

City of Edinburgh Council

10.00am, Thursday 26 August 2021

Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 2 Consultation and General Update– referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

Executive/routine	
Wards	All
Council Commitments	

1. For Decision/Action

- 1.1 The Transport and Environment Committee has referred a report on the Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 2 Consultation and General Update for consideration.

Stephen S Moir
Executive Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Louise Williamson, Assistant Committee Officer
Legal and Assurance Division, Corporate Services Division
Email: louise.p.williamson@edinburgh.gov.uk

Referral Report

Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 2 Consultation and General Update

2. Terms of Referral

- 2.1 On 9 August 2018 the Transport and Environment Committee had approved the commencement of a Strategic Review of Parking that would look at parking pressures across the entire Edinburgh area.
- 2.2 On 12 September 2019 the Committee had considered the full results of the review process, approving four phases of new parking controls, with initial consultation on the proposals for Phase 1 to begin in Autumn of 2019
- 2.3 On 19 August 2021, the Committee considered an update on progress on the Strategic Review which included the results of the Phase 2 consultation process, making a series of recommendations based on the consultation results and, where appropriate, on other strands of work arising from, or linked to, the Strategic Review of Parking.
- 2.3 In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, presentations were heard from Ward Councillors Douglas and McLellan.
- 2.5 The Transport and Environment Committee agreed:

Motion

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that the report formed the second part of a city-wide strategic review of parking being conducted in 4 different stages and previously approved in 2018.
- 3) To note the degree of consultation and engagement which had taken place and the consultation results for the Phase 2 schemes.
- 4) To request officers undertook further engagement with resident's groups and other local stakeholders, such as Community Councils, on the final designs for Phase 2.
- 5) To request an additional report in Autumn 2022 at the latest (including feedback on the implementation on phase 1) to allow Committee to review

the designs for the TRO process for Phase 2 schemes following the engagement set out in 4) above and prior to a traffic order being issued. These designs should be consistent with the implementation of the pavement parking ban.

- 6) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.
- 7) To approve the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report.
- 8) To note the details in Appendix 5 to the report, which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that the Council had traditionally only introduced new parking restrictions in areas where there was significant support amongst residents for such restrictions.
- 3) To consider that the results of the consultation for phase 2 showed a significant majority of respondents were opposed to these plans and therefore conclude that there was not significant public demand for their implementation.
- 4) To agree not to proceed with the implementation of parking controls in the Phase 2 area.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) Having considered the consultation results, the policy justification behind the measures proposed by the Strategic Review of Parking, and the potential for parking migration between areas, to approve commencement of the legal process to introduce parking controls into all areas covered by the Phase 2 proposals.
- 3) To note the operational details for the proposed parking controls for the Phase 2 area, as detailed in Appendix 3 to the report.
- 4) To note the recommended changes arising from the consultation process to the proposed designs as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.
- 5) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.

- 6) To approve the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 to the report.
- 7) To note the details in Appendix 5 to the report which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.
- 8) To agree that high quality public engagement during the roll-out of these proposals would be crucial to its success, and therefore call for a comprehensive public engagement programme to be brought forward, in particular focusing on the policy justifications for the extension of the CPZ and the likely knock-on effect of adjacent zones coming into operation.
- 9) To further agree that the roll-out of the extension of the CPZ could be used as an opportunity to encourage vehicle owners to consider more sustainable transport options, and therefore to agree to investigate the potential to collaborate with public transport operators, the City Car Club and active travel organisations to provide information and incentives to residents to choose more sustainable travel options at the point of CPZ extension.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Corbett

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion

Voting

First Vote

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	5 votes
For Amendment 1	-	4 votes
For Amendment 2	-	2 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Child, Doran, Gordon and Macinnes.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Lang, Smith and Whyte.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Booth and Corbett.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 2 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion (as adjusted) and Amendment 1.

Second Vote

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	5 votes
For Amendment 1	-	4 votes
Abstentions	-	2

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Child, Doran, Gordon and Macinnes.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Lang, Smith and Whyte.

Abstentions: Councillors Booth and Corbett.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that the report formed the second part of a city-wide strategic review of parking being conducted in 4 different stages and previously approved in 2018.
- 3) To note the degree of consultation and engagement which had taken place and the consultation results for the Phase 2 schemes.
- 4) To request officers undertake further engagement with resident's groups and other local stakeholders, such as community Councils, on the final designs for Phase 2.
- 5) To request an additional report in Autumn 2022 at the latest (including feedback on the implementation on phase 1) to allow Committee to review the designs for the TRO process for Phase 2 schemes following the engagement set out in 4) above and prior to a traffic order being issued. These designs should be consistent with the implementation of the pavement parking ban.
- 6) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.
- 7) To approve the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report.
- 8) To note the details in Appendix 5 to the report, which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.
- 9) To agree that high quality public engagement during the roll-out of these proposals would be crucial to its success, and therefore call for a comprehensive public engagement programme to be brought forward, in particular focusing on the policy justifications for the extension of the CPZ and the likely knock-on effect of adjacent zones coming into operation.
- 10) To further agree that the roll-out of the extension of the CPZ could be used as an opportunity to encourage vehicle owners to consider more sustainable transport options, and therefore to agree to investigate the potential to collaborate with public transport operators, the City Car Club and active travel organisations to provide information and incentives to residents to choose more sustainable travel options at the point of CPZ extension.

- 2.6 In terms of Standing Order 31.1 the requisite number of members required that the decision be referred to the Council for approval.

3. Background Reading/ External References

[Minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 9 August 2021](#)

[Minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 12 September 2019](#)

Minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 9 August 2018

4. Appendices

Appendix 1 – report by the Executive Director of Place

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday, 19 August 2021

Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 2 Consultation and General Update

Executive/routine	
Wards	All
Council Commitments	

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 It is recommended that the Transport and Environment Committee:
 - 1.1.1 notes the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1;
 - 1.1.2 having considered the consultation results, the policy justification behind the measures proposed by the Strategic Review of Parking, and the potential for parking migration between areas, approves commencement of the legal process to introduce parking controls into all areas covered by the Phase 2 proposals;
 - 1.1.3 notes the operational details for the proposed parking controls for the Phase 2 area, as detailed in Appendix 3;
 - 1.1.4 notes the recommended changes arising from the consultation process to the proposed designs as detailed in Appendix 1;
 - 1.1.5 notes the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in this report;
 - 1.1.6 approves the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 of this report;

- 1.1.7 notes the details in appendix 5, which outlines the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.

Paul Lawrence

Executive Director of Place

Contact: Gavin Brown, Network Management and Enforcement Manager

E-mail: gavin.brown@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 469 3823

Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 2 Consultation and General Update

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 In [August 2018](#), Committee approved the commencement of a Strategic Review of Parking that would look at parking pressures across the entire Edinburgh area. This review would help to form a citywide strategy for addressing parking pressures, taking a proactive approach on policy and strategy grounds.
- 2.2 In [September 2019](#), Committee considered the full results of the review process, approving four phases of new parking controls, with initial consultation on the proposals for Phase 1 to begin in Autumn of 2019.
- 2.3 This report provides an update on progress on the Strategic Review and considers the results of the Phase 2 consultation process, making a series of recommendations based on the consultation results and, where appropriate, on other strands of work arising from, or linked to, the Strategic Review of Parking.
- 2.4 This report seeks a decision on the proposed introduction of parking controls in the Phase 2 area, based on the consultation results. Depending on that decision, authority is further sought to commence the necessary legal processes that would introduce parking controls in the Phase 2 area, with the operation details and amendments noted in this report. It also provides an update on general progress made on the Strategic Review of Parking.

