

# Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Tuesday, 3 June 2014

## Priority Parking Areas – TRO Consultation Responses

<b>Item number</b>	8.1
<b>Report number</b>	
<b>Executive/routine</b>	
<b>Wards</b>	5 – Inverleith 6 – Corstorphine/Murrayfield 9 – Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart 15 – Southside/Newington

### Executive summary

---

This report updates Committee on the progress of Priority Parking proposals in various areas around Edinburgh and makes recommendations based on the results of ongoing consultation and investigation.

This report also considers the objections received during three public consultations as part of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process to introduce Priority Parking Areas in Priestfield, Blackford and Lockharton.

### Links

---

**Coalition pledges**

**Council outcomes** [CO22](#), [CO23](#) and [CO26](#)

**Single Outcome Agreement** [SO4](#)

## Priority Parking Areas – TRO Consultations Responses

### Recommendations

---

- 1.1 It is recommended that Committee approve:
  - 1.1.1 the making of the Traffic Order for the Priority Parking scheme in the Priestfield area;
  - 1.1.2 the making of the Traffic Order for the Priority Parking scheme in the Lockharton area; and
  - 1.1.3 the undertaking of a further consultation for the proposed Priority Parking scheme in the Blackford area.

### Background

---

- 2.1 A previous report on Priority Parking was approved by Committee on 29 October 2013 and gave permission to start the formal legal procedures necessary for the introduction of Priority Parking.
- 2.2 This report informs Committee of the results of the public consultations conducted as part of the traffic order process in Priestfield, Blackford and Lockharton.
- 2.3 It also updates Committee on the progress of a number of other Priority Parking Areas.

### Main report

---

- 3.1 The public consultations in Priestfield, Blackford and Lockharton were carried out between November and December 2013 and are summarised below.
- 3.2 **Priestfield:** The results from this area indicate that there is strong support for the proposals as 103 responses of the 132 received were supportive. 19 objections and 10 general comments were also received. It is consequently recommended to introduce the Priority Parking scheme in this area.
- 3.3 The majority of local residents support the proposals as they have problems parking near their homes during the day and they consider that Priority Parking will help tackle commuter and non-residential parking problems in their neighbourhood.

- 3.4 Residents who objected to the proposals mainly did so because they would have to pay for a parking permit to park outside their homes and suggested that they be issued free of charge to residents. There were also concerns about potential displacement of parking problems to other areas, namely Prestonfield.
- 3.5 In addition, a small number of people indicated that they did not have a parking problem as parking pressures are not consistent across the area.
- 3.6 **Blackford:** The results indicate that the majority of those who responded to the consultation supported the proposals. There were 47 respondents who supported the proposals, 21 objections and 10 general comments.
- 3.7 However, there was a very low response rate of 9% and it is not considered that this small sample is representative of views from across the area as a whole.
- 3.8 Further analysis revealed that only 6% of households within the area indicated their support for parking controls and these responses were spread across the whole of the area. The sporadic pattern of residents indicating their support for the scheme suggests that any perceived commuter parking problems are not widespread throughout Blackford.
- 3.9 Proceeding with the scheme on the basis of these responses would result in the sporadic introduction of parking restrictions, often individual parking places, spread throughout the area which could create confusion among residents and visitors to the area.
- 3.10 The Council asked residents to submit their objections and indications of support regarding the proposals during the consultation period. The general lack of responses from residents with a preference either way on this matter is a significant indication that the introduction of parking restrictions is not necessary.
- 3.11 Given the low response rate and the comparatively small number of residents who support the scheme, it is not considered that there is currently a mandate from the local community to introduce the Priority Parking scheme.
- 3.12 However, in similar situations in other areas, such as within Blinkbonny and Telford, the Council has taken the decision to conduct a further consultation in order to try to elicit further responses. It is considered that, given the parking pressures that exist within this area that it would be beneficial to repeat the formal consultation stage of the TRO process.
- 3.14 **Lockharton:** The consultation results suggest that there is a clear geographical split between people who support the proposals, mainly residents in Craiglockhart Terrace and those who have objected to the proposals, residents from Meggetland Terrace. Therefore, it is recommended to introduce proposals in Craiglockhart Terrace, in a first phase, whilst postponing restrictions in Meggetland Terrace.
- 3.15 Other Priority Parking Areas at **Craigeith** (B4) and **Blinkbonny** (B5) were approved by Committee at its meetings on 19 March 2013 and 29 October 2013. These became operational on 6 January and 3 March 2014, respectively.

- 3.16 In addition, it is anticipated that Priority Parking proposals in the Murrayfield area will have been advertised for public comment, before the date of this Committee. The results of which will be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.
- 3.17 Further details regarding the indications of support and the objections received during the Priestfield, Blackford and Lockharton public consultations are considered in the following appendices.

## Measures of success

---

- 4.1 The measures of success will be ensuring residents can park closer to their homes once Priority Parking is introduced and to deliver an appropriate balance between the number of residents' permits purchased and parking places provided. It is also important that residents have a clear understanding of the consultation results and have confidence in the outcomes.

## Financial impact

---

- 5.1 The implementation of the Priestfield scheme was estimated to be in the region of £35,000. However, this is a maximum cost and introducing the restrictions in phases is expected to reduce expenditure, as all of the parking places may not be required. In addition, it is proposed, where possible to attach signs to existing street furniture or walls and fences, with the property owners' permission, this could reduce costs further.
- 5.2 The cost of the Lockharton Priority Parking proposals has previously been reported to Committee to be approximately £20,000. However, further work on costing the current proposals suggests this is nearer £10,000 which is the upper limit.
- 5.3 All implementation costs can be met from within Parking Operations Revenue Budget 2014/15.

## Risk, policy, compliance and governance impact

---

- 6.1 It is considered that there are no known risk, policy, compliance or governance impacts arising from this report.

## Equalities impact

---

- 7.1 Consideration has been given to the Council's Public Sector Duty in respect of the Equalities Act 2010 and there are no direct equalities impacts arising from this report.

- 7.2 The main aim of Priority Parking is to manage effectively the demand on the available kerbside space in residential areas and to help residents park closer to their homes. It is expected that this will have a positive impact on the Council's duty regarding the protected characteristics of age and disability.

## Sustainability impact

---

- 8.1 The impacts of this report in relation to the three elements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 Public Bodies Duties have been considered and the outcomes are summarised below:
- The proposals in this report are not expected to negatively impact on carbon emissions;
  - The proposals in this report are not expected to negatively impact on the city's resilience to climate change impacts; and
  - The proposals in this report are not expected to negatively impact on social justice, economic wellbeing or the city's environmental good stewardship.
- 8.2 It can be argued that introducing further parking restrictions may encourage commuters to leave their vehicles at home and use more sustainable travel options, thus reducing carbon emissions in the city centre. However, the restrictions will not prevent entirely commuters from parking within an area.

## Consultation and engagement

---

- 9.1 In all three areas under consideration for Priority Parking schemes; Priestfield, Blackford and Lockharton, informal consultations were carried out to gauge the opinions of residents on the possible introduction of parking controls. The results suggested that there was sufficient support to start the formal legal processes for each area and part of this procedure includes a public consultation.
- 9.2 The Priestfield and Blackford public consultations commenced on 22 November 2013 and ran until 13 December 2013. A public meeting was held at Prestonfield Primary School on 19 November 2013. This gave local residents the opportunity to view the proposals, discuss any concerns and ask Council officers questions. The results are discussed further in Appendix One and Two respectively.
- 9.3 The Lockharton consultation started on 8 November and ran until 29 November 2013. The results are detailed in Appendix Three.
- 9.4 The results of the three public consultations were presented in greater detail to the ward members to seek their views. The outcomes of the processes and the possible recommendations were discussed with the Councillors.

## **Background reading/external references**

---

[Priority Parking – Various Areas, Edinburgh](#). Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee Report, 2 August 2011.

[Progress on Priority Parking – Various Areas, Edinburgh](#). Transport and Environment Committee Report, 23 November 2012.

[Priority Parking Update – Various Areas, Edinburgh](#). Transport and Environment Committee Report, 29 October 2013.

Appendix One: Results of Priestfield Public Consultation.

Appendix Two: Results of Blackford Public Consultation.

Appendix Three: Results of Lockharton Public Consultation.

Appendix Four: Priestfield Priority Parking Consultation Comments.

Appendix Five: Blackford Priority Parking Consultation Comments.

Appendix Six: Lockharton Priority Parking Consultation Comments.

### **John Bury**

Acting Director of Services for Communities

Contact: Gavin Sherriff, Traffic Orders and Project Development Assistant

E-mail: [gavin.sherriff@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:gavin.sherriff@edinburgh.gov.uk) | Tel: 0131 469 3309

## Links

---

<b>Coalition pledges</b>	Maintaining and enhancing the quality of life in Edinburgh.
<b>Council outcomes</b>	<b>CO22</b> - Moving efficiently – Edinburgh has a transport system that improves connectivity and is green, healthy and accessible. <b>CO23</b> - Well engaged and well informed – Communities and individuals are empowered and supported to improve local outcomes and foster a sense of community. <b>CO26</b> - The Council engages with stakeholders and works in partnership to improve services and deliver on agreed objectives.
<b>Single Outcome Agreement Appendices</b>	<b>SO4</b> – Edinburgh’s communities are safer and have improved physical and social fabric. Appendix One: Results of Priestfield Public Consultation. Appendix Two: Results of Blackford Public Consultation. Appendix Three: Results of Lockharton Public Consultation. Appendix Four: Priestfield Consultation Comments. Appendix Five: Blackford Consultation Comments. Appendix Six: Lockharton Consultation Comments.

# Appendix One: Priestfield

1. As part of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO/13/37) procedure for the introduction of a Priority Parking scheme in Priestfield, it is necessary to advertise the proposals for public comments.
2. The formal consultation started on 22 November 2013 and ran until 13 December 2013. A letter was delivered to each household within the area with further information about the proposals, asking residents for their views and inviting them to a public meeting.
3. A public exhibition was held at Prestonfield Primary School on 19 November 2013. This gave residents the opportunity to view the plans and question Council officers about the proposals.
4. In addition to the letter being distributed: street notices were erected throughout the area, a public notice was placed in the press, documents were available for inspection at the City Chambers, plus information was published on the Council's website and Scotland's public information portal, "Tell Me Scotland".

## The Results

5. The consultation elicited 132 individual responses from; 130 residents within the area, one business and a submission from the Grange Prestonfield Community Council. These contributed 395 individual points about the proposals which are considered in detail within Appendix Four.
6. Further examination of the responses reveals that; 103 were considered to be supportive, 19 were objections and 10 were general comments.

