and trees" and better path networks for cycling and walking. Kirkwall has very little in the way of natural habitat within or surrounding the town so we welcome any measures to protect, enhance and increase this.</p>	Action point 37: Flooding text added to SWOT (p19).
KA11	Key Agency	4	We welcome the references to sustainable travel and greenspace but we would like to see environment having an individual bullet point. The framework references protection, development and improvement of the environment, for example drainage, flood risk and habitat enhancement, and the health and wellbeing benefits of this so it appears this is one of key visions for Kirkwall.	Action point 38: KUDF revised to reflect this point by adding another vision point on 'A sustainable place'. 'Environment' is covered in various ways through each of the 6 design principles (p24).

KA11	Key Agency	5	<p>Yes, we welcome the connection with the Active Travel Path Network, developing the core path network and providing better connected functional greenspace. We also welcome the inclusion of surface water management as a key part of the Strategy for Kirkwall. Taking a sustainable approach and linking any plans for management of flooding to greenspace provision is positive.</p> <p>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) is a big part of sustainably managing surface water drainage so we would welcome references to the requirement for SUDS throughout any development. We would also welcome reference to foul drainage and working with Scottish Water to ensure there are no capacity issues and all development in the settlement and immediate vicinity can connect to the public foul sewer.</p>	<p>Action point 39: Points noted and text added to signpost the requirement for a revised and updated Settlement Statement for Kirkwall, where this information is contained (p29).</p>
KA11	Key Agency	6	<p>We welcome the references to provision of heat infrastructure, SUDS and water resource management, strengthening the green network, reducing water run-off through enhancing greenspace, provision of green infrastructure and water management in the Design Process Overview and Town Design Principles, which are further detailed in Chapter 6. However as per our advice in Section 5 above we would welcome specific reference to the requirement to connect to the public foul sewer and installing SUDS under example the "Future new, restored ..." section.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
KA11	Key Agency	7	<p>We welcome "Enhance Greenspace" being one of the Town Design Principles. However under this specific section on page 31 reference is also made to example surface water management including sustainable drainage and sustainable building design. We welcome the proposal to enhance greenspace and connect it with blue-green infrastructure and networks and the consideration of other environmental sustainable measures. As such we consider this section could be usefully retitled, to better demonstrate it encompasses all these measures, from Enhance Greenspace to example enhance, protect and improve the natural environment with enhance greenspace being a sub section of this.</p>	<p>Points noted. Please see above response.</p>
KA11	Key Agency	8	<p>8.1 In general, yes.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
KA11	Key Agency	9	<p>We welcome the highlighting in the draft of the constraint currently due to surface water flooding. We are not sure what progress has been made on the Surface Water Management Plan for the town, but you may wish to consider carrying out a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) specifically on this issue. We recognise that although a solution to the surface water problems is still some way off, there may have been smaller scale works and improvements over the years which may have reduced the flood risk.</p> <p>The last detailed assessment of the risk was the Kirkwall SFRA published in 2010 and we think it would be helpful to reassess whether the baseline information on flood risk that is being used for planning decisions is still the best information available. One option would be to</p>	<p>Points noted and these comments have been passed on to OIC Engineering Services who are responsible for the Surface Water Management Plan. They have advised that they would envisage updating the plan following completion of the Section 16 modelling currently being carried out by Scottish Water. This should be early next year. They will compare the Planning and SEPA maps as suggested and make a recommendation as part of this process.</p>

			defer to the SEPA Surface Water flood map as being representative of current flood risk from this source. It seems to highlight most of the areas where past flooding has occurred, with the exception of some areas which are known to have flooded more extensively where there is greater input from fluvial flooding from the Muddisdale Burn and the Papdale Burn, which are both culverted in parts of the town. This is something we would be happy to discuss with you in more detail if it would be of assistance to you.	
KA11	Key Agency	10	Possibly, but the Council may need to establish what the effective flood management options are before the feasibility of this could be decided.	Points noted. Please see above response.
KA11	Key Agency	11	No specific advice.	Noted.
KA11	Key Agency	12	In general, yes. We welcome the use of this area as a town park which is compatible with its level of risk, and it may be that it can contribute to flood risk management.	Support noted.
