

REAL ESTATE:SCOTLAND

Response to City of Edinburgh Council- City Plan 2040 Call for Ideas Consultation

20 October 2026

About Real Estate: Scotland

Real Estate:Scotland is the voice of the real estate industry in Scotland, representing owners, developers, funders, agents and advisers across the sector. We welcome the opportunity to contribute to the City Plan 2040 Ideas consultation and to contribute to the evidence base underpinning the emerging Local Development Plan.

This response draws on members' experience of delivering housing, employment space and regeneration projects in Edinburgh and elsewhere across Scotland and the wider UK; work on development viability and investment; and analysis of the city's changing demographic trends. It also reflects the need for City Plan 2040 to learn from the delivery experience of City Plan 2030 and to create a more flexible, realistic and investment-supportive planning framework.

Executive Summary

City Plan 2040 is being prepared at a decisive point for Edinburgh. The city remains a major economic, cultural and employment centre, but the assumptions that supported successive high-growth plans can no longer be treated as automatic. Updated household projections are lower than the earlier projections used to inform the NPF4 Minimum All-Tenure Housing Land Requirement. Edinburgh's population also fell slightly in the year to mid-2025, while East Lothian, Midlothian, West Lothian and Glasgow continued to grow.

The Council should not interpret this as evidence that Edinburgh needs fewer homes. Population estimates record where people have managed to live, not necessarily where they would choose to live if suitable, affordable homes were available in the city. The growth of neighbouring authorities is consistent with demand being displaced from Edinburgh to places where housing can be delivered more readily and often more affordably.

City Plan 2040 should therefore be an adaptive, deliverability-led plan. Housing Allocations are not the same as delivery and if the City wishes to be a successful employment centre it must actively compete and promote itself as a location for major corporate occupiers, as Glasgow and Manchester have done for Barclays, JP Morgan and Bank of New York. It should be based on a realistic central demographic scenario, but retain enough capacity to support the city's economic strategy and respond to future demand. Crucially, it must distinguish nominal land capacity from homes that can genuinely be delivered within the plan period.

The Plan must also be adopted on time. A delayed plan risks becoming out of date before it can guide investment, particularly where it relies on demographic assumptions, infrastructure programmes and policy requirements that are already changing. Scotland's wider planning system is already affected by out-of-date development plans; our July 2026 policy paper on planning noted that 22 of Scotland's 32 planning authorities had out-of-date LDPs as of January 2026. The Council should take a pragmatic approach to updated evidence: consider it properly, but do not restart or indefinitely delay the plan-making process each time new data emerges.

The strongest test of City Plan 2040 will be whether it enables homes, infrastructure, employment spaces and investment to be delivered. That requires a much stronger approach to viability, delivery confidence, infrastructure programming, planning certainty and policy flexibility than has been evident in the current plan.

1. Employment Space is at a Premium with Limited New Supply

The Edinburgh Grade A office market, where new corporate occupiers would seek opportunities, is incredibly tight (2.7% vacancy Q2 2026: JLL) and has very limited supply forthcoming in the period to 2030. The City has never really set a Core Business District as can be seen in other major cities, and in truth the availability of sites to do so is very limited. However, without a strategy to attract major new corporate occupiers, the city will risk losing this high value investment to other locations. Currently, there is only some 125,000 square ft of new development in the Grade A pipeline, with prime rents at £49.50 sq ft. Our members have suggested this needs to be closer to £60 sq ft to provide confidence in new development despite positive policies such as rates-free periods for new development. This local picture is consistent with a wider UK trend. Colliers' August 2026 UK Property Snapshot records a continued national flight-to-quality, with Grade A space accounting for 76% of London take-up in Q2 2026, up from a 62% ten-year average, even as London's own all-grade vacancy stood at a comparatively loose 8.3%. Set against that benchmark, Edinburgh's 2.7% Grade A vacancy represents an acute, city-specific scarcity that the Plan should treat as a priority for new supply rather than manage through negative land-use designations alone. National office rental growth also accelerated to 3.0% in the year to July 2026, reinforcing members' view that Edinburgh rents need room to move if new Grade A development is to be viable.

This scarcity carries a real opportunity cost beyond conventional office demand. Edinburgh's inability to offer sufficient, suitable lab and life sciences space risks losing high-value research, spin-out and scale-up activity to cities that can accommodate it, at exactly the point the city is trying to attract and retain scientific and technical talent. Without a deliberate strategy for this kind of specialist space, there is a real risk that Edinburgh becomes complacent about a competitive advantage it cannot assume will last.