Priestfield Consultation Responses

Type	Number	%age of Responses
Support	103	78%
Objection	19	14%
Comment	10	8%
Total	132	100%

7. There are 567 addresses within the proposed Priestfield Priority Parking area and responses were received from 108. Therefore, the percentage of properties that responded was 19% which is about average for a consultation of this nature.
8. The number and pattern of the responses received indicates that there is clear support for the proposals in Priestfield, particularly in parts closest to the north-east of the area near Dalkeith Road.



9. Further information on the numbers of objections or supportive and general comments per street is provided in the table below.

Priestfield Consultation Results by Street								
Street	Properties				Individuals			
	Total	For	Object	Comt*	Total	For	Object	Comt*
Dalkeith Road	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Kilmaurs Road	11	11	0	0	17	17	0	0
Kilmaurs Terrace	3	2	0	0	3	3	0	0
Kirkhill Drive	8	7	1	0	8	7	1	0
Kirkhill Gardens	10	8	1	1	12	9	2	1
Kirkhill Road	24	22	2	0	26	24	2	0
Kirkhill Terrace	3	2	1	0	4	4	0	0
Marchhall Crescent	9	7	2	0	10	8	2	0
Marchhall Road	5	5	0	0	7	7	0	0
Priestfield Crescent	3	1	2	0	5	1	4	0
Priestfield Gardens**	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	5	3	1	1
Priestfield Grove	3	0	0	3	3	0	0	3
Priestfield Road**	<b>23</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	27	17	6	4
Priestfield Road North	2	3	0	0	3	3	0	0
Totals	109	86	17	9	131	103	19	9

\* Comment.

\*\* More than one type of response was received from one property.

10. It should be noted that no responses were received from Marchhall Place or Priestfield Avenue. Plus the submission from the Community Council is not included within the above table, as this does not regard a specific property within Priestfield but the entire area as a whole.
11. The results show that indications of support were received from 86 households, objections from 17 and comments from 19. There were two households where two different types of response were received and these account for the difference in the above totals.
12. In all but one street, Priestfield Crescent, where responses were received, there were more indications of support for the proposals than there were objections.

#### The Objections

13. There were 19 people who objected to the proposed Order raising 34 separate points, eight were suggested twice or more and will be considered further in this report. While every point raised is analysed in greater detail in Appendix Four.

14. The first two points were; seven residents felt that they should not have to pay to park outside their homes and six suggested that parking permits should be free for residents.
15. While it is understandable that residents wish to park their vehicles outside their own homes, in many areas of Edinburgh there is insufficient kerbside space to accommodate all the competing demands.
16. Therefore, residents have asked the Council to introduce parking restrictions to help them park in their own streets. Since there are costs involved in providing such a service, it is considered that those who will benefit the most, the permit holders, should help contribute towards these running costs.
17. Priority Parking aims to introduce parking places where there is support for the proposals and leave the kerbside space uncontrolled where people have objected to the Order so that they do not have to pay to park outside their own homes.
18. Four of the top eight points can be categorised as residents' concerns about Priority Parking potentially displacing parking pressures to other areas.
19. Six people suggested that introducing parking controls would move commuter problems to other areas. The aim of the proposals is to provide a sufficient number of parking places for residents who already park on the street during the day and want to buy a parking permit. The controls would not remove all non-residential parking from the area but manage existing demands better. Thus controls will help residents without totally removing commuter parking.
20. An additional two comments suggested that the proposals would specifically move problems to the Prestonfield area and two others objected that the controls were not going to be applied consistently throughout the whole area from the start. Such an approach is likely to create displacement as introducing parking places where they are not supported and are likely to remain unused could move problems into Prestonfield.
21. Two people objected to the proposals as they considered displacement would be more dangerous since there is no child crossing support on these routes to the primary school.
22. This has been reported to the Road Safety Team, for their consideration, as they work with primary schools to develop safer routes for children walking and cycling to school.
23. Five people stated that they did not have any parking problems in their area. Parking problems are subjective as being unable to park outside your home may be an issue for one resident whilst it may not for another. However, only a small number have said they do not experience any problems compared to 48 people who have said they support the proposals as it will make it easier for them to park.

24. The final main comment concerns two residents who said that they do not have white access markings painted across their driveways. This is not part of the proposals and such requests should be submitted to the Local Roads Team, through the South Central Neighbourhood Office. Parking Operations will ensure that these comments are forwarded to the Local Neighbourhood Office.

#### The Proposals

25. While there are valid concerns from those who have objected to the proposals, there are equally valid issues for those who support them. The numbers and contents of the responses clearly indicate that there is a strong level of support the introduction of the scheme.
26. Priority Parking is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the majority of objectors who do not want parking places to be introduced outside their homes.
27. As the above table indicates there is support for the introduction of parking places and it is proposed to implement a first phase of parking places close to households that have indicated their support.
28. This will help to ensure that only parking places that are needed and will be used are introduced. It will also better meet the needs of residents by reducing needless street clutter and parking places whilst minimising the potential risk of problems moving to other areas.

# Appendix Two: Blackford

29. The Blackford Priority Parking consultation ran concurrently with the Priestfield one from 22 November to 13 December 2013.
30. Residents were informed about the start of the TRO/13/07 public consultation by a letter delivered to each property within the area. The letter asked residents to indicate to the Council whether they supported or opposed proposals and invited them to a public meeting where they could find out further information on Priority Parking.
31. The public exhibition was held at Prestonfield Primary School on 19 November 2013. This gave residents the opportunity to view the plans and question Council officers about the proposals.
32. In addition to the letter being distributed: street notices were erected throughout the area, a public notice was placed in the press, documents were available for inspection at the City Chambers, plus information was published on the Council's website and Scotland's public information portal, "Tell Me Scotland."

## The Results

33. There are 679 properties within the proposed Blackford Priority Parking area. The consultation elicited 78 responses including; 71 from residents living within the area, four Edinburgh residents from outside the proposed area, a representation from Craigmillar Park Bowling Club, one from East Suffolk Park Proprietors' Association and one from Grange Prestonfield Community Council (GPCC).
34. Further analysis revealed that; 47 respondents supported the proposals, 21 objected and 10 offered general comments.

### Blackford Consultation Responses

Type	Number	%age of Responses
Support	47	60%
Objection	21	27%
Comment	10	13%
Total	78	100%

35. Of the four people who live outside of the proposed area, three objected and one made general comments.
36. Removing those who live outside the area and the GPCC which does not relate to a fixed address, it can be considered that the remaining 73 responses came from 63 properties. As a percentage of properties within the area, this equates to a return rate of 9% which is significantly lower than average for a consultation of this nature and around half the expected rate.

37. A further breakdown of the results per properties and individuals is provided in the table below.

Blackford Consultation Results by Street								
Street	Properties				Individuals			
	Total	For	Object	Comt*	Total	For	Object	Comt*
Blackbarony Road	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0
Craigmillar Park	3	0	2	1	3	0	2	1
Crawfurd Road	5	5	0	0	6	6	0	0
East Savile Road	3	2	1	0	5	3	2	0
East Suffolk Park	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Gilmour Road	9	5	2	2	11	6	2	3
Gordon Terrace	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0
Granby Road	9	4	4	1	11	5	5	1
Hallhead Road	6	3	2	1	6	3	2	1
Lygon Road	5	3	0	2	5	3	0	2
Mayfield Road	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	0
Ross Road	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	0
Savile Terrace	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0
Suffolk Road	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	0
West Savile Road	5	5	0	0	5	5	0	0
Wilton Road	5	4	1	0	6	5	1	0
Sub-Total	63	40	16	7	73	47	18	8
Outside	4	0	3	1	4	0	3	1
Totals	67	40	19	8	77	47	21	9

\* Comment

38. There were no responses received from residents in East Suffolk Park or Esslemont Road, and the GPCC representation was not included in the above table, as it does relate to a specific property within Blackford but the area as a whole. Gilmour Road and Granby Road received both the greatest number of responses from properties in one street (nine) and the greatest number of residents who responded from one street (11).
39. The results indicate that support was received from 40 households, objections from 19 properties and comments from eight more. This is a comparatively small number of responses when considering that there are 679 households in the area. Furthermore, the Priestfield area produced a good rate of response and is relatively similar in nature.
40. The low rate of return in the Blackford area reduces the confidence that the sample is representative of the whole neighbourhood and that the majority of residents support the introduction of the scheme.

41. The results suggest that there is very little support for the introduction of the Priority Parking proposals. The 40 households equal approximately just 6% of the properties within the area. Plus these indications of support are spread across the whole area making for a very patchy spread of support. This suggests that support is in response to local issues and not one commuter parking problem throughout the entire area that needs addressed. While Priority Parking schemes are flexible enough to be introduced where there is support for parking controls this needs to be as a result of one significant problem.

## The Objections

42. There were 103 separate reasons submitted by people either objecting to or supporting the introduction of Priority Parking received during the consultation period. All these comments are considered in full in Appendix Five.
43. Turning to the 21 objections, 52 separate reasons were presented against the proposed Order and these were referenced on 74 occasions. Only five were suggested more than twice.
44. The main reason for objecting to the order was submitted by eight residents who stated that the parking restrictions are not necessary. It is clear that since this is a large area, the demands on the available kerbside space and residents' views on the need for parking restrictions are likely to change from one street to the next.
45. Much like those that support the introduction of the controls, those who object are spread throughout the area. This does not make it easy to identify clear areas where there is support and opposition to the proposals.
46. The second highest reason, offered by four residents, was they do not want to pay for parking permits. The Council has always considered that those who will benefit the most, the permit holders, from this service should help contribute towards its running costs.
47. Priority Parking aims to introduce parking places where there is local support for them and it is not the intention to put parking places which would not be used by residents, there is little value in such an approach which could move pressures to other areas without helping anyone.
48. Another three reasons were quoted three times including: many houses already having drives; problems being caused by staff and students at the University of Edinburgh's King's Buildings campus and not commuters; and the scheme will create more problems.
49. The main aim of the scheme is to help those without access to a private off-street parking place to park near their homes.
50. While there are a number of possible trip generators in Blackford, the Council does not know the specific reasons why each vehicle parks in the area and one particular source cannot be accredited as more significant than any other.

51. A vehicle being used by staff or students attending King's Buildings is likely to mirror the parking pattern of a commuter. That being the case its impact is likely to have the same effect on preventing residents from parking near their homes. Therefore, Priority Parking will be able to tackle part of this demand and there should be no distinction between a vehicle being used by a student or academic and one belonging to someone working in the city centre.
52. Some residents consider that the proposals will add to the current parking pressures. It is said that there will be problems with residents competing over parking places, find out permit prices and then applying for them.
53. Residents already share the same kerbside space as it is available on a first come, first served basis and this would not change for permit holders should the scheme be introduced. However, it would give them a priority over other road users during the hours of control.
54. While residents may feel that the Priority Parking could make matters worse for them, without specific reasons these cannot be considered fully.