KA11	Key Agency	13	<p>In general, yes. We note the reference to an energy from waste project. In line with our Development Plan Guidance on Sustainable Resource Use and Energy (LUPS-DP-GU2c) we support the development of new waste management facilities that help in the delivery of the Zero Waste Plan objectives. Such facilities may require authorisation from SEPA and further guidance on this can be found in our SEPA Regulated Sites and Processes guidance note.</p> <p>You will need to consider public safety in the design of the referenced path, including effects of wave action. They will be a valuable infrastructure and have the potential to be well used by both locals and visitors year round.</p> <p>We welcome the reference in regard to the Coastal Path to avoiding detrimental impacts to sensitive habitats and species and providing biodiversity enhancement. We note the reference to "Parkland is to be designated and designed in two fields – lower field wetland / floodland and woodland incorporating native trees, shrubs and groundcover". We particularly support the restoration of degraded habitats and the creation of wildlife corridors. Local biodiversity officers will be best placed to provide advice on native planting and habitat creation that will adapt to climate change pressures in the future.</p>	<p>Support noted for waste management facility and your response will be forwarded on to relevant colleagues within OIC who are managing this project and Marine Services in relation to the Ports Masterplanning project.</p> <p>Support for coastal path noted, and public safety in the design of the path will be considered at the project feasibility stage.</p>
KA11	Key Agency	14	<p>In general, yes. We welcome the proposals to "look to recognise the opportunity to enhance biodiversity and to create and strengthen green networks between and including the park and open space areas" and the planting strategy using native and biodiversity friendly plants.</p> <p>14.3 We note the references to Bignold Park not being utilised much due to a "lack of drainage".</p> <p>The Bignold Park area is troubled with drainage issues and would benefit from improved drainage and consideration could be given to example SUDS ponds to help address this issue.</p>	Support noted.

KA11	Key Agency	15	<p>In general, yes. We welcome the references to “opportunities for publicly accessible greenspace, sustainable surface water management / drainage infrastructure and nature conservation”; encouraging active travel and establishing a drainage strategy for development land allocated in the local development plan.</p> <p>15.3 We note the references under Arcadia Farm to “transform a piece of wet, unused land into a community park” and “assisting in the drainage of boggy areas”. The recovery of drained land is welcomed. The planting of native trees and creation of wildflower meadows is fully supported under our Scottish biodiversity strategy commitments.</p> <p>It will also link nicely to the wetland project further along the Crantit canal trail.</p>	Support noted.
KA11	Key Agency	16	<p>16.1 No specific advice but would confirm we are always happy to assist and provide advice on issues within our remit, where this is useful.</p>	Action point 40: Point noted and text amended to reflect the role of the public sector in the development and delivery of the KUDF (p94).
KA11	Key Agency	17	<p>17.1 No specific advice.</p> <p>We trust this information is of assistance to you. But if you have any queries relating to this letter, please contact me by telephone on 01224 266656 or email at planning.aberdeen@sepa.org.uk.</p>	Point noted.
KA18	Key Agency	1	<p>It is encouraging to see that the surface water management issues currently being experienced in Kirkwall are being considered at such an early stage in the Urban Design Framework and will be a key consideration when taking some of the projects included in the plan forward. We strongly support the strategy to put in place measures to sustainably manage surface water drainage across the town and agree that this is particularly important to enable the development of low-lying sites in the town centre and town centre west areas of Kirkwall.</p>	Support noted.
KA18	Key Agency	2	<p>Scottish Water has been working on a hydraulic model of the catchment to understand the impact of sewer flooding on our customers and to enable development within the area. Kirkwall is a complex catchment with many hydraulic issues to address, including coastal and overland flow flooding. Several strategic options have been modelled and discussed with Orkney Islands Council and developers earlier this year and opportunities to coordinate sewer upsizing at the same time as road works, such as the possible reorganisation of parking on Great Western Road, are already being explored.</p> <p>The next stage will be to agree on a final solution and set out the principles under which the strategy will be delivered and funded collaboratively between Scottish Water, Orkney Islands Council and Developers. It is anticipated that this work will then be incorporated into the development of the Kirkwall Surface Water Management Plan.</p>	Action point 41: Points noted and text added to KUDF to reflect this information (p18).

KA18	Key Agency	3	<p>In response to Question 10, developers will be required to contribute towards and deliver mitigation on Scottish Water's sewer network which enables their developments, but they should not be expected to offset any detriment that is not attributed to their specific development.</p> <p>They would also be entitled to a Reasonable Cost Contribution (Provision of Water and Sewerage Services (Cost Contribution) (Scotland) Directions 2015) towards these costs from Scottish Water to take into account the additional revenue being received as a result of the new properties connecting to the public sewer infrastructure.</p> <p>Should Orkney Islands Council wish to seek contributions from developers to help to overcome flooding constraints that their flood schemes seek to resolve, this would be a decision for them to make.</p>	Points noted.
KA18	Key Agency	4	<p>In relation to the potential for creating 'islands' within the Peedie Sea, Scottish Water would be concerned about any project that could reduce the volume of surface water that can be accommodated here, as it acts as a key asset in surface water management. If this project is to be taken forward please ensure Scottish Water is included in any discussions.</p>	Action point 42: Point noted, and KUDF text amended to clarify that any proposals will not have a detrimental impact on the surface water management capacity of the Peedie Sea. Scottish Water will also be included in any discussions at project development stage (p52)
IG2	Interested Group	1	<p>██████████ appreciates this opportunity to engage with you regarding this draft framework. ██████████, as a brand and also a key employer in Orkney, is proud to belong to both the Orkney and Kirkwall communities, and welcomes the chance to discuss and support development of these communities for the benefit of local residents.</p> <p>We have reviewed the framework as a whole and wanted to highlight our broad alignment with the vision and strategy contained within. The context and SWOT is largely aligned with our own views and in particular, we noted the references to the strength and opportunities of the 'Orkney brand' which ██████████ have continually recognised as a unique and very meaningful part of their own brand value. ██████████ home on Orkney is at the centre of promotional and marketing activities carried out with the brand's consumers.</p>	Support for vision and strategy noted.
