

# Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Tuesday, 13 January 2015

## Proposed Priority Parking – Murrayfield Area, Edinburgh

Item number	7.9
Report number	
Executive/routine	Executive
Wards	6 – Corstorphine/Murrayfield

### Executive summary

---

At its meeting of 29 October 2013, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report on the progress of Priority Parking schemes across the city.

That report considered the results of the informal consultation process into Priority Parking in Murrayfield, and recommended the commencement of the legal process to introduce a Priority Parking scheme for Murrayfield, but only in those areas where there had been support for the scheme.

The draft order detailing the extent of the scheme was advertised in June 2014, at which point those interested in the scheme were invited to make their views known to the Council.

This report details the results of that consultation and considers the various points made within the received representations. The report further recommends proceeding to make the order and to implement Priority Parking, on a phased basis, in the Murrayfield Area.

### Links

---

#### Coalition pledges

Council outcomes [CO22](#), [CO23](#), [CO24](#) and [CO26](#)

Single Outcome Agreement [SO4](#)

## Proposed Priority Parking – Murrayfield Area, Edinburgh

### Recommendations

---

- 1.1 It is recommended that the Committee:
  - 1.1.1 notes the content of this report;
  - 1.1.2 sets aside the objections to the traffic regulation order and approves the making of the traffic order as advertised; and
  - 1.1.3 approves the phased implementation of the Murrayfield Priority Parking Area.

### Background

---

- 2.1 At its meeting of 29 October 2013, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report providing an update on the progress of ten separate Priority Parking proposals across the city, including Murrayfield.
- 2.2 As one of the first areas to the west of the city centre without parking restrictions, Murrayfield is subject not only to commuter parking related to the city centre, but also to parking from nearby businesses. Following representations from both local residents and the local ward Councillors, Murrayfield was included within the list of areas to be considered for Priority Parking.
- 2.3 An initial consultation with residents, designed to determine whether Priority Parking would be supported, was carried out in March and April 2013. While that exercise showed little support from those parts of the area closest to Ravelston Dykes, support increased significantly in those streets closest to the Glasgow Road. Following discussions with the ward Councillors it was decided to proceed with a Priority Parking scheme that covered only the areas where it could be shown that there was support for parking controls. It was this intention that was reported to Committee as part of 29 October 2013 report.
- 2.4 The initial stages of the legal process to introduce Priority Parking to the revised Murrayfield area began in the autumn of 2013, with the formal consultation taking place in June 2014. This report considers the content of the representations received as a result of that formal consultation and recommends a course of action that reflects the views of those who responded.

## Main report

---

- 3.1 The legal process required to bring into being any traffic order involves several different stages, two of which involve consultative exercises. It is the second stage of consultation where the Council is required to seek the views of the general public. It is at this point in the legal process that the draft traffic order is formally advertised, allowing those who may either be affected by the order, or those who are interested in its' effects, to view and comment upon or object to the full detail of what is proposed.
- 3.2 According to the legislation, local authorities are simply required to consider objections to the draft order. However, rather than seeking only objections, it is normal practice to invite supportive responses from residents when considering permit parking schemes. In doing so, such consultations now encourage both sides to have their say, giving the Council clearer indications of public opinion on the proposals.
- 3.3 The draft order for the Murrayfield Priority Parking scheme was advertised in June 2014. In accordance with the applicable legislation, notices were placed on-street, adverts placed in the local press and copies of all of the relevant documents were placed at the reception in the City Chambers, so that any interested parties could view them.
- 3.4 In addition to the legislative requirements, electronic copies of all of the relevant documents were made available on the Council's website and on the Scottish Government's public information gateway, TellMeScotland.gov.uk. A letter explaining the process and how to make views known to the Council was also delivered to every property within the area affected by the draft order, thereby ensuring that residents and businesses were made aware of the consultation process.
- 3.5 At the end of the twenty one day consultation period the Council had received a total of 278 responses. Of those 186 (67%) indicated that they broadly supported the idea of Priority Parking, while 79 (28%) indicated their opposition to the scheme. A further 14 responses (5%) made comments regarding the proposals which could be classed as neither supporting of nor opposing the proposal. With a total of 700 properties in the area being considered, this represents a significant level of response to a consultation on Priority Parking.

- 3.6 Those in favour of Priority Parking cite difficulties in finding parking places close to their homes as a result of non-residential parking as the main reason for their support. It is apparent from the responses that commuter parking is one cause of those difficulties, alongside local garages and vehicle hire companies in the area who appear to use the surrounding streets as free parking for their vehicles. These uses place additional pressure upon space in an area in which few properties have access to off-street parking. With the majority of residents having no option but to park on-street, access to parking places can be extremely limited.
- 3.7 The opposition that exists is most apparent in streets, or parts of streets, furthest from the Glasgow Road. Many of those opposed to Priority Parking object on the grounds that they consider that the measures are unnecessary, or that they will provide no benefit (57 instances). There is little doubt that parking pressures reduce away from the Glasgow Road and that the comments made by those residents are entirely valid. However, there is equally little doubt that much of the Murrayfield area is subject to parking pressures. Priority Parking represents an effective, and proven, means of managing demand for space and addressing parking pressures.
- 3.8 The topics which elicited the greatest number of responses, and which are directly related to Priority Parking, are indicated and discussed below:

#### **Displacement**

- 3.9 The issue of displacement featured in 40 responses, with respondents concerned that Priority Parking would merely move parking problems elsewhere. For displacement to other areas to occur, the area covered by Priority Parking must have reached its capacity and/or that there are other, more attractive alternatives to finding a space outwith the Priority Parking Area. In choosing area boundaries it is imperative that there is unused space in each Priority Parking Area to accommodate any redistribution of parking that might occur. The area covered by the proposed Murrayfield Priority Parking scheme includes streets with the capacity to allow that redistribution.

The method of implementation adopted is also designed to minimise the potential for migration. An initial phase of implementation, based on consultation responses, will typically introduce no more than 50% of the total parking provision. Subsequent monitoring of permit uptake and bay usage will determine where, and to what extent, further parking provision is required. Experience of implementing other Priority Parking schemes has shown that this approach has been successful in delivering schemes that meet the needs of those who want to use them, without moving parking pressures to new areas.

Priority Parking is designed and implemented to reduce the potential for migration outwith the Priority Parking area. It is, however, accepted that parking within Priority Parking areas will become more evenly distributed. As a result, some less busy streets within the area may experience some increase in parking.

### **Phasing**

- 3.10 Sixty nine responses indicated that they wished to see all of the proposed phases introduced together, or expressed concern at the levels of priority parking proposed in the first phase.

The aim of the phased approach is to ensure that we provide the right number of spaces in the correct locations. A single implementation of all spaces would ignore locations where there was less support and could result in an overprovision of space and a subsequent displacement of non-residential parking to other streets and other areas. Phasing allows the Council to get the balance right, providing spaces where they are needed and supported. It also helps to ensure that Priority Parking meets its aims of addressing parking pressures without impacting on other areas. However, the proposed extent of the first phase of implementation will be reassessed in light of the recent consultation in order to ensure that parking provision reflects the consultation results. The overall aim will be to provide sufficient space for every resident who needs to park on-street during the day and chooses to obtain a permit.

### **Hours of Operation**

- 3.11 Forty two responses indicated concern related to the proposed hours of operation, or the length of time proposed to be controlled. There is additional concern that some users might be able to work around the controlled period by returning to move their vehicle.