#### The Proposals

55. While it is clear from those who responded to the consultation that there is support for the introduction of Priority Parking in Blackford, this must be considered in the context of a very low response rate.
56. That being the case it is questionable whether this sample is representative of the views of local residents and if there is sufficient support for the proposals.
57. Similar to the informal consultation there are pockets of support for Priority Parking, but it is sporadic and it is not considered to be sufficiently concentrated in locations which would allow for the formation of a viable scheme.
58. In areas where only one or two comments were received in favour of the proposals, it could be viewed that introducing parking places is for the benefit of a small number of individuals or households only.
59. This approach could encourage requests from elsewhere in the city where individual residents would like a controlled parking place introduced for their exclusive use.
60. Since there are only 40 households, out of a potential 679, which support the proposals, it is considered that there has been insufficient indications of support within the overall area to support proceeding with this proposal.
61. However, a similar situation arose in both the Blinkbonny and Telford areas when proposals for Priority Parking were consulted upon. Despite strong indications that parking problems existed and that measures to address those problems would be supported, the consultation responses were both low in number and inconclusive in terms of the result. In both instances the Council decided that it would be beneficial to repeat the consultation exercises with a view to encouraging more residents to respond.

62. While the second Telford consultation has yet to be carried out, the second consultation in Blinkbonny resulted in an increased response rate, with a clearer result in terms of the ratio of support to opposition. It is hoped that a carefully worded letter, indicating the importance of responding, would have a similar effect in the Blackford area.



# Appendix Three: Lockharton

63. The Lockharton Priority Parking public consultation ran from 8 November to 29 November 2013.
64. To start the TRO/12/73 public consultation a letter was delivered to each property within the area which included further information on the proposals and invited residents to indicate whether they objected or supported the proposals.
65. In addition to the letter being distributed: street notices were erected throughout the area, a public notice was placed in the press, documents were available for inspection at the City Chambers, plus information was published on the Council's website and Scotland's public information portal, "Tell Me Scotland".
66. A public meeting was not held in this area, as there were no requests from the Community Council to discuss the proposals further.

## The Results

67. There are 198 properties within the proposed Lockharton Priority Parking area. The consultation elicited 48 responses including; 46 from residents living within the area, one from a resident in Lockharton Gardens and a representation from The Wickets Residents' Association.
68. Further analysis reveals that; 28 respondents support the proposals, 16 objected and 4 offered general comments.

Lockharton Consultation Responses

Type	Number	%age of Responses
Support	28	58%
Objection	16	34%
Comment	4	8%
Total	48	100%

69. The person from outwith the area submitted a letter with general comments about the proposals.
70. Not considering the letter from outwith the area and the representation from the Residents' Association which does not relate to a fixed address, the remaining 46 responses were received from 38 properties. As a percentage of properties within the area, this equates to a return rate of 19% which is about average for a consultation of this nature.

71. A further breakdown of the results per properties and individuals is provided in the next table.

Lockharton Consultation Results by Street								
Street	Properties				Individuals			
	Total	For	Object	Comt*	Total	For	Object	Comt*
Colinton Road	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	0
Craiglockhart Terrace	23	17	4	2	28	22	4	2
Meggetland Terrace	13	3	9	1	16	4	11	1
Sub-Total	38	21	14	3	46	27	16	3
Others	2	1	0	1	2	1	0	1
Totals	40	22	14	4	48	28	16	4

\*Comment

72. The response from outside the area and the supportive comments from The Wickets Residents' Association are included in the 'Others' section, while they do not relate to specific properties they do regard parts of the area in question.
73. The results indicate that support was received from 22 households, objections from 14 properties and four made general comments. While 28 people support the proposals, 16 objected and four offered general comments.
74. There is a clear difference of opinion between residents who live in Craiglockhart Terrace and those who live in Meggetland Terrace.
75. The majority of residents who responded to the consultation from Craiglockhart Terrace support the introduction of Priority Parking whilst the majority of those who responded from Meggetland Terrace have objected.
76. From the 48 representations received, there were 151 individual points submitted for consideration. The main issues will be considered further.

#### The Objections

77. The main reason given by people for objecting to the Priority Parking scheme was that they did not have any parking problems and therefore considered that the proposals were not necessary.
78. This was stated by 12 people with the majority, nine, living in Meggetland Terrace, two in Craiglockhart Terrace and one in Colinton Road.
79. Since parking problems are subjective, it is possible for residents in the same area or the same street to have different views on parking outside their homes.

80. It is clear from the consultation results that residents in Craiglockhart Terrace do not support the introduction of parking controls in their street. There is little merit in introducing residents' parking places which are unlikely to be used. Therefore, it is proposed to delay such places to a second phase, only introducing them if necessary and if there is evidence to suggest that local residents want them.
81. The second main issue that was raised concerned private driveways within the proposed area and nine different points were raised 13 times regarding this issue.
82. Whilst the plans did not include every new driveway that has been built recently, it is not the case that parking places are introduced across private drives.
83. There were also concerns that the proposals would encourage more people to create driveways on their properties. However, Priority Parking is a low-cost solution to help residents park closer to their homes without having to pay for the construction of a private drive.
84. The third major reason raised by residents regarded the extension of the S3 Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The draft Order does not propose any changes to the S3 zone and therefore, these points are mainly considered to be comments.
85. Four people said that parking problems only started when S3 was introduced and that reducing its extent should be considered first before any further parking restrictions are proposed.
86. The CPZ was extended into Merchiston to address commuter parking problems and there is little evidence from residents within the zone to support the request for the reduction of its boundary. One of the main criticisms of the CPZ extension is that it moved commuter parking pressures to the next nearest unrestricted street.
87. Priority Parking aims to minimise potential displacement of parking problems by finding a balance between the numbers of parking permits purchased and parking places provided.
88. There were also requests for parking charges in S3 to be reduced to attract more commuters to park in the zone which runs counter to the rationale for its implementation.
89. Parking charges in S3 fall into the lowest price category at £1.00 per hour. Maximum stay periods apply in public parking places, usually up to 4 hours and there are no plans to amend such restrictions at this time. Reducing charges or removing maximum stay periods could encourage more commuters to drive into Edinburgh rather than use public transport or active travel alternatives.

90. The next concern regarded the Wickets development and the cul-de-sac in Craiglockhart Terrace. While there was a concern about possible displacement of parking into the Wickets, residents did not believe that parking places were necessarily needed from the beginning. Since there is little support from residents in some parts of Craiglockhart Terrace fewer parking places could be required and it is expected that parking places would only be introduced in the Wickets during a second phase if they became necessary.
91. Turning to the Craiglockhart Terrace cul-de-sac between numbers 28 and 41, three responses were received from residents in this section requesting the introduction of residents' places. However, there are few sections within the cul-de-sac which would be suitable for the introduction of parking places, as there are a number of driveways and private accesses. Marking parking places could reduce the available space for residents and it lends itself more toward a mews status. However, with few indications of support and being outwith the CPZ this approach is not being considered.
92. Once an Order has been advertised for public comment additional parking places cannot be added and another TRO would require to be started to introduce parking places in the cul-de-sac. It is proposed to monitor the situation and make further changes through a variation Order in the future, if necessary.
93. The next major issue relates to the footway opposite numbers 12 to 21 Craiglockhart Terrace. There are no proposals relating to this area as part of the Priority Parking proposals. A previous Order, to introduce waiting restrictions along the length of the pavement, was abandoned as this would also have reduced parking opportunities for residents.
94. It is clear that residents want something done about this pavement but there is no one option that is widely supported. A number of suggestions range from introducing double yellow lines or residents' parking places to narrowing or removing the pavement altogether. Physical changes to the streetscape are outwith the remit of Parking Operations and these comments have been reported to the Local Roads Office.
95. There were a number of different comments regarding the nursery in Craiglockhart Terrace and these, along with every other comment received, are considered further within Appendix Six. However, it is important to note that Priority Parking is not being proposed to help the nursery or parents of children attending it, but to improve parking opportunities for local residents.

#### The Proposals

96. It is clear from the results of the consultation that residents in Meggetland Terrace do not consider parking controls to be necessary. However, residents living in Craiglockhart Terrace have said that they have problems parking outside their homes and support the introduction of the proposals.
97. The benefit of Priority Parking is that it is sufficiently flexible to allow controls to be introduced in streets where there is support for them whilst retaining the unrestricted nature of others where residents oppose the proposals.

98. It is proposed to introduce parking places in Craiglockhart Terrace adjacent to households which support the proposals. It is also proposed to delay parking places in Meggetland Terrace until a second phase, if necessary.
99. The geography of the area lends itself to this approach as the indications of support in Craiglockhart Terrace are more concentrated and this will be reflected in the scheme.
100. In addition, with the introduction of a number of new driveways in Meggetland Terrace there is less likely to be support for the scheme in this street. However, similar opportunities do not exist for many houses in Craiglockhart Terrace and there is much less off-street parking available.
101. Therefore, it is recommended to introduce a first phase in Craiglockhart Terrace and delay parking places in Meggetland Terrace until such time that there is evidence available to suggest residents need additional help to park in their street during the day.

Appendix Four: Priestfield Priority Parking Consultation Responses

Number	Reason	Response	Action	
48	The scheme will make it easier for residents to park & tackle commuter parking.	The main aim is to help residents park closer to their homes during the day by creating areas which cannot be used by all-day commuters.	No actions proposed.	
22	Double parking problems.	The Priority Parking proposals cannot tackle such problems entirely but if it becomes law, it is expected that the Responsible Parking (Scotland) Bill will give the Council more powers to better tackle this issue.	No actions proposed.	
22	Commuters speed in the area to get to a vacant space.	A 20mph speed limit was introduced to tackle excessive speed and enforcement of this is a matter for Police Scotland.	No actions proposed.	
Commuter Pressures	17	Commuters circle area looking for a space.	All-day commuters will not be able to park in the permit holders parking places during the controlled period. This may help to reduce the pressure some residents feel they are under from other motorists to move their vehicles in the mornings. If permit holders are parked in the parking places, commuters will not be able to leave their vehicles there for the whole day and this may reduce such instances in the future. However, some residents have said that they have had to circle the area to find a parking place in the mornings.	No actions proposed.
	9	Commuters waiting for residents to vacate space.		
	3	Commuters follow residents to their vehicles to get the space.		
	2	RESIDENT: I have to circle area looking for space after taking children to school.		
17	Difficult for trades persons' to park or load/unload.	Trades' permit holders will be able to park in the permit holders' places during the controlled period. Visitors' parking permits will also be available and can be used by trades' persons.	No actions proposed.	
16	Difficult for residents to park during the week.	The main aim of the scheme is to help residents park closer to their homes during the day between Monday and Friday.	No actions proposed.	
Driveways	15	Parking across driveways.	While some elements of the scheme may help to prevent inconsiderate parking at driveways, this is not the main aim. If the Responsible Parking (Scotland) Bill is made it is expected to tackle such problems better.	No actions proposed.
	3	No white lines across drive.	Residents can submit requests for the introduction of Access Protection Markings across their driveways to the Local Roads Team. There is a charge for this service.	No actions proposed.
	1	Many properties have drives but residents don't use them.	Any road worthy, insured and correctly taxed vehicle can park on the public road and the Council can only introduce parking controls to manage who uses the road space.	No actions proposed.
	1	Give free permits to households without drives.	Parking Operations do not know which households have drives or access to off-street parking places. However, it is considered that residents permit holders who benefit from the introduction of the scheme should help contribute towards its operating costs.	No actions proposed.