IG2	Interested Group	2	<p>Strategy (pg.22): In terms of the strategic approach, we are broadly aligned with point 1 of page 22, particularly the intention to make the best use of brownfield land in future residential development.</p> <p>However, we are concerned to see and oppose the proposal to 'Grow Kirkwall in a specific direction' as envisaged in the framework. The image indicates that development would be outwards from Kirkwall in the direction of Scapa, directly across the Crantit area. The Crantit Burn and Lagoons are critical to the continued operation of ██████████, being the main water supply for ██████████. It is relevant to reference bullet points 1 and 4 of paragraph 7.13 of the Kirkwall South Development Brief, which highlight that no planning permission for development in this area would be granted unless it can be</p>	<p>Support for the redevelopment of brownfield land for housing noted.</p> <p>Action point 43: KUDF revised to illustrate that the alternative growth options discussed during the Your Kirkwall community engagement were ruled out. (p25) To provide clarity and for the avoidance of doubt, the KUDF does not contain a proposal to grow the town to the south, and the chosen strategy for the future growth of the town is to consolidate development within the existing town boundary, with immediate term development promoted within a 20 minute walk of the town centre.</p> <p>Please also be assured that the contents of the KUDF are also consistent with those of the Kirkwall South Development Brief. There is no change to Planning policy in this area.</p>

			<p>demonstrated that there would be no unacceptable effects to the quantity and quality of the water supply to the [REDACTED].</p> <p>To underline the importance of this matter to [REDACTED], we commissioned a Water Catchment Impact Study, completed in 9 February 2018 which identified a number of risks to our water quality and quantity from developments in the Crantit Basin, and land adjoining that feeds into the basin.</p>	
IG2	Interested Group	3	<p>Kirkwall South Focus Area & Project K10 Exemplar Site (pg.102)</p> <p>We have highlighted our concerns above regarding any development in Kirkwall South in connection with any impact to our [REDACTED] water supply. In principle, we have no opposition to the approach of exploring opportunities in this area for publicly accessible greenspace or improved path connections for walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Project K10 site raises a key concerns for [REDACTED] operations, and we do not support the proposals for this development. You will be aware that the [REDACTED] is next to this proposed development site. A large proportion of the [REDACTED] warehouses are located directly adjacent to this proposed site. Our particular concern is one related to health and safety as whilst the development site is outside of the Comah (CoMAH) zone surrounding the [REDACTED] site, the topography of the land means that in the event of a fire in one of our warehouses any water used for firefighting (firewater) would flow downward into this area proposed for residential development.</p> <p>We believe that in the event the development goes ahead we would be required by the Competent Authority and regulator of the CoMAH Regulations (Health & Safety Executive and Scottish Environmental Protection Agency) to put in place mitigation measures to prevent firewater running into the development. We have serious concerns about whether these mitigation measures would be achievable from both a financial and practical perspective. There is a strong likelihood that the impact of this proposed development would force [REDACTED] to move two-thirds of its on-site warehousing out of Orkney to the mainland of Scotland.</p> <p>Having to relocate [REDACTED] warehousing operations and the maturation of the [REDACTED] to the mainland would clearly be very damaging for a number of reasons. Not only would a relocation mean a loss of jobs for local people employed in current warehousing operations at [REDACTED] but it would also represent a significant negative impact on the [REDACTED] brand, and the unique characteristics of the [REDACTED]. A key part of [REDACTED] brand equity is built on our strong assertion that the Orkney climate provides long,</p>	<p>Points noted, and support for footpaths and cycle ways noted.</p> <p>As you are aware, the principle of development on the K10 site has been established since the adoption of the Local Development Plan 2017, and it is not possible to deallocate this land until a formal review of the Local Development Plan which will be in 10 years time. Unfortunately, no representation against inclusion of the land in the LDP was received during extensive public consultation over a period of years. Now that the land is included within the town boundary, the best way to control the development of land is to own it.</p> <p>Action point 44: Areas of the K10 site affected by the CoMAH zone are identified in the K10 exemplar development at appendix 1, however as yet undeveloped land will not form part of this zone until such a time as it is developed.</p> <p>Support for footpath/cycle way connections to the distillery from town noted.</p>

			<p>even-paced ██████ maturation and we cite this in all of our promotional material. This is something that we will vigorously protect.</p> <p>We note the reference to a path along the stream which would connect K11 site to the ██████. As mentioned previously we are generally supportive of improving access with footpaths in this area and would be interested in dialogue to explore the possibility to accommodate a path that runs along the boundaries of our property.</p> <p>However, we should make you aware that we do not envisage it being possible to put a path through any part of the ██████ site. There would be a number of public safety, site security, and Customs and Excise restrictions, together with CoMAH regulations which would prevent the introduction of a footpath through a fully operational ██████.</p>	
IG2	Interested Group	4	<p>Whilst we have identified our concerns about aspects of the Urban Design Framework, we have tried to provide you with sufficient background to hopefully allow you to properly understand our position. However, if you require any more detail or explanation regarding this response, we would welcome further engagement.</p>	Points noted.