3. Background

- 3.1 In August 2018, Committee approved the commencement of a Strategic Review of parking that would look at parking pressures across the entire Edinburgh area. In approving the review, it was recognised that there was a need to take a more strategic look at parking problems across the city.

- 3.2 From enquiries received by the Council, and from discussions with ward Councillors, Community Councils and residents it was apparent that there was increasing support for new parking controls in many areas as a result of the significant and widespread impacts of non-residential parking. Several key areas (such as Corstorphine, Shandon and Leith) had shown interest in the introduction of parking controls it was considered that there was clear justification for the Council to take a different approach from its previous stance, where applications for new parking controls were subject to certain qualifying requirements.
- 3.3 The full results of the review were reported to Committee in September 2019, with proposals for new parking controls being recommended for a number of areas that were shown to be subject to parking pressures.

4. Main report

- 4.1 The Strategic Review of Parking took a holistic approach to the parking situation across Edinburgh, assessing parking pressures on a street by street and area by area basis. The result of this process was, for the first time, to paint an overall picture of the relative parking pressures for the entire city and its outlying towns and villages.
- 4.2 This report updates Committee on progress made since the results of the Phase 1 consultation results were considered in January 2021. This report and its accompanying Appendices will provide detail and, where necessary, make recommendations linked, but not limited, to:
- 4.2.1 the Phase 2 Consultation results;
 - 4.2.2 linkages with the City Mobility Plan;
 - 4.2.3 the proposed changes arising from the Phase 2 consultation;
 - 4.2.4 the course of action for each of the areas forming part of Phase 2 of the Strategic Review of Parking;
 - 4.2.5 detailed proposals for the possible operation of controlled parking within the Phase 2 area, including details of hours of operation, lengths of stay and the extents of the proposed Zones;
 - 4.2.6 permit and pay-and-display charges associated with the operation of controlled parking in the Phase 2 area.
- 4.3 This report provides an overview of the different elements that form part of, or are directly associated with, the proposals arising from the Strategic Review. Further detail on each element can be found in the appendices to this report.

Background to the Strategic Review

- 4.4 The Strategic Review split the Edinburgh Council area into five Review Areas. Those areas were further subdivided into 124 Investigation Areas. Each street in each Investigation Area was assessed in terms of the observed parking demand,

with the collective results being used to generate an overall parking pressure rating for the investigation area. Heat maps generated for each area showed the relative parking pressures on a street by street level.

- 4.5 In September 2019, Committee considered a detailed report on the results for areas 4 and 5 of the Strategic Review. The results for Areas 1 through 3 had been previously reported to Committee in [March](#) and [June](#) of 2019. The September 2019 report considered the collated results for all five of the review areas, drawing together the results for all of the separate investigation areas. Considering the entirety of the results, that report then made a series of recommendations for new parking controls with the aim of addressing the identified parking pressures, whilst linking with and supporting Council policies relating to delivering a safer, greener city.
- 4.6 Four phases of implementation of new parking controls were approved, along with a timetable for delivering those four phases. Committee approval was obtained to continue the process of design and informal consultation for those four phases.

General Update

- 4.7 In January 2021, Committee approved the commencement of the legal process to introduce parking controls in the Phase 1 area.
- 4.8 In accordance with the revised timetable reported to that Committee, an informal consultation exercise was conducted in those areas covered by Phase 2 proposals in March of 2021 and in Phase 3 during May 2021. At the time of writing, a further informal consultation exercise is also under way in those areas covered by Phase 4.

City Mobility Plan

- 4.9 Since the Strategic Review of Parking was initiated in 2018, the Council has approved its City Mobility Plan (CMP). The Plan strengthens the Council's commitment to policies on private car usage and encouraging use of active travel and public transport.
- 4.10 More importantly, there are key policies within the CMP that link directly to the introduction of parking controls and their use as a direct means of influencing behaviour:
- Movement 33 Parking Controls: Extend the coverage and operational period of parking controls in the city to manage parking availability for the benefit of local residents and people with mobility issues
 - Movement 34 Residents Parking Permits: Manage the way residents parking permits are issued based on demand, location and vehicle emissions.
 - Movement 36 Parking, Waiting and Loading Restrictions: Review, apply and enforce parking, waiting and loading restrictions whilst balancing the needs of local businesses and residents and people with mobility difficulties.

- Place 5 Streets for People: Create more liveable places by reducing the level of on street parking in areas well served by public transport whilst enabling parking for local residents and people with mobility difficulties.

4.11 Where the Strategic Review had its origins in addressing the concerns of residents, it must now be considered that the primary aim of the Review as it moves forward must be to support and deliver upon the policies within the CMP.

Integration with other Projects

4.12 The Parking Operations team continue to work with colleagues across other parts of the Council to integrate aspects of other projects into the design. The aim of that integration remains to provide and deliver, as far as is possible, single proposals that encompass a range of changes and improvements.

4.13 The proposals that are either being brought forward under the umbrella of the Strategic Review, or where changes have been made to the proposals from the Strategic Review include:

- 4.13.1 revised bin and recycling locations proposed under the Council's Communal Bin Review (CBR);
- 4.13.2 waiting restrictions, parking places and loading places approved as part of the Trams to Newhaven Project, where those proposals lie outside of the Tram's Limit of Deviation;
- 4.13.3 proposed cycle hangar locations;
- 4.13.4 proposed city car club locations;
- 4.13.5 proposed on-street EV charging points;
- 4.13.6 Leith Connections, where restrictions on that route will be progressed separately to the Strategic Review; and
- 4.13.7 Proposals relating to the potential introduction of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in the Leith and Corstorphine areas, where work will ensure that these projects could proceed separately and without conflict.

4.14 The design process has incorporated, as far as is possible, all impacted elements of these different projects.

Phase 2 Consultation and resulting proposal

4.15 In terms of recommending possible next steps, our consultant has not only detailed the consultation responses themselves, but has also considered the policy linkages behind the Strategic Review of Parking and, in particular, how parking controls support the objectives within the City Mobility Plan. Their findings are detailed within Appendix 1, with those findings concluding that there is policy justification for parking controls in the two separate and distinct areas covered by Phase 2 (the A8 corridor and those areas adjacent to Phase 1 in Leith).

4.16 It is clear from the consultation responses that there is a majority of respondents who do not believe that the introduction of parking controls is warranted at this time.

However, it is also clear that there are many residents who do report that they experience parking difficulties or who suggest that there are issues with commuter parking, as well as with other forms of inconsiderate, obstructive or unsafe parking in their area.