Driveways cont.	1	Too many driveways limit residents parking.	Parking Operations do not have any powers to prevent residents from creating driveways on their property.	No actions proposed.
	1	Will not give the Council any money and will change garden into a drive.	Priority Parking is a flexible approach and it is only intended to introduce parking places where they are supported by local residents. Unrestricted spaces will remain in each street for residents who choose not to buy a permit to park in. This is a low-cost solution and permit prices are considered to be much lower than the cost of constructing private parking.	No actions proposed.
	12	Cannot re-park in my street during the day.	The parking places will keep areas free from all-day commuters and long-term non-residential vehicles for residents' permit holders.	No actions proposed.
Access	9	Access difficult for emergency services.	Five of comments were received from residents in Kilmaurs Road and the remaining four were received from residents in Marchhall Road. In Kilmaurs Road, all the junctions are treated with DYLS to ensure access and the road width is 10m. With parking on both sides of the street it is expected that around 6m would be available for access. In the case of Marchhall Road, the road is 8m wide and with parking on both sides 4m should be available for access. The Council did not receive any comments from the emergency services regarding this proposal.	No actions proposed.
Access	8	Priestfield Road becomes narrow and one-way.	The aim of the proposal is not to remove all parking from the area and it is likely that vehicles will continue to park on Priestfield Road. There is also an argument that single-lane roads and reduced sight-lines can actually reduce vehicle speeds as drivers approach with caution as they do not know if another vehicle is approaching from the opposite direction. Therefore, greater visibility can actually increase average speeds in some cases.	No actions proposed.
Long-term	9 8 6	Long-term parking for holiday makers. Long-term parking by students. Commuter parking is a problem but so is long-term non residential parking.	While the proposals will not remove all commuter or long-stay parking from the area, it will create places where such parking is not permitted and which will make it easier for residents' permit holders to park in their street.	No actions proposed.
Scottish Widows	8	Problems created by Scottish Widows.	The Council does not have any information on the reason why commuters choose to park in this area. That said, parking for employment purposes is likely to be one of the main causes of commuter parking pressures in residential areas.	No actions proposed.
	1	Do the Council think Scottish Widows staff will take the bus?		
	8	Displacement.	The aim of the scheme is to help residents park closer to their homes and only provide spaces for those who want to purchase a parking permit. It is intended that parking pressures are contained within the area and minimise the risk of problems moving to other areas.	No actions proposed.

Pay	7	Should not have to pay to park outside home.	It is considered that permit holders will be the main beneficiaries of the scheme and they should help contribute towards its running costs.	No actions proposed.
	7	Permits should be free for residents.		
No Problems	5	Do not have any parking problems.	It is clear that some residents will not have concerns with other motorists parking in their street during the day, for instance if residents use their vehicle away from their home during the day and only need to park outside their home during the night. In such situations the proposals will have little impact on such residents. However, it likely depends on personal circumstances whether a resident considers the proposals are necessary or not. The aim is to help residents who need it and avoid inconveniencing those who do not.	No actions proposed.
	1	No problem with business users parking in the street during the day.		
Safety	5	Safety for children.	The Council's primary aim is road safety. The scheme is likely to help parents of children park closer to their homes and reduce their need to cross the road. Concerns about the routes to school have been passed to the Road Safety Team for their information.	Reported concerns to Road Safety Team.
	2	Move problems to Prestonfield where there is no lollipop support for children walking to school.		
Priestfield Grove	5	No Through Road sign for Priestfield Grove.	Residents were concerned about two recent incidents in Priestfield Grove where vehicles allegedly damaged boundary walls due to lack of turning space in the street. While it is clear that residents want something done about this there is little consensus and conflicting suggestions on what approach should be taken. The informal consultation did not suggest that parking places were required within the street and as a result introducing any would need to pass through another legal process. A new no through road sign has been ordered and will be introduced at the entrance.	A new sign has been ordered and the requests for yellow lines sent to Local Roads Team.
	5	Problems accessing Priestfield Grove.		
	5	Do not want DYL in Priestfield Grove.		
	4	DYL Priestfield Grove & Crescent junction.		
	1	Introduce SYL in first part of street.		
	1	Priority Parking places in Priestfield Grove.		
	1	Restrictions at entrance to Priestfield Grove.		
	1	Single yellow lines for Priestfield Grove.		
	5	Residents using various materials to mark out their parking place on the road.	It is not appropriate to leave any foreign objects on the road and the Council will remove such items.	Reported to Local Roads Team.
	5	No available parking for visitors.	Visitors can park in unrestricted areas free of charge. It is expected that the parking places will create better parking opportunities for visitors which would've previously been occupied by all-day commuters. Visitors' permits are also available for residents' to purchase.	No actions proposed.
Nursery	4	Nursery in Kilmaurs Terrace creates a lot of congestion.	<b>What can be said about this?</b>	
	1	Parking place for nursery parents dropping off children in Kilmaurs Road.		



Priestfield Gardens	4	No current parking problems but there will be if Priestfield Gardens are excluded so this street needs to be included.	There were very few responses from residents in Priestfield Gardens during the informal consultation and as a result parking places were not included within the draft Order. Additional spaces cannot be added once an Order has been advertised but residents will still be able to purchase parking permits for the area if the scheme proceeds. The results of the formal consultation from Priestfield Gardens are unclear as only three residents supported the scheme, one objected and offered general comments.	No actions proposed.
	1	Agrees that there are no restrictions in Priestfield Gardens.		
	4	Commuters dump rubbish in the street.	This is outwith the scope of this consultation.	Reported to Environmental Wardens.
	4	Extend controlled period until 3pm to cover shift workers.	The 90 minutes controlled period could not be expected to cover every eventuality or shift pattern. However, it will prevent all-day commuters from parking in the permit holders places. To ensure the low-cost nature of the scheme it is essential that a maximum period of 90 minutes is restricted otherwise enforcement costs and as a result permit prices would likely increase.	No actions proposed.
	3	Introduce an afternoon controlled period.		
	3	Parking problems reflect the large number of guest houses in the area.		
CPZ	2	CPZ needed to eliminate all commuter parking.	Introducing a CPZ or measures similar to such controls will move parking problems to other areas and will likely lead to further requests for parking controls in new areas. The Council does not have the funds available to continue to introduce such restrictions across the city.	No actions proposed.
	1	Parking places should cover the entire street.		
	1	Wants unrestricted areas to have public parking places.		
CO2	2	Permits should not be linked to CO2.	Parking permits are linked to the CO2 emissions of a vehicle and there is a higher charge for second permits in a household to encourage residents to consider the environmental impact of their private travel choices.	No actions proposed.
	1	Should not be an additional cost for second vehicles.		
Approach	2	Restrictions should be consistently applied across whole area.	It is not the intention of the Council to introduce parking restrictions where they are not necessary or supported by local residents. It is considered that a one size fits all approach is now inappropriate and Priority Parking will allow the proposals to be tailored to better meet the needs of residents.	No actions proposed.
	2	Geographical variation; severe problem in Kilmaurs but not in Priestfield Avenue.		
	2	Proposals will shift problems to other areas: Prestonfield.	Any new parking restrictions cannot guarantee that pressures will not move to other areas, the aim of Priority Parking is to minimise any impacts by only introducing parking places where they are needed and will be used by residents. The aim of the scheme is not to remove all non-residential parking but to better manage it.	No actions proposed.
	2	Problems become worse since the introduction of B1.		
	2	Problems are only a result of controls elsewhere.		

	2	Dalkeith Road residents take up 30% of parking space.	Dalkeith Road residents are unable to park on their street during the day and are considered to be residents of this area and must be accommodated.	No actions proposed.
	2	P&R should be closer to the city centre.	The aim of Park and Rides are to prevent commuters from needing to drive into the city centre, bringing pollution and congestion nearer to residential areas. Introducing a P&R closer to the city centre would be counter-productive and not reduce such problems.	No actions proposed.
	2	Resurface roads and pavements in Priestfield.	This is outwith the scope of this consultation.	Reported to Local Roads Team.
	2	Problems for delivery vehicles.	It is expected that more parking opportunities will be available in the parking places for those making deliveries in the area as spaces were previously occupied by all-day commuters.	No actions proposed.
Money	1	Proposals are a way to generate funds for the Council.	This is not the aim of the scheme which is well supported by local residents. Income from parking permits will help to contribute toward enforcement costs and is unlikely to create a surplus.	No actions proposed.
	1	The scheme is a money making idea.		
Phasing	1	Introduce all of phase 2 at the start. Residents will need to justify and argue for spaces.	It is not considered appropriate to introduce all the parking places at once. Doing so could introduce places that are not needed, remaining empty during the day which will increase the potential of moving parking pressures elsewhere. It could also make some residents feel that they have no option but to purchase a permit and introduce unnecessary road markings and signs. The Council will work with residents to introduce places where they are needed and respond positively to their feedback.	No actions proposed.
	1	Include west part of Priestfield Road, Priestfield Road North, Kilmaurs, Kirkhill and Marchhall Roads in first phase and in full.		
Health Care	1	Dentist patients parking.	Short-term visitors can park in unrestricted areas free of charge. They can also park in the parking places outwith the controlled period and may find more parking opportunities are available in these areas which could've been previously occupied all day by commuters.	No actions proposed.
	1	Commuter parking prevents health care professionals parking near their patients.		
Business	1	No parking for customers or staff.	This company was concerned that there would be no parking opportunities available for its customers should the scheme proceed. However, visitors can park in unrestricted areas all-day and in the parking places outwith the controlled period. There may be more parking opportunities available for visitors to the area in the parking places in spaces which were previously occupied all day by commuters.	No actions proposed.
	1	Relocate business out of town as a matter of priority if proposals implemented.		
	1	It will help short-term parking for local businesses.		
Markings	1	Refresh road markings and surface at same time.	Road surface renewal is outwith the scope of this proposal and this has been reported to the Local Roads Team. The requests for refreshing road markings have been passed to the Council's maintenance contractor.	Reported to Local Roads Team and maintenance contractor.
	1	Renew DYL at Kirkhill Drive & Priestfield Road.		