IG3	Interested Group	1	1 Extremely valuable. Community involvement positivity essential	Support noted.
IG3	Interested Group	2	2 * recognizing that the nature..... May we suggest the following for consideration. Park & choose ie:- oxioting at Dounby road ""Finnstown possibly Airport and Scapa areas would be appreciated to reduce motorised traffic within Kirkwall. Disability buggy available at bus station complex, and Bimor friendly busses would be appreciated	Points noted. These are beyond the scope of the KUDF, however your comments have been forwarded on to the Transportation team at OIC.
IG3	Interested Group	3	3 Kirkwall Economy "threats" Please assure that the following are relevant:- "danger to vitality of local businesses" by a) online shopping b) More expensive purchase, ie:- Poundland £1.00 Dealz £1,20 for same item	Action point 45: Points noted and text added to SWOT (p19).
IG3	Interested Group	4	11Proposed "Pickaquoy Street" please ensure that 20 mph or lower vehicular speed limit is appropriate ** Great Western and Pickaquoy Roads. Please ensure us that direct oooooo from the above named roads, is provided for cyclists, pedestrians, and disabled preceding towards Coop and Lidl supermarkets, where, it is noted that a "positive lack" of "covered" secure Sheffield "Edinburgh" style cycle parking racks exist. Please assure us that provision will be installed in a) a highly visible location, overlooked by public and staff b) aloover to the main entrance door than car parking.	<p>Points noted. The KUDF contains proposals for a low speed environment here. The speed limit is currently 30mph. It is up to the Roads Authority to determine speed limits within this context. Please also note that it is intended that a review of speed limits in Kirkwall will be carried out by the Roads Authority over the coming 3 year period subject to resources.</p> <p>Points noted re access to supermarkets. The Design Principles section covers this point through the 'easier movement' and 'walkable town' criteria. Any future design process will respond to these principles.</p> <p>Cycle parking at the supermarkets is at the discretion of the retailers.</p>
IG3	Interested Group	5	<p>Would it be correct to state that the appointment of an "OIC" Active Travel coordinator, and associated Active Travel Forum, would be seen as a positive step towards implementation.</p> <p>An "active travel" "policy" will I am ensuring, be essential.</p>	Points noted.
IG3	Interested Group	6	I must leave it for ** to comment on questions 1 to 3 (about the community engagement process, the description of the Kirkwall context,	Noted.

			the assessment of Kirkwall's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats).	
IG3	Interested Group	7	4 (p20): We should support the Kirkwall Vision (p20), particularly its emphasis on making it "easier and more comfortable to get around by walking, cycling and public transport".	Support noted.
IG3	Interested Group	8	<p>5 (p25): We support the Kirkwall Strategy (p22-25), Particularly the following elements: Concentrating development in locations that are within easy walking distance of the town centre</p> <p>Taking a responsible approach to parking demand. Agree with the idea of not expanding levels of parking provision, but question the need to retain existing parking-there should be a willingness to reduce it. Car sharing clubs can reduce the need for private car ownership see information available from the car sharing charity Carplu Bikeplus (www.carplusbikeplus.org.uk)</p> <p>Focusing on resolving Kirkwall's traffic issues. This is a laudable aspiration, but one should preferably be achieved without exercising the "option" (let alone an "aspiration") to build a southern bypass. This could divert funding from solutions that would reduce the need to travel alongside it when making radial journeys.</p> <p>Reducing the demand for car commuting by promoting better walking and cycling opportunities.</p>	<p>Points noted. However there was a mixed appetite from the Orkney public to reducing car parking, and a compromise has been put forward at retaining current levels but not increasing them. It is also important to consider that there is the forthcoming Road Equivalent Tarriff which will lead to many more vehicles arriving in Orkney. Orkney's rural areas, as noted within the KUDF, are also dispersed in terms of settlement pattern, meaning that reliance upon the car is something that must be accepted to a degree – a concept which is supported by Paths for All who funded this project.</p> <p>Action point 46: There are no proposals for a bypass contained within the KUDF in the short to medium term because traffic models indicate that there is no need for this scale of infrastructure improvement to address the minor and localised issues raised through the community engagement. That said, it may come forward as an idea in the longer term if there is a demonstrable need, and because the KUDF is a 20 year plan, the idea is not completely ruled out for the future. However, in the short to medium term this is not expected and the graphic has been revised to clarify this point so it is not in doubt. (p25)</p>
IG3	Interested Group	9	7. Improving wayfinding and signage, Cycle network signing should indicate the time taken to cycle to each destination, rather than the distance. Experience elsewhere has shown that it is more likely to motivate people to take up cycling.	Points noted and this will be taken forward during a separate Signage and Wayfinding Strategy project.