- 4.17 The results of the consultation therefore warrant detailed consideration, particularly in the context of the data gathered by the review process and, most significantly, in conjunction with the policy justification behind the introduction of parking controls. These aspects are discussed in detail within Appendix 2 to this report, as well as the potential implications for Areas within Phase 2 of neighbouring or nearby areas being included in current and/or future phases of proposed parking controls.
- 4.18 Further detail is also provided in Appendix 2 to the implications of considering each individual area of Phase 2 on their own, with special regard given to the potential for migration.
- 4.19 Migration of parking pressures is a significant concern in terms of how that migration might undermine the policy objectives of introducing parking controls, but also in terms of the likely impact that migration could have on residents and businesses within the affected areas.
- 4.20 Parking migration is effectively the result of non-residents who are used to parking in an existing uncontrolled area being faced with the prospect of that area no longer being available to them. If there are similarly uncontrolled areas nearby, then the obvious temptation is for that parking to move, or “migrate”, to the next uncontrolled area, taking with it the pressures and inconsiderate parking that controls are designed to resolve.
- 4.21 There is a general perception evident within the consultation results across many of the Phase 2 areas that there are no existing problems in their area and that there is no justification for controls at this time. However, with the gathered evidence showing many streets and areas in Phase 2 already subject to high demand, the addition of migrated parking would significantly impact parking availability in such areas. It is our experience that migration of parking will occur as new zones are introduced and that the lengthy legal processes required to introduce parking controls will mean that it may not be possible to react quickly to problems as they arise.
- 4.22 The following table takes information from Appendix 2, considering the main factors behind the proposal in each area, based on:
- Review Result: Parking pressures identified from the original surveys;
 - Migration Risk; Likelihood that existing pressures will move to new areas; and
 - Policy Impact; Alignment with City Mobility Plan objectives:

	Review Results		Migration risk	Policy Impact
Area	Placing	Rating		
Roseburn	2	High	High	High
Willowbrae North	5	High	High	High
Bonnington	11	High	High	High
West Leith	12	Medium	High	High
Easter Road	15	Medium	High	High
Saughtonhall	26	Medium	Medium	High
Corstorphine	27	Medium	Medium	High
Murrayfield (B9)	37	Medium	Medium	High
Murrayfield	96	Low	Medium	High

Note: Refer to Appendix 2 for further detail.

- 4.23 While the Strategic Review of Parking commenced in advance of the Council adopting the City Mobility Plan, the aims of the review support many of its policy objectives, delivering a sustainable transport hierarchy and changing emphasis away from private car usage.
- 4.24 In addition to the policy justifications, there is significant likelihood that parking pressures from Phase 1 areas will move into the areas covered by Phase 2 and that inaction now would see parking pressures and difficulties exacerbate existing parking problems in these areas, or create a deterioration in parking that would necessitate further action.
- 4.25 On the basis of meeting policy objectives, as well as addressing existing pressures and protecting against the impacts of migration, it is proposed that each of the areas included in Phase 2 should move forward to legal process, on the basis of introducing Controlled Parking Zones in those areas.
- 4.26 Detailed consideration of the potential benefits and impacts for each of the areas included in Phase 1 can be found in Appendix 2 to this report. A description of how parking controls would be expected to operate within the Phase 2 areas is detailed in Appendix 3.
- 4.27 Appendix 3 also contains the results of additional work carried out to ascertain the suitability of each of the Review areas in terms of identifying the layout of potential new “Zones”. As in Phase 1, that work has been led by the need to consider how each of those Zones might work in terms of supplying sufficient space for those residents who might have a need to park on-street. Appendix 3 provides a detailed analysis of the available data, in conjunction with the proposed design, resulting in recommendations as to possible new Zones.

- 4.28 The findings of that work show that, based on available data for vehicle ownership within the affected areas, there should be sufficient on-street space available to accommodate the anticipated demand from residents.
- 4.29 The general proposal largely mirrors those arrangements already in place in the neighbouring extended zones of the CPZ, where controls operate Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 5.30pm.

Phase 2 Design Changes

- 4.30 A number of changes have also been recommended, with those changes arising from the consultation process. Should it be decided to proceed with any part, or all, of Phase 2, those changes would be incorporated into the detailed design. Those changes are detailed in Appendix 1. The list of changes is not exhaustive, with potential to make further amendments to improve the operation of restrictions prior to advertising the draft Order.
- 4.31 While the initial design included CBR locations as part of the proposed layout of parking places, further design revisions may also be required to incorporate cycle hangars, as outlined earlier in this report, prior to any potential advertising of Phase 2 proposals.

Industry Specific Parking Permits

- 4.32 The report on the Phase 1 results highlighted the need to consider a new form of permit that would allow businesses offering garage type services the ability to park customer vehicles on-street during the hours of restriction in any new area of parking controls.
- 4.33 That approach has now been included within the Phase 1 proposals and in the advertised traffic order.
- 4.34 The same approach is being taken within Phase 2 where, depending on the decision of this Committee, businesses in the Phase 2 area will be contacted in order to better understand their potential need for on-street space.
- 4.35 As described within the proposal for Phase 1, the proposed permit would be available to businesses offering garage services, allowing them to continue current activities within a CPZ by offering permits that would allow their customers to park. The approach will be tailored by individual location and/or business, but would generally consist of:
- 4.35.1 an allowance for customers to park within shared-use parking places in specified streets or specified locations in the vicinity of the business to which the permits are issued;
 - 4.35.2 the creation of specific parking places that can be used by customer vehicles bearing the new permit type; and
 - 4.35.3 a combination of the allowance and the specific parking places outlined above.

- 4.36 Further work will be undertaken to identify garage businesses and to determine the best approach for each location, taking into account parking pressures and availability of space.

Stadiums Review

- 4.37 Separately to the Strategic Review of Parking, an investigation has also taken place into the potential for event, or match-day restrictions at Edinburgh's three main sporting venues:

4.37.1 Tynecastle;

4.37.2 Easter Road; and

4.37.3 Murrayfield.

- 4.38 The stadiums Review was led by concerns within the area surrounding Murrayfield, that certain events, not limited to major rugby matches, were having a significant impact on parking in the vicinity of the stadium.

- 4.39 All three stadiums lie within areas covered by separate proposals within the Strategic Review of Parking. There is an obvious linkage between parking controls designed to address daytime pressures and measures that might be adopted in order to address weekend or evening parking issues related to one-off or repeated events.

- 4.40 Whilst it had been intended to bring a full update on the stadiums review, with associated recommendations, to this Committee, with the obvious linkage referred to in the previous paragraph meaning that there was benefit in co-ordinating the stadiums proposals with the proposals for Phases 1 and 2 of the wider Strategic Review. However, there are a number of other considerations, not least of which are the results of the Phase 2 consultation, where the likely outcome is likely to be determined by this report.

- 4.41 In addition to the consultation results and the need for a decision to be reached in terms of how Phase 2 is moved forward, there are other aspects of the potential introduction of event-based restrictions that will require further consideration:

- Conflicting proposals – With the areas likely to be affected by stadiums proposals covering areas within Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Strategic Review, there will be restrictions in terms of how the different proposals can be moved forward. Legally, it is unlikely, for example, that separate traffic orders could be processed at the same time for both Strategic and Stadiums review proposals. Logistically, the proposals for stadium controls and Strategic Review controls will need to complement each other and, with the latter likely to have wider implications in terms of the extent of those controls, there is a need to understand the wider controls before a decision can be reached in terms of how stadiums controls would operate;
- Form of proposals –how potential event restrictions might be integrated with Phase 2 proposals, depending on the outcome of the consideration of the consultation results and the proposals for the different areas affected

(especially where stadiums restrictions might straddle areas of different restrictions). There would be benefits with integrating proposals with areawide controls, for example.