Specific Parking Places	1	Relocate residents' space opposite 35 Priestfield Road to outside my house.	It is not possible to amend the locations of parking places once an Order has been formally advertised. While a space cannot be guaranteed outside the property of every resident who supports the scheme it is intended that one will be within a suitable distance. However, these suggestions will be noted if future changes are required.	No actions proposed.
	1	Extend parking place outside 2 Kirkhill Gardens up to DYL.		
	1	Doesn't want place outside xx Priestfield Road. (House number removed intentionally)		
	1	Parking place will block my drive in Priestfield Crescent.	These parking places will not be included within phase one and will be held in reserve in case they are needed in the future.	Remove parking places from phase 1.
	1	No impact assessment of residents cars and if spaces will be sufficient.	The Council do not have access to vehicle ownership records. However, parking surveys have identified the potential number of residents' vehicles in the area and the consultation results will also inform how many parking places may be required. The phased approach aims to ensure that the correct number of places is introduced and meets the needs of local residents.	No actions proposed.
	1	Some pay areas between 8-11am for visitors.	Unrestricted areas and visitors' parking permits can be used by guests to park in the area during the day. It is unlikely that commuters will want to pay to park when unrestricted areas are available and therefore residents may end up having to pay a parking charge to park in their streets during the day.	No actions proposed.
	1	Areas around tennis courts should be controlled to provide parking opportunities for players outwith controlled times.	Parking places will be introduced near to residents' homes who want to use them rather in areas where there are no houses, which would result in non-residential parking outside homes. Public parking places could be used by any motorists and could not guarantee spaces for specific groups during the day.	No actions proposed.
	1	Encouraging people in Edinburgh to walk and cycle but still allowing those outside to drive to places like Priestfield.	The Council encourages everyone coming into Edinburgh to consider smarter travel choices, such as Park & Ride sites. However, the Council does not have any powers to prohibit vehicles from outside the city parking in uncontrolled areas and not all commuters live outside of Edinburgh.	No actions proposed.
	1	People who choose to live further from their work should not expect free parking outside the homes of those who choose to live near their place of work.	Any vehicle can park in an unrestricted area. The aim of Priority Parking is to create parking places where residents have priority over other road users during the day.	No actions proposed.
	1	Why were two costly consultations necessary?	The first consultation was to find out if there was support for Priority Parking and if there was to design a more responsive proposal based on parking survey data and residents' views from the initial discussions. The second consultation forms part of the necessary legal process. It is considered that this approach provides value for money better reflects the views of residents.	No actions proposed.

1	Doesn't want to look out onto commercial vehicles parked at junction of Priestfield Road and Kirkhill Road, outside tennis courts.	The Council has no power enabling it to prohibit the size or height of vehicles parking in uncontrolled areas. It is considered that parking places should only be introduced near residents' homes to help them park during the day.	No actions proposed.
1	More parking places in Kirkhill Terrace.	The Order includes six parking places in Kirkhill Terrace which could accommodate 17 vehicles. When considering that four indications of support and no objections were received from residents in this street it is expected that a sufficient number of parking places have been included within the Order.	No actions proposed.
1	Requests a road safety audit - physical traffic calming on Priestfield Road.	This is outwith the scope of these proposals but will be reported to the Local Roads Team.	Reported to Local Roads Team.
1	Restrictions would help patients but restrict staff parking opportunities so they ran a petition.	Parking Operations were informed about a petition in the area but unfortunately, this was not received during the formal period for objections and therefore, it cannot be included within the final results. However, the petition stated that the Council wanted to change all the kerbside space in the area into residents' parking places. This is not the case as unrestricted areas will remain. Therefore, it can be considered that the wishes of the signatories are accommodated within the proposals.	No actions proposed.
1	No problems so unfair being penalised in scheme.	The aim is to introduce parking places where residents support them and avoid introducing places where there is clear opposition to avoid residents feeling this way. However, this cannot be guaranteed where there are differences of opinion between neighbours.	No actions proposed.
1 1	Prestonfield is excluded. Should include all of Prestonfield.	Previous consultation revealed that residents in Prestonfield did not support the introduction of parking restrictions and therefore, the area was not included in these proposals.	No actions proposed.
1	Proposals only where houses are privately owned.	Parking Operations do not have any information on which properties are occupied by the property owners or tenants. The proposals were based upon parking survey data and responses from residents living within the area at the time of the consultations. However, any interested party can comment on or object to the Order and will have their views considered.	No actions proposed.
1	Council has an anti-car policy but the city doesn't have a congestion problem.	The Council has no such policy. It is recognised that the continued growth of private vehicle use in the city is unsustainable and that encouraging smarter travel choice such as walking and cycling can help to tackle poor air quality and climate change.	No actions proposed.
1 1	Restrict all parking on Priestfield Road. More parking places on Priestfield Road.	It is not considered appropriate to introduce restrictions at all the kerbside space on this road as not all residents support the Priority Parking scheme and this will ultimately move parking problems to other areas.	No actions proposed.

1	Noise from commuters.	The Council cannot take action against general traffic noise.	No actions proposed.
1	If on-street parking is still available then there is no reason to suppose that commuters will stop trying to park in the area. The nuisance of motorists patrolling the streets in search of spaces and blocking driveways will not be alleviated, it is likely to be worsened.	The aim of the scheme is not to remove all non-residential parking from the area but to ensure that spaces are available for residents during the day. Residents should be under less pressure from commuters to move their vehicles if they are parked in a permit holders place as such spaces cannot be used by all-day commuters.	No actions proposed.
1	IT failure has meant that some residents' comments were not recorded but, apparently, with no way to identify which or how many.	The CPZ mailbox was full, due to the number and size of responses received, for less than a day. Anyone sending an e-mail to the mailbox would've received an acknowledgement which indicated their e-mail couldn't be delivered. There is no way to identify how many people may have been affected by this.	No actions proposed.
1	GPCC wants assurances that there will be consultation on the extent and timing of both phases.	The phases will be based upon the results of the public consultation and residents will be informed before any parking places are introduced.	No actions proposed.
1	Introduce limited single yellow lines, enforceable for the same periods, where it is too narrow to allow parking on both sides and a residents' bay is proposed.	The Police can already take action where a vehicle is parked that will obstruct the passage of traffic on any road.	No actions proposed.
1	Visitors' permits should be linked to CO2.	This is not practical as residents are unlikely to know which vehicles they will be used on.	No actions proposed.
1	Residents don't like to park next to hedge in Kirkhill Drive at night due to break-ins.	Consideration will be given to introduce any parking place sin Kirkhill Drive on the south side of the street first.	No actions proposed.
395			

Appendix Five: Blackford Priority Parking Consultation Comments

Number	Reason	Response	Actions	
19	Hard to park near my home during the day.	The aim of Priority Parking is to help residents park closer to their homes during the day.	No actions proposed.	
University	11	Problems are caused by University staff & students not commuters.	The Council does not have any evidence to suggest that specific vehicles belong to staff or students attending the University of Edinburgh's King's Buildings campus. However, such commuting could prevent residents from parking near their homes during the day.	No actions proposed.
	2	The order doesn't deal with the needs of staff and students at King's Buildings and they will not disappear.	The main aim is to help residents park closer to their homes which is being made difficult by non-residential parking in the area, unrestricted spaces will remain for such motorists. It is not the responsibility of the Council to accommodate parking for organisations on the public road.	
	1	University restricts parking in its own areas but happy to cause congestion and danger elsewhere.	The Council are not responsible for parking on private land and there is no requirement to find parking space for commuters. However, the aim of the controls is not to remove all non-residential parking from the area.	
11	Many commuters take the bus from here to other destinations.	The area is well served by buses into the city centre and this may attract motorists to park and ride in the area.	No actions proposed.	
8	Parking restrictions are not necessary.	The Priority Parking approach focuses on streets where there are parking problems and where controls are supported by residents. There is no desire to introduce parking restrictions where they are not welcomed by local residents.	No actions proposed.	
5	Long-term parking - people going on holiday.	The parking survey data indicated that there was an element of long-term parking in the area.	No actions proposed.	
5	Hard for guests and trades people to park.	It is expected that the permit holders' spaces will provide parking opportunities for short-term visitors and those making deliveries during the day outwith the controlled period. Visitors' and trades' parking permits can also be used in the parking places.	No actions proposed.	
4	Hard to park near my home on Saturdays.	The scheme is only proposed to operate Monday to Friday.	No actions proposed.	
4	Wants an additional parking place in Granby Road adjacent to the boundary of 16 Suffolk Road in phase 2.	Once a draft Order has been advertised it is not possible to add new parking places to the scheme. Should additional parking places be needed these would need to pass through another legal process and such action would only be considered if all the phase 2 places had already been introduced.	No actions proposed.	

Driveways	4	Inconsiderate parking across drives.	While some elements of the scheme may help to prevent inconsiderate parking at driveways, this is not the main aim. If the Responsible Parking (Scotland) Bill is made it is expected to tackle such problems better. Parking Operations do not consider applications for new driveways and this is a low-cost scheme to help residents park outside their homes.	No actions proposed.
	3	Many houses already have drives		
	2	Too many people have already changed gardens to driveways		
	2	Encouraging residents to change their gardens to drives		
	1	People should expand driveways not take up public road for private parking		
	1	Proposals will stop people changing gardens into drives		
Paying for permits	4	Do not want to pay for parking	It is the choice of each resident whether they wish to purchase a parking permit or not. The aim of Priority Parking is to introduce parking places where they are needed, supported by local residents and will be used. Therefore, it is not intended to put parking places outside the homes of people who did not support the proposals. However, this cannot be guaranteed where there are differing opinions among neighbours.	No actions proposed.
	1	The proposals mean I'd have to pay to park outside house		
	1	Unfair that some residents have to pay to park outside their homes and others don't.		
Money	3	Restrictions are another charge, tax or financial burden on residents when times are tough.	The Council has no desire to introduce parking restrictions where they are not supported by local residents. The Council's transport budget is completely separate from police matters.	No actions proposed.
	1	Rather money spent on local policing.		
	1	Save money by not proceeding with scheme.		
	3	Insufficient number of residents' parking places on Wilton Road and East Savile Road.	The number of parking places were based upon parking survey data and the responses from residents during the informal consultation.	No actions proposed.
	3	B&B visitors cause problems	The scheme will not prevent visitors to guest houses from parking in the area.	No actions proposed.
	3	Insufficient spaces in Gilmour Rd between Wilton Rd & Lygon Rd put more space on west side.	There are three houses in this section and since each household can purchase a maximum of two permits, the six parking places in the draft Order are considered to be sufficient. Parking places nearby could accommodate visitors.	No actions proposed.
	2	Wants a Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ)	The Council has previously decided that new CPZs cannot be considered for areas with less than 1000 and require considerable financial resources which the Council doesn't have.	No actions proposed.