IG3	Interested Group	10	Support its emphasis on concentrating development in locations within easy walking range (p22) and on creating walkable streets (p30,40). However the document should spell out a general aspiration to apply 20 mph zones or limits for built up streets. This is a highly effective (and cost-effective) way to promote pedestrian and cycle safety, and to increase walking and cycling levels.	Action point 47: Points noted and reference has been added (p26). Please also note that it is intended that a review of speed limits in Kirkwall will be carried out by the Roads Authority over the coming 3 year period subject to resources.
IG3	Interested Group	11	<p>There are many places in the document which refer to the creation of new footpaths or boardwalks, or improving existing ones, and to opening up more or better-connected greenspace (e.g pp25, 31-32). We support these but urge that, wherever possible the opportunity is always taken to design these facilities to be useable by cycling as well as on foot-particularly in the context of proposed new developments or redevelopments and./or along waterfronts.</p> <p>On the one hand, cyclists and pedestrians should not be "lumped together" on pavements in built-up streets, where pedestrian activity is high.</p>	Action point 48: Points noted and reference to cyclists added specifically to the 'easier movement' heading on p24 to ensure this is considered for all projects. The KUDF also makes clear that the 'Active Travel Network' is for pedestrians and cyclists.

			On the other hand, they can generally co-exist on paths which are separate from roads (e.g on waterfronts and through open spaces), providing there is sufficient width for the expected level of use, and slight lines are good. Good surfacing (even, solid and weather proof) and lightening is important for supporting cycle (As well as pedestrian) access using off-road routes in all weathers and at all time of the year.	
IG3	Interested Group	12	<p>We generally support the policies on cycling infrastructure (pss), and particularly agree with the statements that's "[Cycle] Routes that require them [ie cyclists] to concede to side street traffic are less likely to be used".</p> <p>However, the statement that "Cyclists will generally be accommodated on the carriageway" should not be qualified, This is true for streets with light traffic travelling at low speeds, However the suggestion that physical separation is only needed at speeds of 40 mph and above is wrong -it can also be necessary on moderate to heavily-trafficked streets at lower speeds, in order to create the conditions where people of all ages and abilities (including children, older people, women, people with disabilities) will feel safe and confident about cycling. We strongly support the calls for more tightly-angled corners at junctions (p35-36) and the calls for greater pedestrian priority at junctions.</p> <p>However, this text should also refer to cycle priority to be used if they force cyclists to give way at side-roads. Where physically separated cycle tracks are provided (as will be necessary on faster or more heavily trafficked roads), these too should have priority ay junctions.</p>	<p>Action point 49: this page has been removed from the final UDF. This level of detail has not been determined necessary for inclusion in the KUDF and matters will be considered at any detailed design stage for projects in the future. the design of any new cycle infrastructure will be consistent with Cycling by Design, Designing Streets and the SCOTS National Roads Development Guide (p26).</p>
IG3	Interested Group	13	6&7 (p41): We support the call for design guidance, However, we urge that it should also take account of the preceding four bullet-points: i.e. mote emphasis on 20mph; generally allowing cyclists to share footpaths and boardwalks away from roads; allowing cycle access to greenspace; providing god surface and lighting for off-road routed; providing tight-cornered junctions with cycle as well as pedestrian priority).	Points noted. Please see above response.
IG3	Interested Group	14	The design guidance should also make provision for cycle parking at new developments, taking account of the needs of residents, employees and visitors at different types of development. At schools and workplaces, the emphasis needs to be on cycle parking being secure and sheltered. For visitors (e.g. near shops and public amenities), the emphasis is more on east and convenient access.	Points noted. Please see above response.
IG3	Interested Group	15	8 (p55) Generally support the vision for The Town Centre focus area, particularly the proposal to resolve the tensions between motor-traffic and pedestrian activity (p46), and no tackle parking (p54). Add that 20mph limits would help reduce the tension between motor and pedestrian traffic, and that these measures should benefit cycles as well. Also include references to cycle use of the proposed waterfront access proposals(P52)	Points noted. Please see above responses.
IG3	Interested Group	16	9 (p46): I assume we would want to generally support the vision for the Town Centre West focus area, particularly its plans for new and improved pedestrian and cycling routes (p59). We should also seek	Points noted. Please see above responses.