The purpose of Priority Parking is to prevent long-stay parking, such as; commuter, holiday maker or other non-residents from parking without restriction in residential areas. A short controlled period of time, once a day, effectively requires such parking to occur outwith the controlled spaces, regardless of when that period of control occurs. This creates parking opportunities for residents that did not previously exist. To achieve this aim, it is not necessary to control the parking places for an extended period of time or to have more than one period of control. Priority Parking successfully operates under this same model in five other areas, with a further three areas having been introduced in November 2014. Experience in the existing Priority Parking areas indicates that the incidence of motorists returning to move their vehicle is either non-existent or very low. With unrestricted spaces freely available, it is anticipated that non-residential parking will take place in these areas.

## **Cost**

- 3.12 Forty nine responses cited cost as a reason for objection, in terms of payment for permits, cost of implementation or the relationship between permit prices and vehicle emissions.

It has always been the case that those who benefit from resident's permit schemes are expected to contribute towards their operation. Priority Parking has been designed as a low cost solution to parking pressures, with permit prices that reflect the hours of enforcement. While the cost of permits does contribute towards the costs incurred by the Council, the operation of the permit scheme is heavily subsidised from other income streams. Priority Parking is also low cost in terms of the cost of implementation, with schemes typically costing under £25,000. This compares favourably against the introduction of full Controlled Parking Zone control, where costs have historically been significantly higher. In terms of linking permit prices to emissions, the Council decided that, in order to encourage residents to consider their choice of vehicle, that permit prices should reflect the impact that vehicles have on the environment.

- 3.13 Full details of the all of the responses received and an appraisal of their content can be found in Appendix 1 to this report. Appendix 2 indicates the origin of each of the responses received.

## **Conclusion**

- 3.14 It is readily apparent that the majority of support for Priority Parking is from those living closest to the Glasgow Road, where the pressures created by commuter and business parking are most prevalent. There is significantly less support from those properties further away from Glasgow Road. Even though parking surveys confirm that parking pressures lessen in severity away from the Glasgow Road, it would simply not be possible to restrict Priority Parking to one part of the Murrayfield, as parking pressures would simply migrate to other streets within the area.
- 3.15 Priority Parking does, however, afford the opportunity to match on-street provision within a first phase of implementation to the level of support from residents. Through careful monitoring of permit uptake, parking usage and parking pressures, the subsequent phases of implementation can be used to ensure that the right balance of controlled and uncontrolled parking is achieved.
- 3.16 This in-built flexibility in the way that Priority Parking is implemented also means that it is possible to tailor the parking on-street with the actual demand.

- 3.17 On the basis of the level of support for Priority Parking in the consultation it is recommended that the Council proceeds with implementation. However, in light of comments received about the level of Priority Parking provision in the first phase and to mitigate the risk of parking pressures being displaced to other areas, it is proposed to review the number and location of parking places in Phase 1. It is anticipated that the number of spaces and the size of the area to be included in Phase 1 will increase. The aim of this exercise will be to ensure that the scheme meets the needs and expectations of those residents who have shown their support for Priority Parking in their area.
- 3.18 It remains the case that Priority Parking is proving to be an effective parking management tool and that experience elsewhere suggests that it is not only improving parking conditions for residents, but that it is also proving effective at containing parking pressures within the affected areas.
- 3.19 With phasing of implementation remaining a key element in ensuring that the right level of parking provision is delivered in the right locations it is imperative that this method of implementation continue to be the standard approach.

### **Measures of success**

---

- 4.1 Improved availability of parking for residents, visitors and businesses in the area.
- 4.2 An improved quality of life for those living within the Murrayfield area.
- 4.3 Better management of where non-residential parking can take place.

### **Financial impact**

---

- 5.1 The costs associated with the introduction of Priority Parking places within the Murrayfield area will be met from within existing Parking Operations budgets.

### **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 negative equalities impacts arising from this report.

- 7.2 It is anticipated that the introduction of Priority Parking will improve accessibility for residents, businesses and visitors to the area and that this will provide enhancements in terms of Individual, Family and Social Life, Age and Disability by helping people to park closer to their destinations or their homes.
- 7.3 Priority Parking, as a means of improving accessibility for residents and visitors to areas otherwise blighted by non-residential parking, will assist residents to participate in public life. As a scheme which improves access for all residents and visitors, Priority Parking will help to minimise the disadvantage for people with mobility difficulties or those with children. Priority Parking ensures that there is an equality of opportunity for all residents.

## 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 impact on carbon emissions;
  - The proposals in this report are not expected to impact on the city's resilience to climate change impacts; and
  - The proposals in this report are not expected to impact on social justice, economic wellbeing or the city's environmental good stewardship.
- 8.2 It is possible that some of the proposals that might evolve out of the investigative work outlined in this report could have beneficial impacts on carbon emissions. These will be considered in greater detail when the detailed proposals are reported to Committee.

## Consultation and engagement

---

- 9.1 The proposals contained within this report have been brought forward following consideration of the results of an informal consultation with residents and businesses within the Murrayfield area and discussions with the local elected members for the Corstorphine/Murrayfield ward.
- 9.2 This report contains the results of a further consultation, carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999 in relation to a traffic order promoted under the terms of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. This consultation consisted of the legislative requirements related to the advertisement of the proposals, but also included placement of the proposal details on the Council's website, on [www.tellmesotland.gov.uk](http://www.tellmesotland.gov.uk) and the delivery of a letter explaining the consultative process to every address within the area affected by the proposal.



9.3 The views of the elected members for the Murrayfield Ward on the results of the latest consultation were sought in the preparation of this report. The responses received indicated that the report and its recommendations provided positive news on a proposal with high levels of local interest. All of the ward members indicated that they were supportive of the intention to proceed to implement the scheme.

## Background reading/external references

---

None.

### John Bury

Acting Director of Services for Communities

Contact: Andrew MacKay, Traffic Orders and Project Development Officer

E-mail: [a.mackay@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:a.mackay@edinburgh.gov.uk) | Tel: 0131 469 3577

## 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>CO24</b> – The Council communicates effectively internally and externally and has an excellent reputation for customer care. <b>CO26</b> – The Council engages with stakeholders and works in partnership to improve services and deliver on agreed objectives.
<b>Single Outcome Agreement</b>	<b>SO4</b> – Edinburgh’s communities are safer and have improved physical and social fabric.
<b>Appendices</b>	Appendix 1 – Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses Appendix 2 – Murrayfield Formal Consultation – Responses by Street