	2	Signs were not evenly spread, none in Blackbarony Road, only up for one day.	The public notices are not a legal requirement but were erected in Blackbarony Road and the Council did not remove them after one day. A notice was put in the Scotsman newspaper and information was available online.	No actions proposed.
	2	Two controlled periods, another in the afternoon	To ensure that the Priority Parking remains a low-cost scheme only one 90 minutes controlled period is proposed.	No actions proposed.
	2 1	Happy with finding parking as the situation is now. Very few occasions when been unable to park close to our home	Since parking pressures vary across the area and due to personal circumstances, it is likely that some residents will not need help to park during the day.	No actions proposed.
	2	Competition for unrestricted spaces will be greater and people will arrive earlier to use them	The aim is to help residents park during the day but the unrestricted spaces can still be used by commuters free of charge.	No actions proposed.
	2	Spaces outside bowling green will fill up immediately leaving no space for bowlers at any time of the day.	Motorists will be able to use unrestricted spaces and empty residents' parking places outside the controlled period. Therefore, they will still be able to park in the area for shorter periods.	No actions proposed.
	2	Gordon Terrace is a popular commuter parking area.	This is a long street with few houses and one side adjacent to communal gardens. There is little demand from residents and is a good location for non-residents to park.	No actions proposed.
	2	Traffic travels too fast on Gordon Terrace	This is outwith the scope of this consultation.	Reported to the Road Safety Team.
	2	Dumping of hazardous materials in Gordon Terrace Gardens.	This is outwith the scope of this consultation.	Reported to Environmental Wardens.
	2	Problems receiving visitors	Visitors' parking permits can be purchased for guests to park in the parking places during the controlled period.	No actions proposed.
	2	Commercial vehicles; a glider on a trailer, camper vans and private buses park in area.	The aim of the proposals is not to prevent the various types of possible non-residential parking in the area but to help residents park closer to their homes during the day.	No actions proposed.
	2	Change the controlled period to: 12 to 1.30pm.	Once an Order has been advertised it is not possible to change the proposed hours of control.	No actions proposed.
	2	Visitors and staff at the dental and medical practices in the area should be considered.	Non-residents can park in unrestricted areas and more short-term parking opportunities may be available in the parking places outwith the controlled period.	No actions proposed.
CO2	2 1	Permits should not be based on CO2 emissions CO2 permits is a money grabbing scheme	Residents' parking permits in Edinburgh are already based on vehicle emissions or engine size and it is considered that new schemes should follow suit. Only 25% of permit holders' renewal prices increased after CO2 permit charges were introduced.	No actions proposed.



Phases	2	Include all parking place on the north-side of East Savile Road in Phase 1	The phased introduction of the parking places is not set in stone and will be determined by the results of the consultation. Additional parking places will be considered if sufficient evidence is collected during the monitoring process.	No actions proposed.
	2	Include outside 29-39 Gilmour Road in Phase 1.		
	1	Commuter parking is a major problem outside 1-10 Gilmour Road change to phase 1.		
More parking places	2	More residents' parking places in general	The number of parking places were based upon parking survey data and responses from residents during the informal consultation. These included Mayfield Road residents. More parking places can be added in phase 2 should there be evidence to suggest they are needed. However, places not contained within the draft Order would need to pass through a separate legal process if they were to be introduced.	No actions proposed.
	1	More spaces outside 51 Gilmour Road		
	2	Parking places outside 4 and 23 Crawurd Road		
	1	More parking places in Wilton Rd at Mayfield Road end for Mayfield Road residents.		
	1	Increase residents' places in Gilmour Road		
1	Allow commuter parking in West Savile Road at Craigmillar Park end.			
Savile Terrace	1	Proposals will reduce the number of spaces available in Savile Terrace.	There are national standards which must be applied when introducing parking places and it is possible that parking space will be reduced to accommodate the scheme.	No actions proposed.
	1	Pavement parking is necessary in Savile Terrace, not doing so causes problems.		
	1	DPPP outside 8 Savile Terrace is never used	This is outwith the scope of this consultation.	Reported to the Local Roads Officer.
Displacement	1	Long-term parkers will move to outside our house.	The aim of the scheme is to help residents park closer to their homes during the day but contain parking pressures within the area. It is not the intention to remove all non-residential parking from the area and some commuters may park in front of households where they did not previously.	No actions proposed.
	1	The proposals will move problems elsewhere.		
	1	Concerned about displacement of parking problems.		
	1	Parking problems will move to my street as others support it		
Spaces	1	Too many proposed spaces.	The plans include all the available parking places but it is not considered that they would all be needed. Should the scheme proceed, parking places would be picked for introduction dependent upon support in their vicinity.	No actions proposed.
	1	Dramatically scale back the plans.		

Phasing	1	Phase 2 would introduce far more spaces than are required.	Phase 2 parking places would only be introduced if there is evidence to show that they are needed and would be used by residents. The scheme would be monitored and more places would be introduced shortly after the first phase if they are needed.	No actions proposed.
	1	Introducing the scheme in two phases could be less effective - careful monitoring is required.		
	1	Further consultation on extent & timing of phase 2.		
DYLs	1	Extend DYL from Suffolk Road further into Granby Road	The proposals do not include any amendments to double yellow lines in the area and such changes would require to pass through another legal process.	Reported to Local Roads Team.
	1	DYL all junctions in the area		
	1	Inequitable that non residents park for free for as long as they like.	Residents can park in the unrestricted areas free of charge whether they choose to purchase a permit or not. Introducing public parking places, are unlikely to be used by commuters and may result in residents having to pay to park in their own street as these could be the only spaces available. It is considered better to accommodate residents with a permits scheme as commuters are unlikely to be deterred from parking in spaces which are free.	No actions proposed.
	1	I go to parts of this area as I know I can always get parked.	Parking problems will vary across the area due to their distance from traffic generators, bus routes and residential density. The views of residents will help determine whether controls are needed in a street.	No actions proposed.
	1	Delay plans for an independent impact assessment	The views of local residents are the most important factor in this process and any recommendations or decisions will be made on their responses to the formal consultation.	No actions proposed.
	1	Extend consultation period & notify people outside of area	The consultation ran for three weeks from 22 November to 13 December and any interested party can comment on or object to the Order and their views will be reported to this Committee.	No actions proposed.
	1	I own a 2.65m high van and the TRO restricts my parking opportunities.	<b>The aim of the height restriction is to prevent high vehicles from blocking residents' windows and obstructing light.</b>	No actions proposed.
	1	Mornings are not the main problem, afternoons are.	The parking survey data indicates that the peak traffic count in the whole area was between 11am and 1pm. While there are likely to be streets with peaks at different times, the morning period was considered appropriate for the entire area.	No actions proposed.
	1	Doesn't want parking places around the East Suffolk Park green	There isn't any parking places proposed in this area.	No actions proposed.
	1	Hassle to buy permits.	It is relatively straightforward to apply for a residents' parking permit and it can be done by post in the first instance. Subsequent permits can be renewed quickly online.	No actions proposed.

1	Only mark start and finish of parking places	The Council is not permitted to mark parking places in such a manner.	No actions proposed.
1	More applications for permits than spaces from residents in Mayfield Road.	Residents from Mayfield Road were considered as part of the proposals.	No actions proposed.
1	Parking has become much worse since the introduction of B1	The aim of Priority Parking is to minimise the potential for problems moving to other areas by not introducing too many parking places which are not needed. However, driver behaviour cannot accurately be predicted and it is not the intention to prevent commuters from coming into the city.	No actions proposed.
1	Controls will likely reduce membership of Bowling Club	The scheme is being proposed following concerns from residents that it is difficult to park in their streets during the day and it is likely that visitors will encounter similar problems. There could be any number of reasons for patronage to change.	No actions proposed.
1	Controlled period ruins chance of parking for bowling matches or coffee mornings at the club	Unrestricted areas can still be used by visitors to the area during the day. Parking places cannot be used by all-day commuters and may provide better parking opportunities in the afternoons.	No actions proposed.
1	Permit or visitors' permits for Bowling Club	Businesses are not entitled to apply for parking permits.	No actions proposed.
1	Previous consultation shows a significant majority against controls	The previous informal discussions covered a much larger area and only those streets where there was more support for Priority Parking were included in this formal process.	No actions proposed.
1	Central reservations on Minto Street, Mayfield Gardens & Craigmillar Park are poorly lit and unsighted at night	This is outwith the remit of Parking Operations.	Reported to Local Roads Team.
1	Only heard about the proposals from Ian Murray MP	A letter was delivered to each household within the area with further details on how to participate in the consultation process.	No actions proposed.
1	Not sufficient enough time to reply	The consultation ran for three weeks from 22 November to 13 December 2013 and this is the standard length for a consultation of this type.	No actions proposed.
1	Students will move during period and return after it is finished	Priority Parking will prevent non-residents from parking in the parking places all-day, but it will not stop non-residents from parking before and after the controls in the area.	No actions proposed.
1	It does not offer motorists any certainty of finding a space than currently exists	Priority Parking cannot guarantee permit holders a parking place and non-residents can continue to park in the area.	No actions proposed.
1	Commuters circling the area for spaces	The Council has no powers to stop any vehicle from using the road as they see fit.	No actions proposed.
1	Proposals will restrict residents, visitors & trades' persons movements unless they buy permits	The unrestricted areas allow the controls to be flexible and it is the choice of each resident whether they wish to purchase a parking permit or not.	No actions proposed.

1	Proposals do not help outside the hours of control.	To ensure the scheme remains a low-cost proposal it is necessary to keep the restricted times to a maximum period of 90 minutes.	No actions proposed.
1	More residents' spaces in Wilton Road - some households have four vehicles	Each household will only be entitled to apply for a maximum of two parking permits and this will help to determine the number of available parking places in some locations.	No actions proposed.
1	Parking controls will increase the quality of life for residents	Better parking opportunities can have a significant impact on people's lives.	No actions proposed.
1	GPCC not asked to organise meeting	The public meeting was organised by the Council and was well attended by locals.	No actions proposed.
1	IT failure has meant that some residents' comments were not recorded but, apparently, with no way to identify which or how many.	The CPZ mailbox was full, due to the number and size of responses received, for less than one day. Anyone sending an e-mail to the mailbox should've received an acknowledgement which asked them to re-submit their e-mail at a later time. There is no way to identify how many people may have been affected by this.	No actions proposed.
1	Restrictions will make it safe for young children to play.	While The parking controls will not remove all moving traffic from the area and it is	No actions proposed.
1	Quality Bike Corridor has made it more difficult for residents to park.	The Council is attempting to strike a balance between better cycling facilities in the city and help for residents to park near their homes.	No actions proposed.
1	Access for emergency service vehicles is difficult.	There have been no issues reported to the Council from the emergency services regarding access to these streets.	No actions proposed.
1	Guest houses encourage their customers to park in residential streets.	The aim of the proposals is not to prevent all non-residential parking in the area but to help residents park closer to their homes during the day. Such motorists will still be able to park in unrestricted areas and in parking places outwith the controlled period.	No actions proposed.
1	Wants a disabled persons' parking place outside house.	This is outwith the scope of this consultation.	Asked South Neighbourhood Team to send out an application form.
1	Many vehicles that park in the area have residents' permits from CPZ.	It is likely that some CPZ residents will travel to this area either for commuting or visiting purposes.	No actions proposed.
1	Vehicles speed around the streets and the area is becoming a rat run.	This is a road safety concerns and is outwith the scope of this consultation.	Reported to the Road Safety Team.
1	Need to monitor and make changes quickly - include Orchardhead Road.	The scheme would be monitored after its introduction and if required, more parking places could be added in a second phase shortly afterward. However, it is not intended to investigate any controls in Orchardhead Road.	No actions proposed.