			cycle parking in the new housing and other developments proposed here (58-59)	
IG3	Interested Group	17	110 (P64): The principle of seeking funding from developers for tackling flooding issues here seems reasonable, though we cannot comment on the particularities of this. We should say that opportunities should be sought to improve walking and cycling access in the context of any flood prevention schemes.	Points noted. Please see above responses.
IG3	Interested Group	18	11 (p72): We must leave it for Ian to comment on the Pickaquooy Road improvement proposals (p71-72). They look reasonable.	Point noted.
IG3	Interested Group	19	12 (P73) and 13 (85): It looks like we'd want to support the Peedie Sea and Pickaquooy focus area improvements, and also that Hatston improvements. There is a good deal of overlap between them e.g the proposal for a shoreline routed from Hatston Pier around Weyland Bay to Carness (P68, P76 and p81) and the Wideford Hill patch network (p73 and p76. We'd welcome an assurance that the Craigiefield Walk / Parkland section of the coastal park (83-84) We'd appreciate that this is more environmentally sensitive area. However this does not preclude cycle access- it merely requires that use of more environmentally sensitive materials. We'd strongly welcome the proposal to make the electric bike hire available at the pier (p76). Making e-bikes available on a "try before you buy" basis is a highly effective way of introducing newcomers to cycling, and is particularly appealing to older people and those with disabilities. However, they can also work for encouraging younger and more able-bodied people to take up cycling for longer and/or hillier journeys than they would otherwise feel willing to make by bike.	Support noted.
IG3	Interested Group	20	14 (p93): In relation to the Papdale area improvements, it looks like we should comment on the opportunities to improve cycling (as well as walking) access to Papdale primary school and to Kirkwall secondary school, and indeed for shy future use of Papdale House.	Points noted. Please see above responses. Proposals for each area are covered by the Design Principles on p24 which apply across the whole town.
IG3	Interested Group	21	15 (p104): As regards, the Kirkwall South focus area, I presume we'd support the proposed cycle parking in relation to the proposed redevelopments of the Balfour Hospital site (p96 and p101) and the K10 site.	Points noted. Please see above responses.
IG3	Interested Group	22	16 (p107): We should offer Cycling UK's own willingness to be involved in more detailed planning and in running "Play on Pedals", "Community Clubs", "Big Bike Revival" and similar projects to promote cycle use amongst groups who are under-represented in cycling such as older people, younger people and people with disabilities. It would be well worth involving the charity carplus Bikeplus in arranging e-bike hire, as proposed in the Hatston focus area improvements.	Points noted.
IG3	Interested Group	23	17 (p108): We support the proposals for sustaining momentum, However, to guide the overall development of cycling infrastructure, we recommend the planning and publication of a comprehensive	Points noted and this is clearly articulated in the KUDF (p59)

			<p>development of more cycle routes (and in need of core pedestrian routes).</p> <p>The development of cycling infrastructure needs to be seen not just as a collection of individual “facilities”, to be delivered where space and funding opportunities permit, but as steps towards the development of a comprehensive network plan that enables people of all ages and abilities to get from A to B for any local journey.</p>	
IG3	Interested Group	24	<p>As for the comments provided, The principle of referring to equalities legislation is a good one, however I should point out that the Disability Discrimination Acts (DDA) 1995 has been fully repealed by the Equality Act 2010, as has virtually all of the DDA 2005 (and the remaining bits are not relevant to cycling). The only relevant equalities legislation is the Equality Act 2010 (and it’s the Equality Act, not the Equalities Act).</p>	Points noted.
ANON	ANON	1	<p>Yes, but OIC need <u>to listen</u> to the views submitted, famously, the council ignore ideas put forwards and adopt their own agenda anyway</p>	Points noted.
ANON	ANON	2	<p>I very much like the idea of easier walking and cycling in Kirkwall. I prefer to do these rather than drive. I’d like to see safe over-taking lanes in the country roads that lead to Kirkwall, sometimes slow-moving vehicles like tractors can cause frustration on the roads and often you witness bad or dangerous driving by residents obviously trying to get to work on-time.</p>	Points noted and this is out with the scope of the KUDF.
ANON	ANON	3	<p>No-How is high level of public jobs considered a “weakness”? Surely the opposite is true! Less jobs it is worse for any community, ie the local economy suffers etc. the public sector cutback are an ideology endorsed by the senior officials at OIC that unbelievably get voted through by elected members! With a COMMUNITY OIL FUND of 547.25 million at its disposal that makes 10s of millions of pounds each year in interests and investments. -how can this be considered a weakness or anything other than a positive!</p> <p>Relating to the cruise ships, I understand the Harbours Dept makes millions of pounds per year on harbour fees from cruise liners. Again, from purely an economic point of view, this is surely a good thing, taking in vast amounts of cash from these ships each year. The council have a duty to the local economy and shouldn’t be looking to cut jobs and services elsewhere!</p>	Points noted. This is considered a weakness from the perspective that a higher proportion of private sector jobs boosts the economy.