- Initial Costs – Integrating stadium controls with wider parking controls would provide for an economy of scale, but there are likely to be legal restrictions in terms of what can be done in conjunction with proposals for Phase 1 and 2 of the Strategic Review. With the preferred approach expected to be to introduce Stadiums restrictions in the area around each stadium, consideration must be given to aligning the different legal processes and the impact that this will have on set-up costs.
- Ongoing Costs – current arrangements for both sporting and entertainment events require significant input from the Council in terms of event management and enforcement. Permanent event restrictions might reduce some of the current management input but would increase on-street management and enforcement. Consideration requires to be given to how the Council would meet the ongoing costs of such arrangements, including the application of management fees payable by event organisers and potential permit costs payable by residents in affected areas.

4.42 Consideration of suitable measures designed to address event day parking issues should also explore the potential for improved sustainable transport options.

4.43 In the report to Committee in January 2021 it was explained that consideration of the Stadiums Review was being postponed until consideration was given to Phase 2 of the Strategic Review, on the basis that the situation would be clearer in terms of the likely return of sporting and other event types. That approach would also have allowed the stadium proposals to be tied closely to the proposals for Phase 2.

4.44 At the time of writing, and with no decision having yet been reached on the future of the phase 2 proposals, it is now proposed to postpone reporting of the Stadiums review until after the decision on Phase 2. This approach will allow the proposals arising from the Stadiums review to be adjusted as required to take account of the Phase 2 decision and for further consideration to be given to the issues outlined above.

4.45 It remains the intention to conduct further investigations into the potential need for event-related restrictions in the vicinity of Meadowbank Stadium at an appropriate time.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 Depending on the outcome of the Committee, any approved legal processes to introduce parking controls or waiting restrictions into those areas covered by Phase 2 of the Strategic Review of Parking will now be commenced. Further detail of those parking controls is explained within this report and its Appendices, with a final decision on the form and extent of those controls to be taken by Committee.
- 5.2 Consultation and design elements for forthcoming phases will continue as described in the report to this Committee in January 2021.

6. Financial impact

- 6.1 All costs incurred by The Strategic Review of Parking are in line with projections and have been met from within the existing budget allocation for Parking. Those costs primarily relate to consultant's fees for undertaking the initial review, preparing designs, conducting consultations, as well as ancillary works associated with data collection and analysis, as well as preparation of reports linked to delivering the desired outcomes from the Review.
- 6.2 There will be ongoing costs involved in carrying out the next stages of the review. Those next stages will involve further consultation and engagement exercises, assistance with preparing the draft Traffic Orders and additional design work associated with ongoing and future phases. The cost of this work will also be met from within the existing budget allocation for parking.
- 6.3 The proposed parking controls for Phase 2, subject to Committee approval, will incur implementation costs and ongoing operational costs, whilst also resulting in potential new revenue streams for the Council. It is anticipated that those costs and likely revenue will be detailed in future reports, at the point where Committee is asked to decide on the outcomes of the legal processes for each proposed Phase of implementation.

7. Stakeholder/Community Impact

- 7.1 An informal consultation exercise on the possible introduction of parking controls in the Phase 2 area was conducted in February and March 2021. That exercise saw leaflets delivered to all addresses within the affected areas, with residents and businesses invited to:
 - 7.1.1 view details of the proposal online;
 - 7.1.2 complete a detailed online questionnaire;
 - 7.1.3 leave comments on an interactive map of the draft proposals;
 - 7.1.4 provide further feedback via the dedicated website; and

- 7.1.5 attend virtual drop-in sessions attended by Council and Consultancy staff, where attendees were given a short presentation and given the opportunity to ask questions that were answered by staff in attendance.
- 7.2 The results of that consultation are contained within this report.
- 7.3 Further consultations will take place as part of any legal process, where interested parties will have opportunities to view the revised proposals and to make comments and/or objections to the detail of the proposals.
- 7.4 Informal consultations are to take place in a similar way to those carried out for Phase 2 for the remaining phases, with a continued emphasis on an online offering in line with current advice on large gatherings.
- 7.5 The proposals for parking controls are anticipated to result in a positive impact in respect of carbon impacts, and adaptation to climate change, discouraging commuting to work and encouraging increased use of public transport and other, more sustainable form of transport.
- 7.6 The potential adverse impact of the proposals could be that migration of parking pressures moves to neighbouring area. Monitoring processes are already in place to ensure that, should any such migration occur, then steps can be taken to identify that migration and take further action to address parking pressures that arise in those areas.

8. Background reading/external references

- 8.1 Report on the results of the Strategic Review of Parking – [September 2019](#)

9. Appendices

- 9.1 Appendix 1 - Results of Phase 2 Consultation
- 9.2 Appendix 2 – Option Assessment for Phase 2
- 9.3 Appendix 3 - General Proposal for Phase 2 Area
- 9.4 Appendix 4 – Charges
- 9.5 Appendix 5 – Progress Update

Appendix 1 – Results of Phase 2 Consultation

This Appendix contains details of the analysis of the responses received to the consultation on Phase 2 of the Council's Strategic Review of Parking.

It consists of a report prepared by our consultants, with appendices detailing the content of the responses received and the changes proposed to the design as a result of suggestions made.



Strategic Review of Parking

Consultation and engagement on proposed changes to the operation of parking controls around Edinburgh City Centre – Phase 2

The City of Edinburgh Council

Document Reference: 1000006447
June 2021

Written by Jess Lloyd
Senior Engagement Consultant
Jess.Lloyd@projectcentre.co.uk

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Project Centre has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions from the City of Edinburgh Council. Project Centre shall not be liable for the use of any information contained herein for any purpose other than the sole and specific use for which it was prepared.

Job Number	Issue	Description	Originator	Checked	Authorised
1000006447	1	Version 1 Draft	Jess Lloyd		Stephanie Tisdall

File path: G:\Project Centre\Project-BST\1000006447 - NSL CEC CPZ Phase 2\2
Project Delivery\3 Reports\1 Draft Reports

CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2.	INTRODUCTION	5
3.	CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY	6
4.	CONSULTATION FINDINGS	8
5.	DESIGN AMENDMENTS	12
6.	STRATEGIES INTEGRATION	16
7.	RECOMMENDATIONS	22
8.	APPENDICES	25
	QUALITY	26

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In August 2018, the City of Edinburgh Council's Transport & Environment Committee approved the commencement of a Strategic Review of Parking that would look at parking pressures across the entire Edinburgh area. The review identified several areas across the city to be developed across four phases.

Phase 1 engagement of this four-phase project, concluded in November 2019 with the findings being presented at Committee on 28th January 2021.

Proposals for Phase 2 were consulted on over a four-week period from Monday 15th February to Sunday 28th March 2021. Phase 3 is currently underway, and Phase 4 will commence later in 2021.

The proposals suggested a range of changes to the operation of parking controls in Edinburgh, all of which are linked to delivering on the commitments in the current Local Transport Strategy and the forthcoming City Mobility Plan.