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Causes of issues	Commuter parking problems	108	The main aim of Priority Parking is to help residents park closer to their homes during the day. By introducing a part-time residents' permit scheme with parking places which operate for 90 minutes during the day, it is intended to give permit holders priority over all-day and commuter parking in their area. Even controlling spaces for a short period will have the effect of preventing motorists from leaving their vehicle in the parking places all day.
	Car dealership problems - suggested between 10-26 vehicles park on-street each day	60	
	Airport parkers	55	
	Long-term parking problems from holiday makers	43	
	Business and commercial vehicles park in the area	16	
	Cannot park close to the house when I have young children and groceries to carry	14	
	Problems created by people visiting the church	11	
	Problems caused by school staff parking	5	
	Congestion from trade vehicles	3	
	People use the area as a permanent parking solution for their cars and then swap them for another	3	
	Wedding or funeral vehicles unable to park outside the church in Abinger Gardens	2	
	Cannot park near or within 200m of my home	2	
	Parking is difficult in the evening and at weekends to	2	
	Too many resident's cars to allow people to park outside their homes, the scheme will have no effect	2	
	Abinger Gardens used as a Park and Ride by commuters	2	
Parking opportunities are very limited in this street	1		
Often unable to park in Murrayfield Gardens as people use it as a P&R	1		
Abinger Gardens worse street affected as it's closest to main road.	1		
Phased approach	Introduce phase 1 and phase 2 at same time, it will take longer and cost more to do so separately	69	The phasing in the initial plan was largely indicative. The actual phasing will reflect the results of the consultation. More parking places can be included in phase 1 where there is greater support for them. The aim is to closely match the number of permits purchased to available spaces and a second phase, a couple of weeks after implementation, may be required to ensure this. The costs are the same whether the work is completed in one or two phases.
	There is no guarantee that there is the desire, commitment or funding to implement the second phase	2	
	Murrayfield Gardens, Phase 1, has Priority Spaces adjacent to 19 houses which is a very low percentage of the total and well below the overall 55% support in the preliminary Consultation. On the other hand, Phase 2 is shown as having almost 100% of the kerbline	2	
	Extend phase 1 to our house	1	
	Include Coltbridge Terrace in phase 1	1	
	The proposed scale of phase 1 is laughable	1	
The first phase does not provide enough space so we will have to tour the neighbourhood looking for somewhere to park.	1		



Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Approach	Can unrestricted spaces be kept further away from the A8 to make them unpopular with non-residents and can a time limit be put on these places?	23	Parking places would be introduced where they will be used by residents and many will likely be near Corstorphine Road where the support is. The rest of the kerbside space will remain unrestricted without a time limit.
Cause	Rugby International problems Problems during Hearts football matches.	18 3	Temporary traffic restrictions ensure public safety during such events.
Displacement	Displacement to other areas Parking controls will merely move problems somewhere else Concerned about displacement to the north of Murrayfield Drive Restrictions will move problems further west If priority parking is put into Marrayfield Avenue and Gardens this will affect Murrayfield Drive. Every time restrictions are introduced, motorists find the next unrestricted area, nearest the City Centre. Worried about displacement into Stair Park Kingsburgh Road has no parking problems but phase 1 will displace problems from other streets The proposals would make Campbell Avenue an obvious target for further commuter parking Increased parking on the kerbside would increase the danger in Campbell Avenue as it's a rat run Proposals will increase vehicles parking in Campbell Avenue Proposals will force park and riders to use streets outside of the Priority Parking area If restrictions cause migration to Coltbridge Gardens then appropriate measures should be introduced.	21 3 3 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	The aim of Priority Parking is to prevent the migration of parking problems to other areas. Priority Parking works in areas with some spare capacity so that pressures are spread more evenly throughout the area by managing some of the available kerbside space. A phased approach would also help to ensure that we get the balance of controlled to uncontrolled spaces right which reduces the potential displacement of problems to other areas.
West Coates	The Council triggered congestion and the current requests by introducing controls in West Coates Difficult to understand why West Coates is a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) with few parked residents while Murrayfield has virtually no off-street parking does not have had this option. Why is this? Remove Wester Coates restrictions to alleviate some pressure on Murrayfield From a revenue perspective putting meters in Wester Coates was disastrous for EDC – as these streets are now empty! Introduce nine hour parking places in Wester Coates to reduce the pressure on our streets.	14 5 4 1 1	West Coates suffered from commuter parking problems and was included in the CPZ. Problems have moved and Priority Parking aims to tackle this. The CPZ was not financial and prior to its introduction parking was free. There are 9 hour parking places in Wester Coates Road.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Causes	<p>Unrestricted parking on both sides of Abinger Gardens causes residents some distress when considering access for emergency service vehicles</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to shape local services as part of the Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012. You must ensure adequate parking provision to reduce its impact on response times. I expect you will be conducting and publishing a risk assessment for Abinger Gardens as part of the consultation process. This should take into account time required for getting a 3.7 metre wide fire appliance and other emergency services vehicles to Abinger Gardens during normal working hours and also considers the ease of movement within the area for the emergency services to carry out their duties.</p> <p>Remove parking from opposite 2-4 Murrayfield Gardens as the road is too narrow when cars are parked on both sides for emergency service vehicles to pass. It is also a busy school crossing point.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Managing response times is generally the responsibility of the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service. The Council works closely with the emergency services to ensure that access is maintained around the city. As a statutory consultee, the SFRS is consulted on each TRO proposed and in this case no negative comments were received from them.</p>
Costs	<p>Don't want to pay for me, visitors or trades people to park outside my home</p> <p>Unreasonable to ask residents to pay to park outside their homes, permits should be free</p> <p>It is unfair to pay for visitors to park when they don't have a problem either</p> <p>Charging for parking in our residential area is immoral and unnecessary</p> <p>I feel that as a tax payer I already pay sufficiently for parking</p> <p>The price for a parking permit is excessive even at £30</p> <p>The permit price is too high at £82 a year, there should be a max price of £30 per year for pensioners</p> <p>Permits should be free to residents. The Council will make money by issuing parking tickets so none of the costs of introducing this should be born by the residents.</p> <p>Permit fees should be set so that they meet the costs of running the zone over the longer term. They should not be an excuse for Edinburgh Council to collect more revenue to meet shortfalls elsewhere. It is possible that many residents who reject the proposal do so because they do not trust Edinburgh Council to act in the best interests of the people who actually elect them.</p> <p>All households on the street should be given a small number of free parking vouchers each year.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Parking places would only be introduced where there is support and where they will be used. Other areas would remain unrestricted and can be used by any motorist. The Council covers implementation costs but residents would be asked to contribute towards running costs. Permit income doesn't cover all the running costs so prices would need to increase significantly to do so, permits are not priced to collect revenue. Prices range from £10 to £82 (for a high polluting second car in a household) per year, but the average permit price is expected to be around £30.</p>
Cleansing	<p>Parking on south of Abinger Gardens prevents street cleaning and contributes to flooding</p> <p>Lack of weeding, leave clearing &amp; drain unblocking in area</p> <p>Difficult for refuse collection vehicles to access Upper Coltbridge Terrace.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Temporary restrictions can be used for street cleaning. We have not received any complaints from Waste Services regarding lack of access in this area.</p>