ANON	ANON	4	<p>Yes, I’d like to see care homes with options for the elderly to be more active with the community. In other parts of the world they build care homes and nurseries communally, giving the elderly a chance to watch children at play etc. I’d like to see these ideas adapted. A number of residents in Orkney have learning difficulties. I’d like to see communities built where they have the company of other sell crafts, have a café and have residents integrated into the community more. Just to be clear, buildings where those with difficulties are cared for and live and work together etc.</p>	Points noted, and a new care home will be developed on the Soulisquoy site as has been published in the local media previously.
ANON	ANON	5	<p>I agree with a lot of it. I don’t see the need for one-way systems. I see a lot of free parking spaces across from the old bowling alley but people</p>	Points noted. There is no mechanism available to ensure that cars are parked in designated car parks rather than ‘on street’.

			insist on parking on Great Western Road (on both sides!), thus making it a difficult road to navigate. If we ensured people used the available parking it would cure the problem! The parks are a good idea but we need to be sensitive regarding any development at Bignold Park. I understand that Dr. Bignold gave the land to the residents for the purpose of playing football and cricket. Such a generous gesture by Dr Bignold, sure still to be respected after all these years. A communal dog walking area where responsible dog owners can walk their dogs and throw balls, etc would be welcome. More communal drinking areas. Access to fresh drinking water from fountains etc visitors to Orkney would also welcome this.	
ANON	ANON	6	Yes, see above response, more community spaces. Better recycling and waste disposal-I see it isn't mentioned much here.	Support noted.
ANON	ANON	7	More communal access to fresh drinking water-areas where people could walk their pets!	Points noted.
ANON	ANON	8	I don't think we need more parking spaces, we need to manage the ones we have better (i.e ensuring residents are using spaces available instead of parking and congesting the roads	Points noted, and this approach is supported within the KUDF.
ANON	ANON	9	It depends on what you are going to use the Power Station for ultimately, until then its difficult to say. I'd like to see more charging points dispersed over a wider area of Kirkwall and Orkney. I think a combined care home/nursery and/or special needs community project would be a great use for this site. The elderly could look over the Peedie Sea as well as it would be a great view for them etc. I think it would also benefit Albert St, Broad St and the centre of town as it would help visiting friends and relatives take them a walk 'down the town' or 'doon the toon'	Points noted.
ANON	ANON	10	Would communal water fountains help this?	Point noted. This is not appropriate in terms of water quality or quantity. The KUDF proposes the sustainable management of floodwater instead.
ANON	ANON	11	Yes, I've used the walk from Pickaquoy to Widefirth Hill (and beyond) many times. It's a great walk and it should be developed to include Hatston	Support noted.
ANON	ANON	12	The Coastal Path is a very good idea	Support noted.
ANON	ANON	13	Need to sensitive towards Bignold Park as previously stated	Point noted.
ANON	ANON	14	Arcadia Farm Project Is a good idea. Old site for Balfour should be used by supporting groups such as school support groups, alcohol support groups, active life walking groups and walking for health groups etc	Support noted. The Balfour Hospital site is allocated for housing in the Local Development Plan.
ANON	ANON	16	Young people, engage with schools and youth cafes, and youth clubs (all over Orkney, not just Kirkwall)	Action point 50: Points noted and text amended to reflect this.
ANON	ANON	17	Council need to use <u>investments</u> and <u>returns</u> on the community oil fund, (not the actual fund itself), engage with local wealthy business people <u>and look for grants and/or possible sponsorshipS</u>	Points noted.
OICO6	OICO	1	I've had a browse through the Kirkwall UDF document and would like to make the following points:	Noted.