1	The scheme makes it difficult for disabled residents.	Disabled residents who hold a disabled persons' blue badge will be entitled to apply for a parking permit free of charge.	No actions proposed.
1	Difficult for visitors.	Unrestricted areas can still be used by visitors during and visitors' parking permits, which are available for resident to buy, allow guests to park in the parking places during the controlled period.	No actions proposed.
197			

Appendix Six: Lockharton Priority Parking Consultation Comments

Number	Reason	Response	Action		
12	No parking problems.	The consultation results suggest that there is a difference of opinion between residents in Meggetland Terrace who do not want parking controls and those in Craiglockhart Terrace who support the proposals. Many of those who stated they did not have any parking problems reside in Meggetland Terrace.	No actions proposed.		
Driveways	4	20 driveways in Meggetland Terrace not shown on plan.	The Council used the most up-to-date plans available which did not include a number of new driveways. Parking places would not be introduced across existing accesses. Many new drives have already been built and this is unlikely to be as a result of the proposals only. It is possible that new driveways were created in response to existing parking problems and to ensure residents have a parking space for their vehicle.	No actions proposed.	
	1	Encourage more drives which will damage character of area, create uneven pavements & result in drainage problems.			
	1	Homeowners have already started introducing driveways as a result of these planned restrictions.			
	2	More applications for permits than spaces available so more people will create driveways.	The aim of Priority Parking is to introduce parking places that are needed and will be used by residents' permit holders. It also aims to closely match the number of places provided with permits purchased to ensure that there are parking opportunities for permit holders and that other motorists are not prevented from parking in the area.		
	1	New driveways will reduce the number of potential places where parking places could be introduced leaving insufficient places for permit holders.			
	1	One permit per house and those with driveways get none.	There is no information available on which households have access to driveways and this cannot be considered when residents apply for permits.		No actions proposed.
	1	Unfair that those with driveways will not have to pay to park in their street.	The Council are not responsible for managing parking on private land and therefore it cannot be said to be unfair that those who park on their own property do not have to pay for access.		
1	Residents park on the road in Craiglockhart Terrace rather than in their drives.	Some driveways may not be accessible for certain residents or the size of vehicles on the road today.			
1	Getting in and out of my drive will be more difficult.				
Zone S3	4	Parking problems started when restrictions introduced in Spylaw Road.	The CPZ was extended to combat commuter parking problems and there is no evidence to suggest that residents in such areas wish the parking controls to be reduced. Unfortunately, some commuters have moved to the next available unrestricted street.	No actions proposed.	
	1	Redact CPZ boundary and allow commuter parking in Spylaw Road.			
	2	Reduce parking charges in S3.	The aim of controlled parking is not to attract motorists to park and reducing charges is unlikely to impact on commuters as maximum stay periods would still apply.		
	1	S3 is not attracting people to park here so need to reduce parking charge.			
	1	Student parking permit in S3.			
1	Trades' permit for people working in S3.	Parking permits are already available for trades' people working in the CPZ, but there are no plans to introduce a student parking permit.			

Footway	4	DYL pavement adjacent to sheltered housing complex.	Previous proposals to introduce yellow lines along the length of the footway adjacent to the sheltered housing complex in Craiglockhart Terrace were abandoned as this would reduce parking opportunities in the street and likely move commuter parking outside residents' homes. There are no plans to re-start such proposals. Introducing parking places at this location would likely have a similar effect. Removing the pavement or reducing its width are outwith the scope of this consultation and the remit of Parking Operations	Reported to Local Roads Office.		
	3	Remove pavement adjacent to sheltered housing complex				
	1	Do something about the pavement to nowhere.				
	1	Introduce residents' places along the pavement adjacent to sheltered housing complex as non-residents park there.				
The Wickets	1	Narrow the pavement adjacent to sheltered housing complex	The results of the consultation indicate that there is support for the proposals from residents living in the Wickets area. However, as there is less support elsewhere it is not proposed to introduce parking places here in a first phase. This will also reduce the possible impact of displacing parking pressures in this development.	Move parking places to phase 2, if necessary.		
	3	Controlled Areas in the Wickets are not necessary.				
	2	Concerned about displacement into the Wickets.				
	1	DYL entrance to the Wickets in Craiglockhart Terrace.			There were previously proposals to introduce Double Yellow Lines in part of the Wickets but these were rejected by residents and there are no further plans at this time to introduce such restrictions.	No actions proposed.
	1	In the Wickets, each house has a garage and an area of hard standing, plus there are two areas for visitors.			It is proposed to leave parking places near the Wickets to a second phase if they become necessary.	
1	The proposed bay at the entrance to the Wickets would be dangerous as it would require drivers leaving the area to travel on the opposite side of the road, as it is narrow. Vehicles in this position are vulnerable, as cars entering come quickly round the bend and are largely unseen. This also applies to vehicles leaving the Wickets with two sharp corners and restricted visibility.	This section of road is currently unrestricted and vehicles can already park in this location. It is not considered that introducing bay markings would have a negative impact on road safety. It remains the responsibility of all motorists to drive at a suitable speed for the road they are travelling on. Restricting all parking on the approach road is not considered to be in the best interests of all residents.				
Cul-de-sac's	3	Introduce parking places in Craiglockhart Terrace cul-de-sac.	The aim of Priority Parking is to introduce parking places that will be used by residents' permit holders and to closely match the number of places provided with permits purchased. Thereby, better managing the existing parking demands and to reduce the potential for parking problems moving to other areas. There was little support for parking places in the Craiglockhart Terrace cul-de-sac during the informal consultation and few sections of kerb space that would be suitable for the introduction of parking places.	Leave nearby parking places until phase 2, if necessary.		
	1	Leaving the 'hammerhead' cul-de-sac (nos 29-40) and the Wickets unrestricted will transfer commuters to these areas creating congestion.				

Park and Ride (P&R)	3	Introduce a P&R at Boroughmuir Rugby Club.	Parking Operations do not operate any off-street or P&R sites in Edinburgh. The main aim of P&R facilities is to prevent commuters bringing their vehicles into the city centre. Opening such a facility at this location would counter these aims. It is unknown whether there are currently any restrictions to prevent all-day parking at such locations, but it is unlikely that the owners would support all-day commuter parking which would prevent spaces being used by their intended users. Parking agreements between two independent organisations is not a matter for the Council.	No actions proposed.
	1	Ask Edinburgh Leisure to start a P&R at Meggetland playing fields.		
Nursery	1	Encourage nursery to do a financial deal with George Watson's College to allow these parents to park in their car park.		
	3	Expansion of nursery will make parking worse.	The expansion of the nursery is outwith the scope of this consultation. The planning conditions include a limited waiting parking place to help parents drop-off and pick-up children at the nursery and to reduce the impact on local residents. This will proceed whether Priority Parking does or not.	No actions proposed.
	2	Planning consent for nursery includes four drop-off bays, if these are put in place without resident parking then our options will be further reduced.		
	2	Students or nursery parents take up spaces during the day.		
	2	Restrictions to suit nursery rather than residents who have to pay for them.		
	1	Too much emphasis on helping businesses and nursery.		
	1	Restricted hours suit the nursery better than residents.		
	1	Should residents who pay council tax for this street not get preferential treatment rather than nursery parents?		
1	Unreasonable for residents parking to be limited to provide for the needs of the nursery.			
1	You refer to responses from the parents of children at the nursery who want better access for drop-off and pick-up. This should have been properly considered at the time the nursery was granted planning permission and it should be made responsible for dealing with it. It is grossly unfair to impose a parking permit scheme on nearby residents to deal with the preferences of nursery users. We should not be responsible for them.	Better access for parents dropping-off and picking-up children at the nursery was part of the planning application. One of the conditions was to introduce limited waiting parking to reduce the impact of visitors on local residents. This parking place is not dependant upon the Priority Parking proposals which is a separate matter. The majority of residents who responded to the consultation support the introduction of Priority Parking. It is unlikely commuters will pay to park, even for short periods of time, when free parking is available in the same street. The result could be that the only places available for residents require them to pay during the day which could cost them more than an annual permit.	No actions proposed.	
1	Why can't nursery parents pay to park?			



Money	3	Money making exercise.	This is a low-cost scheme and income from residents' permits will only be used to contribute towards the running costs of the scheme. It is unlikely to be surplus income. Permit holders will be the main beneficiaries of the scheme and permit charges will help contribute towards running costs. Each resident can choose whether they need or wish to purchase a permit and unrestricted spaces will remain for those who do not want a permit.	No actions proposed.
	3	Objects to having to pay to park in own street.		
1	Can already park in my street free of charge.			
	3	Access difficult for emergency services.	The emergency services were consulted on the proposals and no negative comments were received.	No actions proposed.
Footway	2	Park half on pavement as road too narrow.	It was observed that vehicles park partially on sections of footway in both Craiglockhart and Meggetland Terraces. Widening the road is outwith the scope of this consultation, but if made law the Responsible Parking (Scotland) Bill may give Council's additional powers to address such concerns.	No actions proposed.
	1	Large vehicles double park & block the road.		
Carers	2	Proposals will restrict carers visiting at lunch times.	The Priority Parking proposals do not aim to control all the kerbside space in the area. Kerbside space is intentionally left unrestricted to enable longer-term parking or other activities during the controlled period. It is unlikely that any proposed controlled hours would satisfy every residents or circumstance. The parking restrictions will be monitored daily by the Council's Parking Attendants.	No actions proposed.
	1	30 visitors' permits a year are completely useless for someone who has a weekly visitor or who has a rota of 24 hours carers, 365 days a year, who need to park in the street.		
	1	Objects to the 1230 - 1400 period. This narrow window, which will be in place for at least 5 years, relies solely on daily rigorous parking enforcement.		
	1	Pleased with proposed controlled period.		
	2	Applying for a permit is not guaranteed.	Each resident would be entitled to apply for one permit and each household could purchase a maximum of two permits. The overall number of permits available is only limited by the number of households in the area.	No actions proposed.
	2	DYL entrance to Craiglockhart Terrace cul-de-sac.	Once a proposal has been advertised, additional lengths of yellow lines cannot be added to the design.	Reported to Local Roads Office.
	2	Introduce a 20mph area.	This is outwith the scope of this consultation. However, as part of the Local Transport Strategy the Council is considering the introduction of such zones in mainly residential areas.	Reported to Road Safety Team.
	2	Long-term non-residential parking.	While Priority Parking does not aim to remove all long-term parking from the area, it will create areas where such vehicles are unable to park and give residents a better chance to park in their street during the day.	No actions proposed.