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Approach	<p>The scheme doesn't go far enough and the hours should be extended</p> <p>Include a morning period</p> <p>Hours of control are insufficient</p> <p>Change restrictions to 12 to 2 or 3pm to prevent part-time commuters and shoppers having free parking</p> <p>To get the full benefit of Priority Parking the controlled period should be 11am to 2pm</p> <p>The restricted times are too limited - two periods of control</p> <p>Extend controlled period from 10am to 3pm between Mon-Sat</p> <p>Wants an afternoon period of control</p> <p>Change restricted period to 12 to 2pm</p> <p>Restricting parking between 1.30 to 3pm just seems silly</p> <p>Extend controlled period from 1.30 to 4pm</p> <p>The times will not deter short-term parkers and 1.30 to 3.00pm will have no impact on school pick-up</p> <p>Extend the restricted period until 5pm to cover school parking</p> <p>Limited controlled period will be of little benefit to residents</p> <p>If a CPZ can't be introduced then the controlled period must be in the morning 10 to 11.30am</p> <p>Extend proposals along all of Kingsburgh Road (particularly at crossroads with Ormidale Terrace) and extend from 9 to 11am and 4 to 6pm, similar to bus lanes</p> <p>Bring forward hours of control to 10 to 11.30am</p> <p>Make the controlled period all-day.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>5</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The proposed operating times cannot be changed once a TRO has been advertised. To make such changes it would be necessary to start a new TRO process. However, it is evident that there are differing views on what the optimal time period should be. It is considered that one controlled period, at any time of the day will have the same impact on all-day and commuter parking as a longer period of control or multiple phases would have.</p>
Impact	<p>Parking restrictions result in more signs to the detriment of the existing street scape</p> <p>I seek assurances that the area will not become a forest of poles such as the Orchard Road scheme. There are sufficient lamp posts to put parking signs on</p> <p>Our houses are C listed yet it is proposed that poles and machines will be put in</p> <p>Seen the effect of restricted parking in Orchard Brae and signs and markings are out of proportion of the benefits. Detract from area's character</p> <p>Proposals will have a negative impact on suburban environment and amenity.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Orchard Brae is in the CPZ. In Priority Parking all the kerbside space doesn't need to be controlled and the number of new signs and poles will be minimised. Existing street furniture will be used where possible and we will seek permission from residents to attach signs to their property. No ticket machines will be introduced.</p>
Traffic	<p>Rat running on Abinger Gardens</p> <p>Damage to vehicles caused by through traffic and vehicles parking on both sides</p> <p>Stop lorries rat running in Succoth Gardens especially during school times.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Overall traffic management is outwith the scope of these proposals but this will be reported to the Local Roads Office.</p>

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Coltbridge Terr	Problems driving along Coltbridge Terrace create a passing place with double yellow lines Make Coltbridge Terrace one-way north bound, there are no passing places.	6 5	Driveways can act as passing places but making it easier to drive along the street may encourage more traffic to use it or at greater speeds. This will be reported to Local Roads Office.
	Introduce parking places on north side of Coltbridge Terrace to allow more space for vehicles to pass.	4	
Controlled Parking Zone	CPZ to remove all parked cars from the area. CPZ would be preferable Extend the time from 8 to 5.30pm, Monday to Saturday. Control the whole area for two hours per day. Introduce more parking places by restricting the entire street. The area including Garscube Terrace, Coltbridge Terrace, Henderland Road, Murrayfield Avenue and Succoth Place should have similar controls to Wester Coates. This is a first step towards introducing full residents parking, which the council needs to generate income after the overspend of the tram project.	5 4 4 2 2 1 1	CPZs are expensive to introduce and operate. On this basis, the Council has decided that there should be no further CPZ introduced. However, Priority Parking is a low-cost solution to address residents' concerns and help them park closer to their homes during the day. There are no plans to replace Priority Parking areas with CPZ and this is not related to the Tram.
Costs	It seems another way for the Council to make money after Tram shortfall Unnecessary expense for the Council and residents Waste of money Cost and hassle of having permits Tax payer will carry a further burden from Attendants, lines and administration - the cost of the trams is enough.	5 2 2 2 1	This proposal is not linked to the Tram project and a clear majority of residents who responded to the consultation are in favour of the scheme. The price of permits is lower than in the CPZ and the application process is relatively straight forward.
Cause	Difficult to exit my driveway.	4	Priority Parking is not designed to improve access but parts of the scheme may help.
Abinger Gardens	Abinger Gardens should be treated as a special case Wants no parking on south side of Abinger Gardens and full CPZ on north Road safety concern when parents have to park on garden side of Abinger Gardens Introduce both phases in Abinger Gardens at once All of the north side of Abinger Gardens should be controlled along with parts of the south side A better solution for Abinger Gardens is a full permit restriction for residents only. It will be enforced, cost the council less and result in increased revenues from permits.	5 4 1 1 1 1	The results of the public consultation in each street will be considered on its own merits. There are no plans to extend the CPZ. There are no plans to remove parking entirely from one side as this would move pressures elsewhere. The aim is to provide enough spaces for residents who need and want to park on the street during the day.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Impact	There would not be any real benefit of controls for residents.	4	A majority of respondents support the controls and believe they will benefit them.
	Priority parking will encourage others to create driveways, changing the character of the street and impacting on property prices More driveways will increase the danger of flooding.	4 1	Priority Parking is a much cheaper alternative to help residents park near their homes than introducing a driveway. Those who do not want to participate in the scheme can park in unrestricted areas.
Consultation	I don't think 13 residents constitutes a majority. The figures indicate that too many people are against this to go ahead. The opinions of a hundred or so residents, where many thousands live, would not in my opinion constitute a valid basis for proceeding further. Does 'informal consultation' not mean that no action can take place until a 'formal' notice has been approved for action to be taken? I do not understand how Committee approved the start of the legal process before the formal consultation took place. Only 11% of residents indicated they agree with Priority Parking. Surely you need to be certain for the sake of the other 89%. The vote in the informal consultation was close, 135 to 122. This does not represent a clear and unequivocal majority justifying your decision to impose restrictions. The decision to proceed with a second consultation is wrong as you have skewed the numbers to enable you to proceed.	4 1 1 1 1	Each resident had the opportunity to participate in the informal consultation and the Council made the decision based on the responses we received. 13 more residents supported the proposals than opposed them and this constitutes a valid majority. This number included all the responses and the margin in favour increased when the north-west area was removed from the proposals, as many of these residents opposed the introduction of controls. The results of the formal consultation will determine whether the scheme proceeds or not.
Visitor	Important that visitors can park without restriction.	3	Visitors could park in unrestricted areas free of charge or with visitors' permits.
Detail	Objects to free area around my house.	3	Parking places could be added through a separate TRO process. However, available places within the current TRO would be introduced first, if required.
Cause	Residents' overnight parking close to saturation Solving weekend and over night problems will require seven day restrictions and two time bands, for example 8 to 10am and 4 to 6pm.	3 1	There may be more residents' vehicles over night than can be accommodated but it is not the aim of Priority Parking to address this.



Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Method	I'm not paying for a permit which may aggravate the current position.	3	Unrestricted areas would remain so that residents do not have to buy a permit if they choose not to.
Detail	<p>The area outside the church should not be for their exclusive use but should be Priority parking</p> <p>Pay-and-display outside the Church was never mentioned before but it should have been. There must be a public meeting on this and the failure to include it leaves this process open to legal challenge.</p> <p>A cynic might suggest that public parking outside the church greatly benefits their commercial activities</p> <p>It surely cannot be part of the Council's plan to facilitate the commercial activities of the church at the expense of residents who are both electors and Council Tax payers?</p> <p>The street can get busy during the day, but this is due to events at the Church. This is mostly mothers with young children or frail people with dementia who would be adversely affected by having to park far away from the Hall. This serves an important social need and many volunteers are elderly and come by car. We are concerned Priority Parking would adversely affect social and community events.</p> <p>The church provides health clinics for babies, imagine new Mums having to find a space and money for it then getting the wee ones to the clinic. There are clubs supporting pensioners which need free parking.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>There is a separate process ongoing to introduce limited waiting parking which is free of charge near the church. The limited waiting places could be used by anyone visiting the area and are not for the sole use of church visitors. Preventing commuters from parking outside the church could provide better parking opportunities for such users and also remove their impact on parking outside of residents' homes. Parking is provided for visitors outside many other public buildings in the city centre.</p>
Causes	<p>Proposals will increase the volume of traffic and they ignore speed safety</p> <p>Road safety in Abinger Gardens. It's a family street with young children and safety is compromised by traffic, parking on both sides and rat runners. Generally cars drive too fast, often damaging cars.</p> <p>The 20mph speed limit in Murrayfield Avenue is ignored by vehicles coming from Corstorphine Road.</p> <p>Elderly, school children and dog walkers cross here and I'm amazed there hasn't been an accident. The lollypop lady only works restricted hours. I've written to the Council several times but received no reply.</p> <p>The junction needs a stop sign and a traffic officer to enforce. Children are scared to cross the road.</p> <p>Cars travel very quickly on Coltbridge Avenue - sleeping policemen are needed to slow traffic down</p> <p>Parking in Succoth Gardens makes traffic obey the 20 mph limit. Your proposals will turn our streets into a highway like Ravelston Dykes.</p> <p>Motorists will be confused about where to park and will drive off again at speed.</p> <p>If the south of Murrayfield Drive has fewer parked cars, traffic speed will increase.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The main aim of Priority Parking is to address commuter parking concerns. It does not propose to remove all parking from the area but to manage it better and provide more parking opportunities for residents. It is recognised that parked cars can help to reduce traffic speeds and road markings may add to this effect. Enforcement of speed limits is a matter for Police Scotland and the Council is considering a city-wide 20mph area.</p>
Signs	Not suitable for HGV sign ignored for Coltbridge Terrace.	2	This is an advisory sign for HGV drivers and the Council have no powers to enforce it.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
White lines	<p>The road markings in Garscube Terrace are in a poor state of repair. The markings outside property entrances and driveways are not visible at all and need redone.</p> <p>Vehicles park across driveways as there are no white access protection markings, repaint them and introduce signs.</p> <p>I have a drive in Coltbridge Terrace. However, when cars park on either side and across the road, it's very difficult to access. People are ignorant of the legal requirement that the body of the car should not cross the reserved area – they think it applies to the wheels (I realise that white lines are very dubious legally). I hope more generous “white lines” are applied.</p>	2 2 2	<p>Access Protection Markings (APM) are not part of the Priority Parking proposals. Such requests should be made to the Local Roads Team. To comply with legislation APMS should extend no more than 1m beyond the dropped kerb and there are no prescribed signs which the Council can use in such circumstances.</p>
Speed	<p>The sharp bend at the top of Murrayfield Avenue is often approached too fast by vehicles travelling to Roseburn. The problem is worse when vehicles are parked on the north-east corner. Introduce double yellow lines around the corner and a SLOW sign on the approach.</p> <p>Speed Humps</p>	2 2	<p>Murrayfield Avenue and Succoth Gardens have speed humps near this junction. Double yellow lines may increase vehicle speed as drivers could see round the bend better. However, the Council is proposing a city wide 20mph area which does not include physical calming measures.</p>
Other	<p>There is a vehicle with a large storage trailer permanently parked in Garscube Terrace.</p>	2	<p>The Council has no powers to remove correctly taxed and road worthy vehicles from the road.</p>
Impact	<p>Daytime commuters will park in Priority spaces if they can organize their affairs so that they will not be in such spaces between 1.30pm and 3.00pm and will put pressure on residents during the unrestricted period especially the mornings when pressure is greatest.</p>	2	<p>It is likely that commuters would park in unrestricted areas leaving the parking places available for residents.</p>
Cause	<p>Double parking problems.</p>	2	<p>The Council has no powers to tackle double parking. This should be reported to Police Scotland.</p>
Consultation	<p>Your Statement of Reasons states this scheme is only valid for the Priestfield Area. I request the termination of the formal consultation. Your start and completion dates need revised and you should notify everyone of this. It affects the validity of the Order otherwise it looks as if you made the whole result up.</p>	2	<p>This was a clerical error. The draft Order and map indicated this regarded the Murrayfield area. It does not suggest the results were incorrect.</p>

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Approach	The scheme adds unnecessary complexity without any discernible benefits to residents.	2	The scheme is straight forward and aims to help residents park closer to their homes during the day.
Costs	<p>Already pay a penalty through road tax there is no justification for extra sums when parking is zero emission.</p> <p>Pricing based on CO2 emissions is iniquitous. If the objective is to reduce vehicle emissions this is already covered by vehicle excise duty.</p> <p>Disagree with permit fees linked to CO2. Cars mainly take up the same amount of space. A parked car emits no CO2. A low emission car with high mileage will produce more CO2 than a low mileage car with higher emissions. This doesn't take into account the manufacturing process emissions. If your aim is to decrease car use, the incentive is already targeted by high fuel taxes which directly correlate to use.</p> <p>Variable permit charges have no correlation with use. This looks like a tax raising exercise.</p> <p>It is not the responsibility of Edinburgh council to tax car owners on emissions. That is the role of the UK government through the DVLA. Car owners are already taxed based on emissions, it is unnecessary and greedy to tax them again. If we must pay for permits please make them affordable.</p> <p>It is discriminatory and unfair, you are charging people who bought cars before parking restrictions are implemented and have no choice of whether they are imposed or not. Why should some residents of Edinburgh be taxed and others not? It is especially unfair when you consider that we pay the highest council tax in Edinburgh.</p> <p>I object that permit cost is based on CO2 emissions – this is discrimination to users of expensive cars who live in expensive houses – not fair at all.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Permit prices are not linked to vehicle excise duty. The Council can introduce a charging structure based on CO2 emissions to pursue local policies such as to encourage the use of more environmentally friendly vehicles, ensure residents consider their personal travel options and improve local air quality. When the proposals were introduced they were cost neutral and the average price of a Priority Parking permit is expected to be around £30 per year. This is more affordable than a CPZ permit would be. Motorists may have purchased their vehicle before the effects of climate change were recognised, but it is not discriminatory to question the continued use of such vehicles in the city.</p>
Costs	I have an older car with a large engine and permit charges puts a penalty on me when I drive less than others and this is never taken into consideration.	2	A system which measures a vehicle's use would require significant administration and regular mileage checks. An older vehicle may be driven less, but it may emit more pollution and harmful particulates, than newer vehicles do, even when driven less.
Detail	Keep end-on parking on west side of Murrayfield Avenue.	2	There are no plans to change the way vehicles park in Murrayfield Avenue.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Detail	Majority of residents park on north side of Coltbridge Terrace because of the unfavourable camber on the side next to the houses. The two sides are not equal and this is important in winter when the grip may not be so great.	2	Parking places are generally located outside residential properties. Permit holders could still park in unrestricted areas on the north of the street.
Yellow lines	<p>Yellow lines on entrance to Stair Park</p> <p>Yellow lines around corners to prevent inconsiderate parking near school</p> <p>Requests DYL at entrance to Upper Coltbridge Terrace</p> <p>Large vehicles have problems accessing Coltbridge Avenue &amp; Gardens - extend DYLS</p> <p>Double yellow line entire west side of Succoth Avenue</p> <p>Introduce double yellow lines on junctions between Murrayfield Gardens, Ormidale Terrace, Murrayfield Drive and Kingsburgh Road</p> <p>Promised new double yellow or red lines on Upper Coltbridge Terrace</p> <p>Unsafe parking will occur in unmarked corners</p> <p>Stair Park difficult for emergency service vehicles to access</p> <p>Double yellow line the small space between the drives of 10 and 12 Coltbridge Terrace</p> <p>No need for double yellow lines round the corners of Ormidale Terrace and Kingsburgh Road.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The Priority Parking proposal does not include any yellow lines and a to introduce such restrictions a new TRO would be required. It is our intention to note all the suggested locations and as part of a monitoring phase, should the scheme proceed, to investigate the need for restrictions at each location. The lengths of yellow lines will be determined on an individual basis but the minimum required would always be introduced.</p>
Approach	<p>There should be rigorous patrolling and enforcement during the hours of restriction</p> <p>How the scheme will be enforced? Will there be dedicated traffic wardens to enforce during this 2 hr period? If not, then it will be ignored and we will be back to square one, having paid for the privilege.</p> <p>I do not want Parking Attendants cruising round the area.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Parking Attendants will enforce the restrictions to ensure that residents benefit from them. Their presence would be similar to Royal Mail delivering the post.</p>
Priority Parking	<p>Reject the proposals as I don't think they will resolve short or long term problems</p> <p>The proposals do not go far enough to address the chronic parking situation in Abinger Gardens</p> <p>Your proposal does not seem to be competent. Perhaps this is no surprise as it comes from the Council who foisted the ridiculous trams on the population.</p> <p>If you wish to help residents park closer to their homes or prevent commuter parking - you will fail.</p> <p>Proposals will not solve the problems.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Priority Parking has been introduced in a number of areas elsewhere in Edinburgh and the available evidence including feedback received from residents suggests that it does help to make parking easier.</p>