OICO6	OICO	2	<p>Use of the name "Powerbowl site" (1st noted on page 53 and again on pages 61,62 and many others) – whilst I acknowledge this may well be a commonly used name amongst the community it has no relevance to Kirkwall and it's use should be avoided in OIC documents. The property is now the Council's museum store and for many reasons this deliberately isn't emblazoned across the outside of the building so folk probably don't know what to call it and just stick with "Powerbowl".</p> <p>The car park adjacent is known as Great Western Road South Car Park, so I'd suggest this name is actively used instead. Since the demise of Powerbowl Ltd in 2007/08 we named the building properly as Unit 1, Great Western Road. This was on the basis that the previous UDF for Kirkwall supported further commercial development at this location so we assumed that there could in future be a unit 2, unit 3 etc. (and not necessarily by Council investment).</p>	<p>Action point 51: Points noted. For the purposes of clarity the name of the building and car park have been left unchanged from that which it was described by the public, however the document has been revised to describe the site as the 'former' Powerbowl site.</p>
OICO6	OICO	3	<p>Page 53 – "the Crafty site" – features in the Council's Strategic Housing Investment Plan and has been sold to Orkney Housing Association (as of 22 March 18) for the purposes of OHAL developing residential accommodation suitable for older people, as per the SHIP. The draft UDF should be amended to reflect that the stated suggestion of using this location for parking simply isn't viable/feasible.</p>	<p>Points noted. The KUDF proposes the redistribution of car parking in Kirkwall to respond to comments made by the public that there is not a lack of public parking, but it is not always in the most suitable locations. The document suggests consideration of this principle on a range of sites and they will be considered on a case by case basis. The premise of the proposals is that car parking numbers are not reduced, but redistributed where possible.</p>
OICO6	OICO	4	<p>Page 53 – "consider new public parking at any redevelopment of the Orrisor site, Balfour Hospital..." – Neither of these locations are in Council ownership and purchasing to invest in creating public car parking is highly unlikely unless substantial external funding was secured. Also, by identifying privately owned sites as being needed for public uses creates a ransom situation (perceived or real) whereby current owners will (probably) expect OIC to pay substantially inflated prices to acquire land to deliver on it's stated objectives – if there is no committee decision to achieve this on any of the mentioned sites then I would caution against raising expectation by proposing solutions which are not intended to happen.</p>	<p>Points noted. Please see above response.</p>
OICO6	OICO	5	<p>I have serious issues with the undernoted extract found on pages 61 and 62:</p> <p>'The power station is likely to become (mostly) redundant once the additional subsea cable(s) are in place in a few years. The Powerbowl site is currently used as parking and a council store. We envisage that the power station will become a community facility, possibly incorporating the council store as tenant, which will release the Powerbowl site for redevelopment. The Powerbowl site could be redeveloped with a mixed development of commercial and flats, overlooking the Peedie Sea'.</p> <p>There is no rational property or operational based reason to consider the Council moving it's store in to the old power station. I am presuming</p>	<p>Points noted. The former Powerbowl site is identified as a key regeneration opportunity for the town if the KUDF is to achieve one of it's key objectives - sustainable residential development patterns within 20 minute walk of the town centre. The objectives of the KUDF emerged from extensive community engagement. In the event that this long terms aspiration is achieved, a suitable alternative location for the museum store would require to be found. The KUDF simply suggests one potential option and there may be others.</p>

			that SSE will look to sell the site/building and I would expect an asking price of at least half a million, if not a million or more for such a prime, prominent and developable site (even retaining/converting existing building). Is there any Council committee decision anywhere which expresses an interest in engaging with SSE to secure this site for use as a community facility as stated? The budget to move the Council's existing store would probably require another ½ to 1 million pounds to create a space suitable for using as a store, and the ongoing revenue cost thereafter is expected to be higher than current expenditure – in these times of budget constraint it's hard to see the Council investing upwards of £1 million to replicate a space which it already has established in Unit 1.	
OICO6	OICO	6	Also, redeveloping the "Powerbowl site" in to a mixture of commercial units and flats makes no economic sense for a modern steel framed building which is only about 12-15 years old. Development in this context implies the Unit 1 building would be removed (implied by the diagram on page 62) which is not an economic idea at all. Further, the suggestion of building residential property on the Great Western Road South Car Park simply reduces available public parking and forces vehicle users to seek other parking locations, and I note from earlier in the document you highlight a number of locations for new parking provision (page 53). The scale of potential investment this could incur is beyond imagination especially in challenging financial times. I pointed out above my concerns about identifying privately owned sites suitable for public car parking provision.	Points noted. It is not proposed that the long term mixed use redevelopment of the site includes reuse of the existing building. As made clear in the document, the proposals do not reduce the number of car parking spaces, it redistributes them. It is also important to note that these proposals are conceptual, and issues such as the specific number of car parking spaces, or development phasing to utilise the condition and lifespan of the steel framed building would be considered at a project feasibility stage further down the line. The basic principle of the KUDF is that this land should be utilised for residential and mixed uses to achieve the sustainable development patters preferred by the community at large.
OICO6	OICO	7	Page 68 – proposed park at Craigiefield – This land is used for agricultural purposes and annually leased out to local farmers as grazing or cropping lets and this generates an income to the Council. The suggested "Craigiefield Park" area is a substantial area of the Council's land ownership in the area. Further, by in effect zoning this arable farm land as only suited to leisure and public space has the effect of knocking a potentially substantial value off of the Council's accounts, since the private sector does not buy land for recreational purposes. The area of land is known as Weyland so it seems odd to actively name a non-existent park and to name it (as Craigiefield Park). I note the reference on page 84 to a local community group taking this idea forward and it would be helpful if you could advise me more about this please as I had never heard of this before.	Point noted. The land was previously allocated for housing development in the Local Development Plan 2017 at the Proposed Plan Stage. However, at Scottish Government Examination Stage, the land was de-allocated as housing land and allocated as open space. It is therefore not supported in planning terms for residential development, so there is no potential negative financial impact on the Council of identifying this Open Space as Parkland in the KUDF. A local residents community group have expressed an aspiration to look after the ground and create an area of parkland.