For conversions, the city would do well to consider the need to provide empty rates flexibility to attract conversions and redevelopment of older stock, including the city's considerable stock of listed buildings.

2. Retail and Hospitality

Edinburgh is establishing itself as the dominant retail and hospitality venue in Scotland. The success and continued investor appetite in the leading St James Quarter and associated investment in Multrees walk, St Andrews square and George Street have secured a vibrant and quality destination and experience economy impact in the east end of the city centre. There are also positive developments and investment in hotel, food and beverage and wider hospitality sector growth in Leith, Stockbridge and Fountainbridge. CityPlan 2040 should be seen to plan to build on these developments and economic growth sectors. Strong public transport networks will be key, and it will be important to ensure positive connections and developments opportunities with the airport, Waverley station and potential for enhancing cruise liner economy for the city and wider region. This underlines the importance of the Forth of Firth Green Freeport, West Town, Edinburgh Park and tram extensions across the city as enablers of economic growth and activity. Outside of the immediate city centre, it is important to recognise that Fort Kinnaird is performing exceptionally well and remains a significant retail and leisure destination for Edinburgh, and will be particularly important in the context of the significant growth planned at Shawfair and across the south-east of the city region, including Cameron Toll, as well as East Lothian. This is

demonstrated by recently submitted plans for more than 42,500 sq ft of additional retail and leisure space. City Plan 2040 should recognise the potential for this investment, alongside the continued expansion of Shawfair, to create a significant economic and commercial hub in the south-east of the city region, and ensure that land-use planning, infrastructure and transport connectivity support that opportunity.

On the hospitality side, UK hotel investment reached £2.1bn in H1 2026 (Savills:UK Hotel Investment Report, September 2026). In Edinburgh alone some £227m of investment was reported by InvestEdinburgh for Jan-Sep 2025 and Savills have also reported a development pipeline for Edinburgh equivalent to 12.6% of its existing floorspace. We believe this is evidence of a nationally accelerating investment trend that City Plan 2040 should be careful not to work against unnecessary constraints on hotel or hospitality development.

3. Industry and Logistics

Modern cities are as ever hugely reliant on industry and logistics in order to function effectively. Edinburgh industrial and logistics property markets are at times overlooked, but they are vital to the city and require to be considered in the Call for Ideas for City Plan 2040. If there is insufficient provision for distribution or support for essentials services and supplies, then the city will falter and lose its attractiveness. And, the underlying fundamentals of these sectors are hugely positive. This is driven significantly by the growth of e-commerce and last mile delivery demand; digital infrastructure and albeit on a city-region basis, advanced manufacturing and industrial capacity. The property markets in these sectors again offer low vacancy rates and quick take up of available quality space. It will again be important for the city to invest in suitable locations for these industries, with Shawfair, Newbridge and Sighthill among the current favoured locations. City Plan 2040 should seek to ensure there is a deliverable spread of sites for logistics and industrial use, while recognising that West Edinburgh contains by far the greatest concentration of developable land in the city. That scale should be treated as the primary opportunity to be unlocked, not a risk to be diversified away from; locations such as Shawfair, Newbridge and Sighthill should be pursued as genuine complements to delivery in West Edinburgh, not a distraction from it. This is consistent with the national picture. Colliers' August 2026 data shows UK industrial vacancy stable at 8.6%, in line with the long-run average, but with the 2026 speculative development pipeline at its lowest level since 2018 - a supply squeeze that Colliers expects to tighten vacancy further by the end of the year. Industrial rents grew 4.5% nationally in the year to July 2026, and UK industrial investment volumes rose to £1.2bn in July 2026, above the five-year monthly average of £1bn, underlining continuing investor confidence in the sector despite YTD volumes running 20% behind 2025. Edinburgh should not assume this favourable market will wait: failing to bring forward suitable, well-connected industrial and logistics land now risks losing occupiers and investment to other city regions just as national supply is becoming scarcer.

4. Demography, Housing Need and the Plan Timetable

The Evidence Report recognises that the household projections used to establish Edinburgh's MATHLR of 36,750 homes are based on 2018-based National Records of Scotland data. The more recent 2022-based household projections show a lower central trajectory, while a high-migration scenario gives a materially higher result.