	2	Parking is only difficult at evenings and weekends or during rugby matches, this scheme does nothing to help at these times.	The main aim of the scheme is to help residents park closer to their homes during the day in response to commuter parking pressures.	No actions proposed.
	2	Make Meggetland Terrace on-way.	This is outwith the scope of this consultation.	Reported to Local Roads
	1	Parking virtually makes the street one-way.		
Problems	1	Proposals would block the street more.	It is unclear how the proposals would block the street, restrict turning or encourage more people to leave their cars in the area creating congestion.	No actions proposed.
	1	Parking places will mean there are fewer places to turn in the street.		
	1	If the scheme goes ahead more people will leave their cars so more congestion.		
Limited Waiting	1	Nursery drop-off and pick-ups take place at the start and end of the day, increase the limited waiting period in Craiglockhart Terrace to 60 minutes, for users of local businesses. Fewer spaces would be needed on Colinton Road to help those residents who cannot park outside their homes due to the traffic island.	The aim of the limited waiting places on Craiglockhart Terrace is to serve short-term visitors to the area. They can also be used by residents at the start and end of the day, up to the maximum stay period, if unrestricted spaces are unavailable elsewhere. However, a longer time period is likely to be occupied more often and may not help resolve problems for short-term users in the area. The longer time period is considered more appropriate for places on Colinton Road.	No actions proposed.
	1	The businesses on Colinton Road (pub, beauty salon and hairdressers) are the sort that one would visit for significant periods of time. So I question whether the one hour bays are appropriate at all.		
Parking Places	1	Extend parking places opposite Craiglockhart Terrace cul-de-sac entrance.	Once a Traffic Order has been advertised, parking places cannot be added or moved. However, they can be made shorter or removed entirely. The aim is not to provide parking places to prevent non-residents parking in the area, but to help residents park in their street.	No actions proposed.
	1	Extend parking places as non-residents park in these areas.		
	1	Remove permit place opposite 53 Craiglockhart Terrace to accommodate nature trail walkers.		
Yellow Lines	1	Extend the double yellow line on the outside edge of the corner of Craiglockhart Terrace between 11-12 to opposite the far end of the driveway at no 12 and, on the inside edge of the corner, up to the near end of no 12 driveway.	The proposals do not include any additional yellow lines in the area. It is considered that the current double yellow lines are suitable to provide sufficient sight-lines for motorists and pedestrians.	No actions proposed.
	1	Do not restrict parking with more yellow lines.		
	1	Confusion whether yellow lines will be painted in Meggetland Terrace which I object to.		

1	I commute out of town most days. But if I was ill one day I would have to remember whether or not I parked in a permit space and move the car. I might not find an unrestricted space or be too ill to move the car and then I would be given a heavy fine.	The Priority Parking proposals will have little impact on residents that do not need to park in their street during the day.	No actions proposed.
1	Rarely park in my street during the day.		
1	Number of P&R is increasing and if PP introduced could have serious difficulties.	Should the number of commuters parking in the area continue to increase, this could lead to more residents supporting the proposals to help them park closer to their homes. The proposals do not aim to change the number of vehicles parking in the area, but to better manage the parking of those that do.	No actions proposed.
1	The controlled hours are when it's easiest to park in the street.	It is unlikely that the restricted period will suit every resident but the times were selected to tackle all-day commuter parking and make the best use of the available resources.	No actions proposed.
1	Experience suggests that this has not been a success in other parts of the city - Grange Road.	Grange Road lies within the CPZ and not in a Priority Parking area. It is not suggested which element is considered to be unsuccessful.	No actions proposed.
1	Priority Parking from 9am-5pm.	The Council has previously decided that there will be not new CPZ extensions due to costs and problems created by moving parking pressures to other areas.	No actions proposed.
1	Wants CPZ.		
1	Most of the cars belong to residents and the proposals do nothing to tackle this.	Introducing parking permits based on a vehicle's emissions and introducing high permits for second vehicles aims to encourage residents to consider their travel choices.	No actions proposed.
1	Letter dated 11 November but delivered on 13 November.	It is not necessary to deliver a letter to residents regarding the proposals. However, a letter was delivered near the start of the consultation to inform residents about the proposals and to seek their views. Notices were put up on street, an advert in the press and information online to give residents the full three weeks period to consider the proposals.	No actions proposed.
1	Limiting parking to highlighted areas only will reduce overall parking places by 50%.	The proposals do not limit parking to the highlighted areas only. The possible parking places are marked on the plans with the rest of the kerbside space remaining unrestricted where any motorists can park as the case is now.	No actions proposed.
1	Proposals will limit opportunities for disabled people.	Priority Parking is being considered as residents have told us that there is a lack of parking opportunities during the day. Spaces that are occupied all day by commuters cannot be used by blue badge holders. Blue badge holders can park in limited waiting areas without time limit and may find more opportunities in the permit holders' places during the day.	No actions proposed.

1	The plan is ambiguous and incomplete. It shows the proposed parking spaces but doesn't indicate changes to restrictions on the opposite site of the road. The implication being that parking may be prohibited on either a part-time or full-time basis. This is inference only and the lack of detail makes it impossible to review these proposals in context.	The proposals only include part-time residents' parking places marked on the plan of the area. The areas of kerbside space which are not marked with parking places will remain as they presently area. This was made as clear as possible to residents.	No actions proposed.
1	Proposals will move problems to other streets.	The aim of Priority Parking is to closely match the number of parking places provided with the number of permits purchased to better manage current demands and to prevent problems moving to other areas.	No actions proposed.
1	End up paying and not getting a space which is worse than the current flexibility.	While any parking scheme cannot guarantee residents a parking place, the proposals would give permit holders a priority over other road users during the controlled period whilst retaining that flexibility as they can continue to park in any part of the street.	No actions proposed.
1	Difficult to unload shopping in the street during the day.	The proposals would create places which permit holders have priority over other road users during the controlled period and may create more opportunities at other times of the day to in spaces which were previously occupied all day by commuters.	No actions proposed.
1	Commuters are a problem but so are long-term dumpers.	While the aim of Priority Parking is not to remove all non-residential vehicles from the area it will create places which cannot be used for the long-term parking of vehicles that do not belong to permit holders.	No actions proposed.
1	Craiglockhart Terrace & Meggetland Terrace are different in nature and shouldn't be considered as a package.	It is understood that the character of these two streets is different and Priority Parking allows a flexible approach to be taken in this instance. With proposals being introduced in Craiglockhart Terrace in phase one but parking places in Meggetland Terrace being held until a later phase if necessary.	Hold parking places in Meggetland Terrace until later phase.
1	Will suffer severe inconvenience and difficulties as a result of the proposed scheme.	Priority Parking is designed to have minimal impact on residents whilst still preventing all-day commuters from parking in parts of the area. This resident resides in Meggetland Terrace and parking places in this street will be delayed until a second phase, being introduced only if they are necessary.	No actions proposed.
1	Whoever came up with this scheme has no understanding of the parking issues in the street.	The Council conducted a parking survey, site visit and an informal consultation with local residents to get a better appreciation of the issues. In addition, the proposals were discussed with the local ward members. It is considered that the Council has a good understanding of the issues brought to its attention by local residents.	No actions proposed.

1	Normally spaces available in Craiglockhart Terrace.	Craiglockhart Terrace is a long street and there are likely to be spaces available at some points further along it from Colinton Road. However, many residents are concerned that they cannot park near their homes due to commuter parking pressures.	No actions proposed.
1	I wonder if the 13 people who opposed the plans during the last consultation were from further up Craiglockhart Terrace. The parking situation is very bad in the first part of the street and it is not an option to leave it as it is now.	The previous consultation elicited 13 responses from people who were opposed to the proposals and these ranged from residents living in Craiglockhart Terrace, other streets within the proposed area and others from the wider Lockharton area. The majority of responses received from residents of Craiglockhart Terrace during this consultation are supportive of the proposals.	No actions proposed.
1	10 minutes limited waiting places in Craiglockhart Terrace for nursery.	It is considered that the 30 minutes period will provide sufficient time for parents of children attending the nursery and for other motorists visiting local shops at other times of the day.	No actions proposed.
1	Visitors' permits should be unlimited.	Limiting the number of visitors' permits per household is a demand management tool to ensure that spaces remain available for residents' permit holders and are not being over-used by non-residents.	No actions proposed.
1	Everyone in the street opposes the scheme.	While the majority of residents who have responded to the consultation from Meggetland Terrace have objected, it is not true that everyone opposes the scheme as four have indicated their support.	No actions proposed.
1	This traffic order is highly unintelligible and the wording inaccessible, unless one has a map and compass to hand!	Traffic Orders are legal documents and require to be written in a certain style. However, a clear plan indicating the locations of the parking places is provided along with a letter to residents which explains the proposals in plain English.	No actions proposed.
1	Need a city wide approach to commuter parking pressures to identify wider streets where commuter parking would be suitable.	The Council's Local Transport Strategy is the city-wide approach to commuter parking pressures. However, the best approach is not necessarily to better accommodate commuter vehicles in other parts of the city.	No actions proposed.
1	Introduce pay parking for commuters opposite Craiglockhart Terrace cul-de-sac.	It is unlikely that commuters would use public parking places when there are unrestricted areas in the same street.	No actions proposed.
1	Permits will be costly.	Priority Parking permit prices approximately range from £10-80. The most expensive permit is for a second vehicle in a household and in the highest CO2 band. The average price of a PPA permit is around £30 per year.	No actions proposed.
1	If the scheme goes ahead ensure there are enough spaces for residents and that visitors' permits allow overnight stay.	The aim of Priority Parking is to closely match the number of parking places provided with the number of permits purchased. Visitors' permits only need to be used by non-permit holders using the parking places during the restricted times. Vehicles can park overnight on any part of the road.	No actions proposed.
1	I can't park close enough to my home to walk from my car.	The proposals aim to help residents park closer to their homes during the day which will especially help older people or those with mobility problems.	No actions proposed.

1	Communicate with residents in the Lockhartons.	Residents in the Lockhartons were consulted as part of the informal consultation and the results suggested that they did not support the introduction of parking restrictions in their area. It was therefore, considered appropriate to bring forward	No actions proposed.
1	Extend to the Lockhartons or don't introduce the restrictions at all.		
151			