Consultation Approach

The consultation provided residents of the eight areas in Phase 2 with an opportunity to view and comment upon the proposals. Feedback was submitted through a wide range of channels, including a dedicated consultation website with interactive maps outlining the proposals for each area, through 16 virtual engagement session events and via email.

A map of the proposal areas is available in the supplementary document, **Appendix A**, page 1.

Consultation Summary

- **16,678** leaflets were distributed across the eight areas advertising the consultation and providing location details of drop-in sessions. A copy of one of these leaflets can be found in **Appendix A**, page 2.
- **2,694** responses were received via the online survey with a further **497** emails received containing further comments and questions. An overview of these emails can be found in **Appendix C**.
- Combining the free text comments from the online survey with emails received that were not specific questions meant there were **3,171** comments in total to analyse.
- **2,424** of the responses came from residents within the areas.
- An additional **2,283** comments were left across the eight interactive maps.

Conclusion

The outcome of the consultation and engagement programme for the second phase of the Strategic Review of Parking has highlighted that residents and local communities are aware of the challenges to parking within Edinburgh and welcome the opportunity to provide feedback at an early stage. Though some specific aspects of the proposals were felt by some residents to be inappropriate for their local area, there were some residents that were broadly supportive of the review.

Many respondents provided comments specifically regarding their road or roads around their homes. Issues experienced included evening and overnight saturation and problems on event days. There were some pocket areas that believed there were no issues with parking in their area, which could be true due to the size of the area of consideration.

2. INTRODUCTION

The City of Edinburgh Council has recently undertaken a Strategic Review of Parking in the City and are proposing new areas of parking control, in order to manage the rising parking demands of both residents and commuting workers, who reside and work in the areas out with the existing parking zones.

The Council appointed Project Centre in September 2019 to undertake a programme of informal consultations and engagement on the key elements of the proposals.

These key elements include the introduction of:

- Permit Holder Parking
- Shared use Parking
- Pay & Display
- No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions (double yellow lines)
- Time Banded No Waiting Restrictions (single yellow lines)

The consultation and engagement programme has been split into four phases, with each phase focusing on a group of different areas. These areas were determined by extensive on-street parking surveys¹ carried out in 2018/2019 and the phases split by priority of issues. This engagement gave members of various resident groups, community councils, businesses and residents the opportunity to view, comment and advise on the Council's proposals for their area(s) at an early stage of conception.

The feedback received from the consultation and engagement programme will be carefully reviewed to inform the design proposals and to enable the Council to consider any amendments that may need to be incorporated ahead of reporting to Committee.

¹ https://consultprojectcentre.co.uk/parkingph2/news_feed/parking-pressure-survey-results-2018-2019

3. CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY

Consultation channels

Just over **16,600** leaflets were delivered to addresses across all the areas in Phase 2 over a two-week period (from **11th to 19th February 2021**), with the proposal details and area maps included. A copy of this can be found in **Appendix A** (supplementary PDF).

These stakeholders included residents, businesses, places of worship, schools and community groups.

The consultation was initially open for four weeks from **Monday 15th February** to **Sunday 14th March 2021** but was extended until **Sunday 28th March 2021**, per the Council's recommendation.

The stakeholders were invited to view the proposals for the parking changes on Project Centre's consultation platform Engagement HQ (<https://consultationprojectcentre.co.uk/parkingph2>), where respondents were able to make comments on the proposals through the online survey, as well as the use of interactive maps.

Eight interactive maps, showing each zone that was being consulted on were available to view via the website. They offered the chance for the responder to plot comments in specific areas relating to the type of proposal in that location. A total of **2,283** comments were left across the eight maps. These comments have been analysed for each area and are available to view, un-edited, in **Appendix B** (supplementary PDF).

A designated project email address was set up at Edinburgh.Consultation@projectcentre.co.uk, which enabled those who could not attend a drop-in session, or were uncomfortable with the online mapping, to communicate via this channel. In total **497** emails were received which are in **Appendix C** (supplementary PDF).

Project Centre hosted 16 virtual public drop-in sessions via Microsoft Teams, carried out over eight days, to allow stakeholders to discuss the proposals with council officials and Project Centre's parking consultants. Two sessions for each area were held at an early afternoon time, as well as an early evening time to allow for flexibility of attendance.

The times of the sessions for each area are listed below:

- Monday 22nd February 1-3pm – Corstorphine
- Monday 22nd February 6-8pm – Saughtonhall
- Tuesday 23rd February 1-3pm – Murrayfield
- Tuesday 23rd February 6-8pm – Roseburn
- Wednesday 24th February 1-3pm – Bonnington
- Wednesday 24th February 6-8pm – West Leith
- Thursday 24th February 1-3pm – Easter Road
- Thursday 24th February 6-8pm – Willowbrae North
- Monday 1st March 1-3pm – Roseburn
- Monday 1st March 6-8pm – Bonnington
- Tuesday 2nd March 1-3pm – West Leith
- Tuesday 2nd March 6-8pm – Easter Road
- Wednesday 3rd March 1-3pm – Willowbrae North
- Wednesday 3rd March 6-8pm – Murrayfield
- Thursday 4th March 1-3pm – Saughtonhall
- Thursday 4th March 6-8pm – Corstorphine

The sessions were well attended with some sessions having over 80 participants.

4. CONSULTATION FINDINGS

Drop-in Sessions

Feedback received throughout the 16 virtual engagement sessions was mixed and largely dependent on the area being discussed.

In each of the sessions, Council officials and consultants outlined the aims and objectives of the Strategic Review of Parking for the City of Edinburgh, to ensure the proposals were explained to attendees effectively. This was done in the form of a presentation, with facts specific to each area.

After the presentation, people were split into smaller breakout rooms where there was one council official and one member of PCL staff to facilitate the discussions. The public were able to raise their hand virtually and the facilitator would call upon people to speak.

At the end of each meeting, there was a short demonstration on how to use the interactive map. All questions that were typed into the chat box were logged. Many of the questions received were useful for future FAQs².

Respondents Location Analysis

Respondents were asked to state the area that they were responding in reference to and if they were a resident, worker, visitor or other within that area. In total, **90%** of respondents identified themselves as residents of the area they were responding to. Response location maps and analysis can be found in **Appendix D** (supplementary PDF).

The maps are accompanied with tables which show the total number of responses for each area. A separate column in the table lists the number of people who provided postcodes compared to the total number of responses received for each area. Similarly, another column lists the total number of postcodes that are from within the proposal area compared to the total number of postcodes received.

A breakdown of respondent type is also provided for each area. A pie chart showing the percentage of respondents who are residents, workers, business owners, visitors or 'other' is shown. The respondents who selected the 'other – please specify' option is also identified on an individual basis.

² <https://consultprojectcentre.co.uk/parkingph3>

The percentage of respondents who said they experience parking problems in each area is provided.

Questionnaire Responses

There were **2,694** responses to the online survey in total, once blank and duplicate answers were removed.

These responses have been analysed and a breakdown of each area is available in **Appendix E** (supplementary PDF).

Responder type and location

Corstorphine (**26%**) was the area with the highest level of responses.

98% of respondents identified as residents of the area they were responding to.

Vehicles

Of the **2,511** respondents who stated that they have a vehicle, **61%** have access to or use of one vehicle. **34%** own two vehicles and **3%** own three or more. **12%** of respondents states they do not own a vehicle.