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Causes	Elderly parents visit less as they cannot park close by.	1	Priority Parking intends to create more parking opportunities for visitors by preventing commuters using the parking places all day.
	Poor parking on south side of Abinger Gardens prevents vehicles passing or exiting spaces on north side Bad parking on corners in Succoth Place Vehicles park too close to corner of Ravelston Dykes and Garscube Terrace Residents are forced to park dangerously to get near their homes.	1 1 1 1	Parking places will manage the manner of parking better in some areas. Creating more parking opportunities is expected to reduce inconsiderate parking.
	Parents dropping-off or collecting children wait in their cars with the engine running for long periods Increased traffic for 10-15 years resulting in air pollution High levels of pollution in Abinger Gardens.	1 1 1	This has been reported to the Council's Environmental Wardens and Air Quality Teams.
	Non-residents parking drop litter.	1	This has been reported to the Council's Environmental Wardens.
	Abinger Gardens couldn't be gritted last winter as non-residents had abandoned cars when on holiday.	1	Abinger Gardens is not a priority gritting route and resources are focused on principle routes first. It's unlikely that parked vehicles had any impact on this.
	Road safety - all day commuters will still arrive in the mornings but there is likely to be increased traffic as vehicles move around these streets searching for remaining unrestricted spaces. This is particularly dangerous as children are walking to school. There are already many children coming by car creating congestion at drop-off time. There are several places within the area to improve road safety - at the junction of Murrayfield Ave/Murrayfield Place remove badly parked cars. Difficult to park on pavement side of street in Abinger Gardens and get children into the house safely.	1 1 1	The proposals would not remove all non-residential parking from the area. The aim is to provide enough spaces to meet the demand from permit holders, who will already park in the street nearer their homes. Separate measures are being considered for road safety reasons.
	Non-residents sell car on the street in this area.	1	The Council has no powers to stop individuals selling cars from the road.
	People going to the Zoo.	1	The zoo is a significant distance away from this area and it is unlikely to contribute, to a great extent, to the number of vehicles parking in this area.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Consultation	<p>Attended previous meeting and assumed people were against so I didn't write in. I didn't respond to the initial informal consultation, as I was against the proposals and hoped they would go away. The residents I spoke to are not aware of the importance to reply! A door to door survey would give a better indication. It is nonsense that we should have to make a second representation at a second consultation and that previous comments will not count.</p>	<p>1 1 1 1</p>	<p>A letter was delivered to every household in the area stressing the importance of responding, even if they had done so before. The informal consultation was to gauge opinion, before more detailed and time-consuming work was started, which would be irrelevant if residents did not support the proposals. It also helped inform possible parking place locations.</p>
	<p>Your selected consultation period is unacceptable in the middle of the summer holiday. What authority do you have to limit the consultation and why have you chosen this particular period? I formally request that it be extended and/or delayed.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The consultation period ran in June 2014 prior to the Edinburgh schools summer holidays. There is a minimum three weeks period for objections which is typically for a consultation of this nature.</p>
	<p>The Order documents do not contain anything like the relevant information for residents to be properly informed so that they can make a proper assessment as to the scheme being proposed.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The main aim of the consultation is to ask residents if they find it a problem to park in their street and whether they would like Priority Parking to be introduced to help them park closer to their home. There is nothing more complex required to respond than along those lines and any further information needed is available on request.</p>
	<p>There should be another consultation after 1 or 2 years to see if residents want to continue with the arrangement.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>It is not intended to have another consultation in a few years.</p>
	<p>97% of residents in Ormidale Terrace support the scheme.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>A petition was received which indicated that many of the residents in Ormidale Terrace supported the scheme.</p>

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Consultation	<p>The Council should have made it very clear that the informal consultation would depend on how the voting went. This was not the case. In my view the Council has wanted this all along. This is sham bit of democracy.</p> <p>What percentage of the total possible household voting roll was 263? I suggest under 10%. Who counted or assessed the votes? The Council. Again a sham of a democracy.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The aim of any consultation, is to find out the level of support for a proposal and if it should be stopped for any reason. In this case, the majority of respondents supported the introduction of parking controls and no reasons were raised to prevent the scheme from proceeding. The results of the informal consultation were reported to Committee in October 2013; 263 responses were received from 244 properties which represent 19% of the households in the area. The results are accurate and valid.</p>
Approach	<p>It looks as if the initial take up of Permits may influence the number of spaces allocated so the Council must explain the process to determine space allocation in Murrayfield Gardens; the concern is that people who have paid for permits may find there are insufficient spaces available – what categorical assurances will the Council provide here?</p> <p>Long term parking would be prevented in Murrayfield Gardens if the only available parking is priority usage but they would probably move to other parts of the area where there were fewer spaces. Not a real solution overall!</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The aim is to get the allocation of permits to spaces right and purchasing a permit is a good indication to the Council that there is a demand for on-street parking from that household. We aim to introduce parking places near to households who have purchased permits to ensure they can benefit from the scheme. It is not possible to guarantee a space outside each permit holders house but it is expected that one will be available within a reasonable distance.</p> <p>The aim is to help residents park closer to their homes without moving parking problems to other areas.</p>