The latest population estimates make this issue more immediate. Edinburgh's population was estimated at 531,370 in mid-2025, approximately 700 lower than in 2024. The city was effectively flat or slightly down over the year, while East Lothian grew by 1.1%, Midlothian by 0.7%, and both West Lothian and Glasgow by 0.6%.

This is a significant interruption to Edinburgh's longer-term trajectory. The city's population has grown by around 18% since 2001 and migration has been fundamental to that growth. The sharp national reduction in international migration is therefore relevant to future housing demand and labour-market growth.

However, one year of population data should not become the basis for a lower-housing strategy. Two explanations require testing.

The first is a structural slowdown in population and household growth. If this is the explanation, the Council should be explicit about how the evidence affects the scale, timing and phasing of the proposed indicative Local Housing Land Requirement.

The second is demand displacement. Edinburgh may be exporting population growth to surrounding authorities because it is not delivering enough homes at prices households can afford. The simultaneous growth of East Lothian, Midlothian and West Lothian makes this a credible issue for investigation. If households and workers are forced to locate further from Edinburgh, the result may be longer journeys, greater car dependence, weaker access to employment and services, and a loss of spending, labour and investment from the city.

The correct response is not to choose prematurely between these explanations. The Council should test a central, high and low scenario; assess household formation separately from population change; and include a demand-displacement scenario that considers the functioning of the wider Edinburgh city region.

The Council should also protect the timetable for adoption. The Plan should incorporate updated evidence proportionately and transparently, but it should not be repeatedly delayed or restarted. The Government has already indicated that plan-making cannot stop whenever new evidence becomes available; this is the practical approach Edinburgh should follow.

A late plan would damage certainty at the very time that Edinburgh needs investment. It would leave an older framework governing land use, infrastructure and housing delivery, reduce confidence in allocations, and create further uncertainty for communities, landowners, developers and infrastructure providers.

The Council should also consider the Scottish Government's Public Sector Reform Proposal, published on 21 September 2026, which sets out an initial proposition to replace Scotland's current local authorities with a smaller number of regional strategic authorities and a larger number of local community authorities, with strategic planning explicitly identified as a candidate function for the regional tier. This is at an early, deliberately non-prescriptive stage, and we do not suggest City Plan 2040 should be delayed because of it. However, the Council should keep the Plan's governance assumptions under review as this dialogue develops, given the possibility that strategic planning functions currently exercised by the Council could, in time, sit at a different level of government.

5. Allocation Is Not Delivery

The Council's proposed indicative Local Housing Land Requirement is 38,950 homes. A meaningful flexibility allowance is necessary, but flexibility in the nominal land supply is not the same as deliverability on the ground.

The Council's evidence identifies capacity for 48,479 homes, of which 9,828 are constrained. Housing completions reached 2,831 in 2025, a strong annual figure, but the underlying pipeline remains fragile. The Housing Land Audit forecasts 2,474 completions in 2025/26, while delivering the MATHLR evenly over ten years would imply roughly 3,765 homes annually. Nowhere is this more visible than in West Edinburgh, where more

than 11,000 homes across the area's committed allocations currently sit at 'minded to grant' status only, with no Section 75 agreement concluded and no realistic route to a start on site while viability remains unresolved. This single area represents around 30% of the Council's entire housing land allocation. The City Plan 2040 provides a platform for the council to close the viability gap that is stalling these sites through the policy and delivery changes set out in this response. Without prompt action, there is every likelihood that this scale of committed but undelivered housing will simply carry over into the next plan period, with the Council sleepwalking into a prolonged period of delivery stasis rather than confronting the underlying cause.

This is the delivery challenge that City Plan 2040 must confront. The Plan should not assume that a site will deliver simply because it has been allocated, has an outline consent, or has appeared in previous land audits. A planning allocation is a policy decision. A consent establishes a planning principle. Neither provides finance, infrastructure, land assembly, remediation, purchaser demand or a viable construction programme.

Every existing and proposed allocation should therefore be reassessed against current evidence of land control, existing leases and occupier interests, finance, abnormal costs, infrastructure, servicing, remediation, flooding, market absorption, phasing and a credible route to a start on site. The Council should distinguish clearly between theoretical capacity, developable capacity and homes that are deliverable within the plan period.

Where a site repeatedly misses delivery milestones, it should not continue to inflate the effective housing land supply. It should be removed, amended, placed in a longer-term reserve or replaced by an alternative site with stronger evidence of delivery.