7% of respondents from the Corstorphine area said they had or used three or more vehicles, meanwhile **19%** of those from Easter Road do not own a vehicle, which is the highest in relation to total number of responses for an area.

Off-street parking

Overall, **56%** of respondents do not have access to off-street parking or a garage with the Willowbrae North and West Leith areas (**80%** and **75%** respectively) being the areas with the least access to off-street parking.

44% of respondents (**1,159 people**) stated they do have access to off street parking or a garage, while **2%** provided no answer to the question. All **2,644** responses for this question were cross tabulated with how many vehicles they own and which area they belong to – see section 1.6.4 of **Appendix E** (supplementary PDF).

Car Club

98% of respondents (**2,585 people**) are not currently members of the car club. Out of the **2,648** people who were not members, **88%** said they would not join a car club even if more vehicles were accessible in their area. **6%** said they would, while **1%** left the answer blank.

Parking issues

24% of respondents (**643 people**) said they do experience parking problems, while another **75% (2015)** of people said they do not experience parking problems. **1%** of responses (**31 people**) left the question blank.

Responses from residents³ who say they do experience parking problems were highest in the Corstorphine and Willowbrae North areas, with **24%** and **33%** of respondents in those areas stating they experience parking problems.

A multiple-choice question was posed to those who said they experience parking problems asking them to tick a list of problems they experience. The biggest problem respondents said they faced is commuter parking. In total, **354** out of the **643** respondents who face parking issues said they experience this problem – this accounts for **55%** of the respondents. Dangerous parking (**53%**) and not being able to park near their home (**50%**) were second and third biggest issues, respectively.

Issue times

Most of these problems are encountered weekday mornings, afternoon, and evenings. There is a steady decline of respondents stating they experience these problems in the weekend. During the weekend, there is a slight rise in Saturday afternoon and evening time slots. Section 1.12.2 of **Appendix E** (Supplementary PDF) provides a full analysis of each problem and the time periods they are encountered.

Improvements and timescales

A multiple-choice question was asked to all respondents asking what parking improvements they would like to see in their area. **30%** of respondents would like to see more action taken against inconsiderately or dangerously parked vehicles. This was followed by **15%** who said improved access to parking for residents would be helpful.

Question 16 referred to preferred timescales. Although a range of timescales were provided, **64%** of respondents (**1,528 people**) made 'other' comments enabling them to enter their own free text, while **11%** of respondents (**291 people**) left the question blank.

³Referring to responses from people who identified as a resident and whose postcode falls within the consultation area.

Excluding 'Other' and blank responses, **874** respondents did select a timeframe that was provided in the survey. Out of this, **66% (575)** selected the 8:30am – 5:30pm M-F option. This figure accounts for **24%** of all responses to this question. This was followed by **8%** of people (**69** out of **575**) who selected the 8:00am – 6:30pm M-Su.

A full analysis of every response in Q16 is provided in sections 1.14.1 – 1.14.14 of **Appendix E** (supplementary PDF).

Interactive Map Responses

Across the eight interactive maps, **2,306** points were plotted by **1,549** people. Not every plot had a comment. **2,229** comments were left on the maps, **73** of these comments were left anonymously. A full breakdown and analysis of interactive map comments can be found in **Appendix B** (supplementary PDF)

5. DESIGN AMENDMENTS

Comments received via the interactive map are to be taken into account in the design review. Main suggestions from these comments and comments made at drop-in sessions are noted below.

Bonnington

- Review of land ownership in EH6 5TG. Residents note parking provision forms part of Title Deeds
- Disabled parking provision to be reviewed in EH6 5TG & EH6 5QB. Comments received stating some are no longer required and others stating additional spaces now required.
- Reduce length of parking provision on crest at Connaught Place to maximise visibility.
- Consider Bollard removal in Bonnington Grove to maximise accessibility.
- Consider additional spaces in Ashley Place which is shown as adopted verge however, has dropped kerb access and bituminous surfacing.
- Consider extended double yellows on Connaught Place to ensure access to cycleway is maintained. Single yellow present due to substation however, off road parking is present.

Corstorphine

- Review Disabled parking provision in Barony Terrace EH12 8RE for current blue badge holders.
- Review carriageway width Barony Terrace between No. 1 to 8 with potential to stagger parking areas further where pinch points are present. Ensure sufficient clearance for emergency services is maintained.
- Review permit holder area on Barony Terrace (No. 22 & 24) as comments received claims it blocks driveway entrances.
- Review access/egress (vehicle tracking) to driveways in Corstorphine Bank Avenue and proximity of parking bays to driveways.
- Review Shared use availability in Gordon Loan. Comments received from home carer highlighting no allowance in current proposals. Opportunity for additional space on south side of street.
- Review overall parking provision at Sycamore Terrace outside properties. No parking bays proposed currently.
- Review permit holder parking on Carrick Knowe Avenue and Traquair Park West junction and ensure line of sight from Traquair Alley Cycleway is not impeded.

- Review access/egress to driveways in Traquair Park West (No's 40, 40A & 42) as current proposals appear to block driveway with parking bay.
- Additional yellow line required in Traquair Park West adjacent to No 37.
- Review access/egress to driveways on Forrester Road as comments received believe parking provision impedes access. Additionally, review carriageway width provided and ensure accessibility for emergency services.
- Consider staggering of bays in Pinkhill to ensure free flow of traffic is maximised.
- Review disabled bay allocation in Pinkhill, comments received believes a space should be available outside 5 Pinkhill.
- Review planning applications for new driveways in Corstorphine Park Gardens to ensure design is accurate for ongoing developments.
- Review extent of double yellows in relation to driveways on Old Kirk Road (No's 18 & 18A.)
- Review driveway locations at 18 Kaimes Road. Comments received indicate the drop kerb arrangement is incorrect and that additional permit parking space could be allocated.
- Communicate restrictions associated with single yellow lines outside private driveways and garages. General feedback received raises numerous queries about associated restrictions related to these markings.

Easter Road

- Review of land ownership in Thorntreeside & Lawrie Reilly Place. Thorntreeside residents state parking provision forms part of Title Deeds. Lawrie Reilly place currently has no proposals however, developer has advised residents that the road was adopted.

Murrayfield (B9)

- Review driveway access at 73 Murrayfield Gardens as it is claimed a new driveway has been installed and is not reflected in the current proposals.
- Review parking locations and potential impacts to drivers visibility in Coltbridge Avenue
- Review two lane parking provision in Upper Coltbridge Terrace and ensure sufficient width to accommodate accessibility for Emergency Services
- Review proximity of parking bays to 11 Murrayfield Road to ensure safe access / egress from private driveway.
- Communicate restrictions associated with single yellow lines outside private driveways and garages. General feedback received raises numerous queries about associated restrictions related to these markings.

Roseburn

- Review of land ownership in Russel Gardens. Residents state some areas of parking provision where proposals lie form part of the development.