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Approach	Restrictions should be applied equally throughout the area as they will only move problems around	1	Providing too many parking places will move problems to other areas and it is not intended to introduce parking places which will not be used.
	If the Council will not reconsider its plan to impose parking restrictions on Murrayfield Drive, then I urge them to provide at least 2 spaces per residence which should maintain the balance of spaces we enjoy today.	1	Parking places will be introduced where there is support and where permit holders will use them. Too many places may move problems elsewhere and will also have a negative visual impact on the area.
	Your proposal to introduce control parking from 1.30 to 3pm is ineffective. There is no peak in congestion between these hours (a bizarre choice, unless it is intended merely to be the thin end of a full control wedge). If there is congestion, it is around school pickup time and lasts only half an hour. Congestion at this time is actually a safety feature, as it forces drivers to slow while the streets are full of children. It is bizarre that you would wish to <i>increase</i> the average speed of traffic during the most vulnerable hour of the day by removing parked cars and open roads to faster traffic.	1	Priority Parking aims to reduce the impact that non-residential parking has in residential areas. One short controlled period requires such parking to occur outwith the spaces, no matter if this is within the hours of peak demand or not. This creates better parking opportunities for residents that did not previously exist. It's not necessary to control the places for a long time or for more than one period. There are
	Why on earth 1.30 to 3.00pm only? Are you mad? This is the exact time when school pupils are returning home and it will be more dangerous to have cars moving around the streets. Nor does it address the problem of part time workers. What a complete waste of time and money for an hour and a half. Frankly it's a complete joke.	1	no plans to extend the CPZ in Murrayfield. Unrestricted areas can still be used by commuters.
	Since the aim is to prevent commuters parking for the whole day, a morning time would be more effective. Will 1.30pm to 3.00pm have the same effect? What is to stop someone parking in a restricted area up to 1.15pm, coming back during lunch and moving a car to an unrestricted area?	1	
I ask you to make every effort not to place bays directly outside the homes of those who have objected. All or nothing of Murrayfield Drive should be included It will be a disaster if Coltbridge is hemmed in by parking controls on both sides	1 1 1	Parking places will be introduced where there is support for them and where they will be used by residents. Introducing too many places could move problems and introduce more signs and poles than are necessary.	



Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Approach	The proposals will make no difference, the number of cars parking will remain the same. Those who wish to park during the day, who do not live in the area, will park in unzoned areas and those who live in the area will now have to spend £30 per car to park in the phased areas.	1	Parking places will only be provided where they are supported by residents who will use them during the day.
	If priority parking is introduced in Coltbridge Avenue, it should also be introduced into Coltbridge Gardens to prevent cars moving into Coltbridge Gardens	1	This is the reason for the phased approach to allow the Council to react quickly should unexpected problems occur in other streets after the start of the scheme.
	Since parking is not being restricted on the west side of Murrayfield Road, priority parking will push commuter parking onto Murrayfield Road and exacerbate the existing problems with traffic flow.	1	Observations have shown that non-residents already park in this area but two-way traffic flow is maintained.
	The purpose for controlling parking in Wester Coates was to push commuters into Murrayfield, to justify controlling parking in Murrayfield. No doubt you plan to roll parking control and parking taxation, steadily westwards.	1	That was not the intention of the CPZ extension and there are no plans to introduce controls westwards of the current proposals.
	The current proposals do not address the two long term parking groups, as such people will find spaces which are not reserved for Priority use and leave their cars there which inevitably puts pressure on the remaining unrestricted spaces.	1	The proposals are not intended to remove all non-residential long-term parking from the area. Such parking already takes place in this area and was identified during the parking survey and accommodated within the design.
	There will be fewer spaces than permits.	1	The aim is to provide enough parking places to accommodate the number of permit holders in the area. Permit holders can also park in unrestricted areas.
	I would not expect policing of Priority Parking to be necessary as residents would monitor it and report infringements which could then be dealt with.	1	The Council is duty bound to ensure that the parking controls we introduce are enforced appropriately. Residents would be paying for a service and they should expect to receive it without having to take action themselves.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Cost	There is no cap or indexing of charges.	1	A pricing strategy is being developed as part of the Parking Action Plan.
	The introduction of charges for residents to park near their homes when outsiders pay nothing leads to the conclusion that the proposal is a money raising exercise. If residents are to be charged then parking places should be guaranteed at all times. Any outsiders not paying taxes to Edinburgh Council should pay for parking if they are creating difficulties for residents.	1	Ideally commuters would pay for parking, but if charges are introduced many would merely park in the next unrestricted area. This would leave spaces for residents but they'd still have to pay for their use. It is not unreasonable to ask permit holders to contribute toward the running costs of the scheme. Permits start from £10 p/a and are based on emissions to encourage more environmentally friendly forms of travel.
	You are imposing a cost on residents to park outside their homes and allowing non-residents who may be the cause of any problems to park for free. This is bizarre.	1	
	I take exception to Priority Parking as it is a stealth mode of raising money from people who supposedly have money to spare. Incorrect. I object strongly to the charge being graded by type of vehicle. This is wrong in principle, it represents double taxation and wrong in practice as another example of shameless money-grubbing.	1 1	
Detail	SYL or loading bay outside shops at 1-8 Murrayfield Place	1	Greenway parking places are present in Murrayfield Place for short-term parking and for loading purposes.
	Coltbridge Gardens is not included in map 2. This is an oversight and should be corrected to include Coltbridge Gardens.	1	Coltbridge Gardens is not included within the amended proposals.
	Introduce parking space on both sides of Garscube Terrace	1	Parking places in Garscube Terrace were located outside each house which doesn't have access to off-street parking.
	I live at the north of Murrayfield Avenue and believe the first phase will do little to help me as most of the kerb space will remain unrestricted, thus attracting non-residential parking. I would recommend extending the restrictions to include the wall that faces south down the avenue and to at least one side of the west end of Succoth Gardens. Extend parking place o/s 60 Murrayfield Avenue up to drive of Murrayfield House Requests a permit holders place on Henderland Road - park on the road instead of in the drive. Extend the residents parking by 10m to cover all of Upper Coltbridge Terrace. If this remains unchanged you can put me down as opposing the proposals.	1 1 1 1	Changes to the parking places within the Order or requests for new ones would need to be considered as part of a separate TRO.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Detail	If you put restrictions in, they must be outside our house as well. Since out of town drivers will park in non-prioritised places. It's a hopeless idea and we don't want it, but if you implement it, you must prioritise all the space in Murrayfield Drive.	1	Priority Parking is a flexible solution. Only introducing places where they will be used by residents, will reduce the potential for problems to move to other areas.
Impact	Ensure elderly residents don't lose out on carer's visits.	1	Carers can park in unrestricted areas or in the parking places outwith the restricted times. Visitors' permits can also be used.
	Parking restrictions will impact negatively on local businesses How will trades manage? Controls will make it more difficult for trades persons to park as free space will be occupied early in the morning and there will be insufficient space for permit holders. Visitors or workmen could find themselves in breach of the relevant order unless they paid for parking in a non residents space or me buying tickets for them.	1 1 1 1	Priority Parking will include unrestricted areas for trade and business users. Trades' permits can be used in the parking places. More places could be created in areas which were previously used all-day by commuters.
	The scheme will hinder our life as a street working together.	1	There is no reason to suggest neighbours cannot continue to work together.
	Stopping people from parking for a short while during the day, they will park in any area - some dangerous - to make deliveries etc. This cannot be safe or sensible.	1	Loading and unloading would be permitted from the residents' parking places. More opportunities may be available for such purposes by preventing commuters parking all-day in such areas.
	Increased risk of accidents in Abinger Gardens as cars are moved back and forth to avoid the 2 hour period.	1	It is more likely that commuters will park in unrestricted areas to avoid the hassle of moving their vehicle for 90 minutes each day. It's not clear where these vehicles would be moved to during this period.
	The times I can park freely outside my house are exactly those you will be "controlling." So the only people such a scheme will affect are the residents. Brilliant!	1	The 90 minutes controlled period may not suit every resident but it will prevent commuters from parking in the residents' places all day.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Impact	Added danger of vehicles parking next to my drive causing visibility problems	1	Priority Parking is not designed to improve access to driveways.
	Trailers are not uncommon in residential areas; how can householders address this limitation if there is a high percentage of priority spaces in the street?	1	Priority Parking wouldn't stop the use of trailers but they are not permitted to park in residents' places. Loading and unloading is allowed, but trailers take up space preventing other residents from parking. They should not be stored on the public road.
	Restricted period will impact on lunchtime visitors/guests. This is a family area and parking restrictions would prevent relatives visiting We do have some people who park long term to get the airport bus leaving their cars for weeks sometimes – if this went ahead these people will take up spaces which are not in the permit zone thereby stopping residents/friends being able to use these spaces.	1 1 1	Visitors can park in unrestricted areas or residents can purchase visitors' parking permits for them. It is considered that the parking places will create extra opportunities for visitors outwith the controlled times in areas which were previously occupied all day by commuters.
Enforcement	Who can we ask to take action against illegal parking? I commented about this in the previous consultation only to be told you were “unable to comment on issues regarding Police Traffic Wardens.”	1	Incorrect parking should be reported to the Council. However, in some instances, such as parking on pedestrian crossings Police Scotland are responsible.
Parking permits	The procedure for changing cars is cumbersome and may take several days; surely the Council could have a simple immediate online system for dealing with that? In addition, there are people who use different vehicles out of their employer's fleet, on a daily basis – how will the system deal with that? I use a company car which changes on a weekly basis – how am I supposed to get a permit?	1 1	More online permit solutions are being pursued. Documents currently need to be provided to prove eligibility. There are no options available for someone using multiple vehicles, but they could park in unrestricted areas.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Parking permits	Permits are limited to two per household; how will the Council deal with several adults sharing a house and all need a vehicle for their work? Surely there must be some flexibility for such people?	1	The two permit limits applies to every house in the city. This is an equitable approach and each household has the same opportunity to park in their street.
	The area is full of larger houses – there should be no difference in permit rates for 2 cars at one address. If a townhouse is split into 3 then the Council will see that as 3 permits at the lowest rate. A whole townhouse with the same street frontage will rate 1 permit and a second at greater cost. This is not logical to me.	1	A higher price for a second permit reflects the impact that multiple car ownership has on space availability and encourages residents to consider if they need a second vehicle. It is not related to the length of a property's frontage and similar situations apply in tenemented areas of the city.
Policy	Suggests a congestion charge starting at the Gyle roundabout.	1	There are no plans to introduce a congestion charge.
Priority Parking	Introduce a parking place on south side of Kingsburgh Road at the west end.	1	It is not possible to add new parking places to the scheme at this time.
	Is there enough residents' parking. There are a large number of flats in 1-13 Murrayfield Place and in 26-28 Coltbridge Avenue. Both sides of the road at the lower end of Coltbridge Terrace should be designated for resident parking.	1	Parking survey data identified the potential number of residents parking on-street during the day and there are enough spaces available to meet this demand. More places can be added to the first phase depending upon the results of the consultation.
	Other cars will park in the designated places for my property and make it difficult to find a parking place, let alone for my visitors. The cobbled area outside 50 Coltbridge Terrace is private residents parking - this will not be controlled so other will park there. We are unable to police this ourselves with out unreasonable cost.	1 1	The Council is not responsible for ensuring correct parking on private land. Priority parking aims to make it easier for residents to park on the road nearer their homes.
Yellow lines	Provide DYL around the island at the foot of Murrayfield Avenue/Corstorphine Road to allow disabled drivers access to the shops	1	This is being progressed under a separate TRO.
	Expects a single yellow line will be introduced outside driveway	1	Single yellow lines should not be used in such circumstances.