The Council should publish a transparent delivery audit of City Plan 2030 allocations and opportunity sites. It should show what has progressed, what has stalled, why delivery has been delayed and whether the original assumptions remain credible. This should inform the selection of sites for City Plan 2040.

6. Viability Must Be at the Centre

Viability is the central delivery issue for City Plan 2040. It should not be treated as a late-stage matter for Section 75 negotiations after years of design, technical work and planning engagement. It should be tested at allocation stage, addressed through pre-application engagement and reflected in the drafting and application of policy.

Development is funded on borrowed capital. Every month of uncertainty, delay or repeated technical work adds finance costs, ties up equity and erodes the margin needed for a project to proceed. Faster and more predictable planning is therefore not simply a process improvement; it has a direct, quantifiable effect on whether homes and infrastructure can be delivered.

Members' experience is that the viability challenge is not caused by one policy in isolation. It is the cumulative effect of affordable housing, education, healthcare, transport, active travel, public realm, biodiversity, open space, drainage, energy, utilities, remediation, flood protection, design, housing mix, legal costs, bonding, delay and finance. Each may be reasonable when considered separately. Together, they can make a scheme undeliverable.

This is particularly acute on brownfield sites, where remediation, complex ownership, existing uses and abnormal infrastructure costs already place pressure on development before policy contributions are applied. Our wider policy paper argues for a viability-first default for brownfield land: viability should be assessed early

and treated as a central consideration in the delivery of regeneration, not as an exceptional issue raised after a scheme has stalled.

City Plan 2040 should introduce a published cumulative viability framework. It should:

- Require viability and deliverability assessment before allocating major sites, particularly brownfield and infrastructure-dependent sites.
- Assess policy requirements together rather than one by one.
- Use current, transparent assumptions on build costs, finance, values, abnormal costs and market absorption.
- Distinguish site-enabling works from wider strategic infrastructure.
- Avoid double counting across different obligations
- Identify the priority, timing and funding source for each contribution.
- Allow contributions to be phased in line with development cash flow.
- Use review mechanisms where changes in value or cost justify them.
- Make clear when wider public funding is needed for infrastructure that serves more than one site or the city as a whole.

The objective should be to maximise homes delivered and public value secured in reality, rather than attach an unsustainable package of obligations to a scheme that does not begin construction.

The Council should also create a clear officer mandate for early viability engagement. Viability should be a legitimate and expected topic at pre-application stage, supported by specialist expertise and a consistent approach to evidence. Our wider paper identifies officer confidence and early, structured engagement as essential to avoiding late-stage impasse and unnecessary delay.

There is also a strong case for policy stability. The Council should avoid adding new local obligations during preparation of the Plan until it has completed a cumulative viability audit of the proposed policy package. Policy ambition must be matched by evidence that the cumulative package can be delivered in current market conditions.

7. Affordable Housing, Housing Mix and Build-to-Rent

We support the delivery of more affordable homes in Edinburgh. However, the current 35% affordable housing requirement should not simply be rolled forward without updated evidence of its effect on viability and delivery.

The Council should publish a current viability assessment that accounts for build costs, finance costs, land values, sales values, rental values, construction inflation, infrastructure requirements, abnormal costs and development risk. A single city-wide percentage may not maximise affordable housing delivery if it prevents otherwise viable schemes from proceeding.

A more differentiated approach may be more effective. This could reflect location, site type, scale, tenure, existing use, abnormal cost, infrastructure requirement and the availability of public funding. The key question should be how to deliver the greatest number of affordable homes in practice, not how to maintain a nominal percentage that may reduce overall output.

The same principle applies to the Hou 3 requirement for 20% of homes on qualifying sites to be suitable for larger families. Family housing need is real, but a city-wide need profile should not automatically become a uniform site-by-site requirement. The Council's evidence indicates that housing need is strongly weighted toward one- and two-bedroom homes, while the appropriate mix on any individual site will vary by tenure, location, accessibility, target market and viability. The issue is especially significant for Build-to-Rent. BTR is financed on a long-term rental-income model. The valuation and funding of the whole building depend on the ability to let the unit mix at sustainable rents. Where a fixed larger-family requirement exceeds local rental demand, it affects not just an individual home but the viability of the entire asset.