Saughtonhall

- Review planning application for 4 Balgreen Avenue. Resident states they are preparing to replace existing garage with larger double garage and would require a larger access provision than that shown on current plans.
- Request for plans to be considered in conjunction with EVCP development.
- Communicate restrictions associated with single yellow lines outside private driveways and garages. General feedback received raises numerous queries about associated restrictions related to these markings.
- Review Shared-Use allocation on Balgreen Avenue of note around No's 2 & 4.
- Review parking proposal outside Murrayfield Nursery and consider some restrictions immediately outside. Concerns raised over safety.

West Leith

- Review Car Club uptake in Restalrig/ryehill areas and consider whether increased provision is required.
- Review proposals outside Hermitage Park Primary and option of maintaining keep clear marking to address concerns over safety.
- Review vehicle tracking through Ryehill Grove and accessibility to driveways due to proximity of parking bays. Consider reducing parking provision to accommodate improved manoeuvrability.
- Review potential conflict with two-way flow and passing opportunities on Restalrig Road between No's 1 to 62. Consider staggering of parking bays.
- Review potential conflict with two-way flow and passing opportunities on Ryehill Terrace. Consider staggering of parking bays.
- Consider addition of double yellows on Lochend Road (No's 42, 44 & 34) between driveways particularly opposite Upper Hermitage junctions
- Communicate restrictions associated with single yellow lines outside private driveways and garages. General feedback received raises numerous queries about associated restrictions related to these markings.
- Request for plans to be considered in conjunction with EVCP development.

Willowbrae North

- Continue double yellow provision from Abercorn Road in to Lilyhill Terrace due to limited carriageway width.
- Request for plans to be considered in conjunction with EVCP development
- Review parking arrangement at offline parking area in Lilyhill Terrace and whether sufficient space is available for cars to park perpendicular to the carriageway.
- Review parking arrangements on Queen's Park Court and ensure sufficient available width provided for emergency service access. Consider parking provision on one side of the road only.
- Review parking arrangements on Scone Gardens and ensure sufficient available width provided for emergency service access. Consider parking provision on one side of the road only or staggering of parking bays.
- Consider moving of shared use bays on Willowbrae Avenue from existing location (No's 21 to 35) to between Glenlee Gardens and Glenlee Avenue junctions to allow direct access to resident parking from street facing properties.

6. STRATEGIES INTEGRATION

Introduction

While Controlled Parking Zones are an effective tool towards managing the supply and demand on on-street parking, they can also contribute towards both National and Local policies and objectives. They can improve road safety by discouraging parking in unsafe locations, support active travel projects, reduce congestion by discouraging demand and contribute to improved air quality amongst other benefits.

National Objectives

The Climate Change Secretary Roseanne Cunningham said *“There is a global climate emergency. This is not just about government action. And it is not something that only affects Scotland. All countries must act and must do so quickly and decisively. We all have a part to play, individuals, communities, businesses, other organisations. And opposition parties also have a responsibility to look at their own approaches”*⁴.

Scotland has a number of policy documents which provide objectives to improve air quality. These policy documents are based around cleaner air for Scotland as well as improved health, which is linked to cleaner air. The Cleaner Air for Scotland Strategy encompasses the guidance set out in the National Modelling Framework (NMF) and the National Low Emissions Framework (NLEF) and provides a number of key objectives which it aims to achieve across Scotland as a whole.

Cleaner Air for Scotland Strategy (2015)

- The cleaner air for Scotland policy document sets out a number of objectives which include:
- % change in NO₂ at each monitoring location, averaged over a three-year period;
- % change in PM₁₀ at each monitoring location, averaged over a three-year period;
- Share of public transport journeys in the overall modal split - % change and/or comparison to the national average;
- Share of low emission vehicles in the overall modal split - % change and/or comparison to the national average; and
- Share of walking and cycling journeys in the overall modal split - % change and/or comparison to the national average.

⁴ [The Global Climate Emergency - Scotland's Response: Climate Change Secretary Roseanna Cunningham's statement - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/publications/statements/2019/04/20190420-climate-change-secretary-roseanna-cunningham-statement/pages/2)

Local Air Quality Management

Since the Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) review and assessment process was introduced, local authorities across Scotland have been required to review and assess the air quality within their geographical areas. The process is designed to identify any exceedances of the UK Air Quality Strategy Objectives and to enable any local authority that identifies such an area to develop and implement a plan with stakeholder to improve air quality within the area ((www.gov.scot), n.d.).

Air Quality Management Areas

Under section 83(1) of the Environment Act 1995, Local Authorities have a duty to designate any relevant areas where the air quality objectives are not (or are unlikely to be) being met as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). AQMAs must be designated officially by means of an 'order'. The extent of the AQMA may be limited to the area of exceedance or encompass a larger area. Following the declaration of an AQMA, the local authority is required to develop and implement a plan (Air Quality Action Plan) to improve air quality in that area.⁵

The National Transport Strategy

The National Transport Strategy has a strong focus towards evolving travel patterns and public demands which the introduction of an CPZ would support. Under the Priorities 'Takes Climate Action' and 'Improves Our Health and Wellbeing' the Strategy is clear that to tackle the climate issue and improve wellbeing, the demand for travel by car must be tackled to reduce congestion, equally reducing congestion is noted as an enabler to 'help deliver inclusive economic growth'. As Edinburgh was the sixth most congested City in the UK, there are opportunities for the introduction of a CPZ to contribute towards these priorities. The Strategy specifically mentions that the cost of parking could influence individuals' and businesses' travel choices.

To support the National Transport Strategy the Scottish Government have defined 'A Long-term Vision for Active travel in Scotland 2030'. This document clearly emphasises the need to encourage active travel through a number of means, several of which would be supported by the introduction of a CPZ. The introduction of a CPZ would allow parking to be managed in such a way to enable new cycling infrastructure, improved and enhanced environments creating a sense of place

⁵ [Cleaner air for Scotland: the road to a healthier future - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](http://www.gov.scot)

Local Level – Edinburgh City

Edinburgh Council aims to set out how it will use Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) as one of the main tools to reduce pollution and encourage mode shift in the city. There are a number of challenges in the city that need to be tackled and have been outlined below:

City Plan 2030

The Council is preparing a new Local Development Plan for Edinburgh called the City Plan 2030, which will set out policies and proposals for development in Edinburgh between 2020 and 2030. Alignment with local air quality management and The City of Edinburgh Council LAQM Annual Progress Report 2020 in developing local and national air quality strategies will be crucial to ensuring sustainable economic growth.

The Council aims to reduce car dependency and encourage a public mode shift to sustainable transport methods by implementing actions including, Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ), increased cycle parking and repurposing use of kerb space for public realm uses.

People will be able to make travel choices that minimise the long-term impacts on our climate and the wellbeing of future generations. We face a global climate emergency. Scotland must transition to a net-zero emissions economy for the benefit of our environment, our people and our future prosperity.