Appendix 1: Murrayfield Formal Consultation Responses

Type	Objections / Comments	Incidence	Response
Yellow lines	The double yellow lines in Abinger Gardens are excessive.	1	No plans to change the restrictions which are considered a suitable length.
	We fear if the scheme goes ahead, the Council will paint yellow lines round the corners of the Ormidale Terrace/Kingsburgh Road, removing 8 spaces and making things even more difficult.	1	The proposals do not include such measures, but requests have been received for them. This will be monitored. The Highway Code states vehicles should not park within 10m of a junction.
Other	People think they have a right to park outside their homes and this creates requests for Priority Parking.	1	The aim is to help residents park closer to their homes improving their quality of life.
	Commuters dump rubbish in Abinger Gardens	1	This has been reported to the Council's Environmental Wardens.
	Need a zebra crossing over to the old railway path by the Ravelston Dykes Bridge.	1	This has been reported to the Council's Road Safety Team.
	The introduction of the Tram will also encourage people to park in Murrayfield to go on holiday	1	This tram is unlikely to have a major impact as the AirLink bus already serves this area.
	The Council will be able to clean Murrayfield Avenue which is probably the dirtiest street in Edinburgh once parking controls are introduced.	1	Temporary restrictions can be used for such purposes. Priority Parking will not remove all parking from each street.
	Many older residents may not have internet access – you must do something to ensure that these residents are not disadvantaged and how do you intend to address that.	1	A letter was sent to each household in the area. Free internet access is available at public libraries and contact details were provided so people could ask any questions.
	Commuters are deterred from parking in Coltbridge Terrace due to the narrow streets and congestion around St George's School.	1	It is not intended to remove all non-residential parking, but to help residents.
	Close the junction between Roseburn and Murrayfield Gardens	1	Right turns are already restricted into Murrayfield Gardens. Police Scotland are responsible for enforcing this restriction.
	Too many westbound vehicles (especially taxis) turn right into Murrayfield Gardens despite the no right turn sign.	1	Murrayfield Gardens. Police Scotland are responsible for enforcing this restriction.
	Concerned about Tower House proposals, in Murrayfield Drive, with more visitors to sheltered housing. We have no information on this and urge you to delay priority parking until rebuilding has taken place.	1	We have no information on this matter. Residents support the scheme proceeding to address existing parking problems.
Moved here to get away from restrictions, it only results in price hikes and actual parking problems.	1		

Appendix 2: Murrayfield Formal Consultation – Responses by street

Street Name	Support	Objection	Comment	Total
Abinger Gardens	9	3	3	15
Coltbridge Avenue	5	5	0	10
Coltbridge Terrace	18	5	1	24
Coltbridge Vale	0	0	0	0
Garscube Terrace	11	4	1	16
Henderland Road	6	0	0	6
Kingsburgh Road	7	2	0	9
Murrayfield Avenue	34	2	0	36
Murrayfield Drive	1	10	3	14
Murrayfield Gardens	54	21	1	76
Murrayfield Place	3	1	0	4
Murrayfield Road	3	2	0	5
Ormidale Terrace	22	9	1	32
Succoth Avenue	2	0	0	2
Succoth Gardens	2	1	0	3
Succoth Place	4	2	0	6
Upper Coltbridge Terrace	4	2	0	6
Outside Area	1	10	3	14
Total	186	79	13	278