The Plan should therefore retain an ambition for family homes while allowing flexibility based on tenure and site-specific evidence. The Council should publish the market and viability evidence for the existing policy, permit an evidence-led approach to mix, and consider alternative mechanisms where the local rental market cannot support the full on-site requirement.

Our [Planning as an Enabler of Investment](#) paper calls for a structured viability audit of Policy 16-style mix requirements and other policies that may be defensible separately but create a cumulative barrier to delivery. City Plan 2040 should apply that principle locally before imposing additional obligations or retaining fixed requirements without review.

The Plan should also actively support delivery of specialist residential asset classes, particularly co-living and later living, rather than treating housing need as met solely through conventional flatted or family homes. Co-living is a distinct, purpose-built accommodation model that can widen the range of affordable options available to single people and young professionals, but it needs its own clear standards for space, amenity, management and contributions to work in practice. Glasgow has already published planning guidance on co-living; Edinburgh has not, and risks losing investment in this asset class to cities that can offer applicants greater certainty. Later living – including retirement and integrated retirement communities – is similarly underprovided for given Edinburgh's ageing population, and a defined policy position would help unlock a form of development that can also free up family homes elsewhere in the city's existing stock. City Plan 2040 should set out clear, asset-class-specific policy for both co-living and later living, rather than leaving developers and communities to interpret how conventional housing policy applies to them.

8. Infrastructure, PPiP and Delivering the Plan

Infrastructure-first is the right ambition, but it must mean funded, programmed and coordinated infrastructure rather than an additional reason to delay development.

Schools, healthcare, transport, utilities, drainage and energy capacity are often planned and funded in separate silos, with weak alignment to the development plan cycle. The result can be consented housing that cannot progress because essential infrastructure is neither committed nor funded. This is a direct delivery problem, not simply a technical planning issue.

City Plan 2040 should be accompanied by a clear infrastructure delivery programme identifying what infrastructure is required, who will provide it, how it will be funded, when it will be delivered and how costs will be apportioned fairly. It should identify where strategic public investment, rather than developer contribution alone, is needed to unlock growth.

The Council should also consider more ambitious mechanisms to give certainty to allocated sites and accelerate delivery. In our wider paper, we recommend that adopted LDP allocations should carry deemed Planning Permission in Principle, subject to defined criteria. If the plan-making process has already established through consultation and examination that a site is appropriate for a particular use, applicants should not have to re-establish the principle of development from scratch.

For City Plan 2040, the Council could explore Planning Permission in Principle, masterplan consent areas, development briefs and other front-loaded tools for major allocations. The purpose would be to reduce duplicated work, shorten timelines, increase certainty and make the allocation itself more meaningful to investors, communities and infrastructure providers.

This should be supported by clear site-specific expectations, a proportionate validation process and early multi-agency engagement. The Council should seek to avoid repeated technical reporting on issues already resolved at an earlier stage unless there has been a material change in circumstances.

9. Spatial Strategy, Green Belt and Sustainable Growth

The Council should restate clearly that Edinburgh moved away from a traditional, continuous Green Belt approach in 2006 in favour of a transport-corridor-led strategy. The purpose is not to weaken protection indiscriminately. It is to direct growth towards locations where public transport, active travel, infrastructure and density can support better environmental outcomes.

The Council should undertake a transparent, parcel-by-parcel assessment of Green Belt land. It should consider transport accessibility, landscape setting, settlement identity, biodiversity, nature networks, climate adaptation, infrastructure and the potential for compact development.

This should inform a sequential approach to housing. The first priority should be urban brownfield land, building reuse and intensification in accessible locations. Where these cannot meet need, the Plan should consider urban-edge or Green Belt parcels on existing or committed high-capacity transport corridors, provided they make a limited contribution to core Green Belt functions and can be supported by early infrastructure. More peripheral or cross-boundary locations should be considered only where closer alternatives cannot meet need and have been assessed against travel, carbon, infrastructure and public-cost impacts.

This matters both for climate and for economic competitiveness. If Edinburgh cannot accommodate housing close to jobs and transport, more of the region's growth will be pushed into locations that generate longer journeys and greater car dependence.

10. Growing and Emerging Use Classes

City Plan 2040 needs to plan positively for use classes that are growing quickly but do not sit comfortably within Edinburgh's existing land-use categories. Data centres are the clearest example: demand is being driven nationally by the growth of cloud computing and AI, but delivery depends on locating sites with access to sufficient grid capacity, resilient power supply and appropriate separation from sensitive uses. If the Plan does not identify a realistic pipeline of suitable sites and address the interaction with grid capacity constraints directly, Edinburgh risks losing this investment to city regions that plan for it explicitly.

The same principle applies to life sciences and laboratory space, digital and advanced manufacturing, and other technical or specialist uses that may not map cleanly onto conventional office, industrial or retail classifications. The Plan should avoid forcing these uses into categories designed for other purposes, and should instead set out a flexible, criteria-based approach that allows the Council to assess proposals on their own merits, including their economic value, their infrastructure requirements, and their fit with the surrounding area, rather than defaulting to policies written before these sectors existed at scale.

11. A Flexible Plan for Homes, Jobs and Reuse

City Plan 2040 should be a plan for economic growth as well as environmental protection. Edinburgh's economy depends on financial and professional services, life sciences, technology, higher education, tourism, hospitality, festivals and creative industries, alongside the growing and emerging sectors addressed in Section 10 above.

The Plan should protect sufficient employment land while avoiding over-prescriptive policies that lock sites into a single use regardless of changing market conditions. Where businesses are expected to move from employment land identified for housing, the Council must identify realistic relocation opportunities. This is particularly important at Seafield: housing-led regeneration should not simply displace viable businesses or reduce the city's employment capacity.

The Plan should also avoid unnecessary restrictions on hospitality, hotels, leisure and the visitor economy. These sectors are central to Edinburgh's competitiveness and support jobs across the wider region. Any proposed constraint should be based on clear evidence of harm and should account for the economic consequences of preventing investment. The City must also prioritise investment in the quality of its public realm to support Edinburgh's hard-won reputation as a destination for the tourist and cultural industries. It cannot be taken for granted that its leading position in these fields will remain so without ensuring the City invests in its own public spaces.

Finally, the Plan should support the sensitive adaptation and reuse of existing buildings. Reuse can reduce whole-life carbon, support regeneration, accommodate new homes and jobs, and make better use of existing infrastructure. Heritage should be treated not only as a constraint but as an economic and environmental asset capable of supporting viable new uses.

Summary of Recommendations

1. Adopt City Plan 2040 on time, using a pragmatic approach to updated evidence. Test central, high, low and demand-displacement scenarios; base housing need on household formation as well as population; publish how the iLHLR responds to the evidence; and avoid delay or restart that would leave Edinburgh governed by an increasingly outdated LDP.
2. Make delivery, viability and infrastructure the central tests of the Plan. Audit existing allocations; distinguish nominal capacity from effective supply; require early viability assessment for major and brownfield sites; publish a cumulative viability and infrastructure framework; phase obligations; avoid double counting; embed clear, published infrastructure contribution calculations and metrics within City Plan 2040 itself, rather than in subsequent, updatable non-statutory guidance, so developers have certainty upfront; and identify where public funding is required to unlock strategic development.
3. Create stronger certainty for allocated sites and the development process. Consider PPIp or equivalent front-loaded mechanisms for allocations, alongside masterplan consent areas and clear development

briefs; reduce duplicated technical work; provide early multi-agency engagement; and ensure allocations have a credible route to consent, finance, infrastructure and delivery.

4. Review affordable housing and housing-mix policy against current viability evidence. Publish an updated assessment of the 35% affordable housing requirement; allow differentiation by site and tenure; review the Hou 3 larger-family requirement; apply a flexible, evidence-led approach to BTR and other rented-tenure schemes; and set out clear, asset-class-specific policy for co-living and later living, matching guidance already in place in Glasgow.
5. Use a transport-led spatial strategy. Reaffirm the corridor-based approach; undertake a functional Green Belt review; and use a sequential approach that prioritises accessible, low-car, infrastructure-efficient sites before more peripheral alternatives.
6. Plan positively for a growing and changing economy. Maintain adequate employment land and relocation capacity, particularly where regeneration affects existing businesses; support life sciences, technology, research and digital infrastructure; facilitate hospitality and the visitor economy; provide a realistic, grid-aware pipeline of sites for data centres and other growing use classes; and support the adaptation and reuse of existing buildings.
7. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this response further with officers as the Proposed Plan is developed, and to make our work on development viability and planning as an enabler of investment available to inform the site assessment methodology.

Contact details:

Real Estate:Scotland

scotland@realestateuk.org