Scotland's communities are shaped around people, with walking or cycling the most popular choice for shorter everyday journeys. This helps people make healthy living choices and assists in delivering places that are happier, more inclusive and equal, and more prosperous. Travelling by foot or cycle, or with a personal mobility aid such as a mobility scooter, is a realistic option for all local journeys as individuals. People are confident to walk and cycle more often and they value and use their local transport networks (streets, roads and path networks), which offer safe, high quality, realistic and predictable journey options for active travel.⁶

CEC City Mobility Plan (2020)

The City Mobility Plan (CMP) replaces the 2014-2019 Local Transport Strategy and provides a strategic framework for the safe and effective movement of people and

⁶ [active travel.pdf \(transport.gov.scot\)](#) pg.16

goods around the city up until 2030. The CMP addresses the relationship between transport and environmental emissions and alongside partnering policies aim to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. The core objectives of the CMP are:

- To improve health, wellbeing, equality and inclusion
- To protect and enhance Edinburgh's environment and respond to climate change
- To support inclusive and sustainable economic growth

The CMP action plans is set out in a three-stage vision, which sets out key milestones for 2022, 2025 and 2030. Some of these milestones include the review of citywide bus routes and existing active travel schemes, reformation of council owned transport companies and the implementation of a Low Emissions Zone. Longer term milestones being a full delivery of cycling and walking networks and a largely car-free city centre by 2030.

Air Quality: Action Plan (Revised 2008)

The Air Quality Action Plan presented a number of initiatives and actions designed to mitigate air quality impacts and assist in the meeting of air quality objectives. These included encouraging a cleaner fleet focusing on bus and freight through forming Quality Partnerships, greater consideration of the impact of developments, Transport Planning initiatives including;

- Park & ride and associated bus priority
- Differential parking charges
- Cycle share scheme
- Tram line introduction

Low Emission Zone Proposal

The City of Edinburgh Council LEZ seeks to improve air quality by restricting the most polluting vehicles. The LEZ can help to realise a number of benefits including reduction in non-complaint vehicles entering the zones, a reduction on the number of harmful pollutants and a reduction in total traffic numbers in the zone.

The introduction of a LEZ in Edinburgh helps to realise some of Scotland's National objectives and Edinburgh's local objectives.

The current proposal is that only a tight city centre zone would apply to all vehicles (with exceptions). The introduction of a CPZ can support the aims of the LEZ by

focusing on wider areas which will encourage commuters and visitors to consider if they really need to bring a car into the City or, if there are alternative modes of transport they can use.

Conclusion

A wide variety of responses were received for this consultation, sometimes with conflicting comments regarding the proposals for certain areas. For example, a group of residents in an area would respond saying there was a real need for restrictions, while another group from the same area responded that there were no issues and controls were unnecessary. Responses could vary from no to many issues from street to street in some areas.

Many specific comments were received regarding certain aspects of the designs and where the current proposals are incorrect, for example where a proposed parking bay may have been drawn across a current driveway. These comments will be reviewed as per the feedback received and improvements made to the proposals. We will also be reviewing requests for Mews-style parking in several areas.

The Corstorphine area is, in particular, where the need for controls is not felt necessary by those living within the area. Despite this, the air quality within Corstorphine is at a concerning level, especially along the St. John's Road area. That coupled with the prediction of future congestion in the area, means that Controlled Parking Zones would work to minimise the impact of these issues and help to future-proof the area against any adverse changes in traffic volumes.

West Leith is another area of concern whereby non-implementation of CPZs would result in displaced traffic from other areas with controls in place. The measures proposed would mitigate against this issue and ensure residents do not feel the negative impact of the introduction of CPZs in neighbouring areas.

Whilst the overall consultation response indicated that people felt controls were not generally required, we are also taking into account the strategies, policies and targets of the City of Edinburgh Council for lower emissions and better public transport infrastructure in this report, to ensure a joined-up approach with wider council projects. In order to meet the targets set out in the Edinburgh City Plan, the City Mobility Plan, Air Quality Action Plan, Low Emission Zone Proposal and to generally tackle climate

change head on, it is recommended to move forward with the outlined CPZ proposals from this engagement. Detailed recommendations can be found in the next section.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the national and local strategies mentioned in the previous sections, the introduction of CPZs is an effective tool toward supporting the defined outcomes. As well as supporting broader strategies, issues these are aiming to improve are detailed below:

Congestion hotspots

To the West of the city, as seen in Figure 3, there are congestion hotspots that are anticipated to expand in the future due to the high level of road traffic flowing through specific corridors. Introducing parking controls throughout the city will not only help to reduce current congestion but will also future-proof areas against predicted congestion arising in the next few years due to new development. The parking controls being proposed are designed to work in conjunction with other controls being introduced elsewhere in Edinburgh, so that impact on residents is minimal, and to support the council's wider active travel measures that are focusing on providing high quality public transport for commuting and an improved active travel network for walking and cycling, so that residents have a better choice of travel modes away from the private car.

Air Quality Management

The council continuously monitor air pollution across the city to ensure it falls within legal target levels. Where areas are measuring above the legal limits, the council have to put measures in place to improve air quality, usually in the form of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). These AQMAs then have Air Quality Action Plans (AQAPs) developed which outline a range measures to be delivered over a certain timescale to improve the air quality in the AQMA and bring it back to within legal limits. More information on Edinburgh's local air quality management is available [here](#).

The council's Central AQMA shown in Figure 1 includes several of the areas we have engaged with in Phase 2, including Roseburn Terrace, on the northern edge of the Roseburn CPZ proposal area, the southern edge of the Murrayfield PPA proposal area, the southwestern edge of the Easter Road CPZ area, and London Road on the northern edge of the Willowbrae North CPZ proposal area.

The St John's Road AQMA shown in Figure 2 runs through the middle of the Corstorphine CPZ proposal area.

The introduction of parking controls would support the AQMAs through encouraging people to use alternative modes of transport where possible, re-evaluate their car use, and thereby ease congestion in the wider AQMA areas through a reduction in car use and movement throughout these locations.

Central Air Quality Management Area




Figure 1 - Map of the Central AQMA



Figure 2 - Map of St John's Road AQMA




Figure 3 - Overview map of traffic and associated issues in Edinburgh

8. APPENDICES

Appendix A – Consultation Area Maps and Leaflet (supplementary PDF)

Appendix B – Interactive Map Comments and Analysis (supplementary PDF)

Appendix C – Emails (supplementary PDF)

Appendix D – Response Location Maps (supplementary PDF)

Appendix E – Online Survey Analysis by Area (supplementary PDF)

Quality

It is the policy of Project Centre to supply Services that meet or exceed our clients' expectations of Quality and Service. To this end, the Company's Quality Management System (QMS) has been structured to encompass all aspects of the Company's activities including such areas as Sales, Design and Client Service.

By adopting our QMS on all aspects of the Company, Project Centre aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. Ensure a clear understanding of customer requirements;
2. Ensure projects are completed to programme and within budget;
3. Improve productivity by having consistent procedures;
4. Increase flexibility of staff and systems through the adoption of a common approach to staff appraisal and training;
5. Continually improve the standard of service we provide internally and externally;
6. Achieve continuous and appropriate improvement in all aspects of the company;

Our Quality Management Manual is supported by detailed operational documentation. These relate to codes of practice, technical specifications, work instructions, Key Performance Indicators, and other relevant documentation to form a working set of documents governing the required work practices throughout the Company.

All employees are trained to understand and discharge their individual responsibilities to ensure the effective operation of the Quality Management System.



Award Winning

**national
transport awards**

LTA LONDON
TRANSPORT
AWARDS

**british
parking
awards
2018
WINNER**



**british
parking
awards
2020
WINNER**

Certifications



Accreditations



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE™
We invest in people Platinum



Memberships



Contact

London Head
Office

Unit 2 Holford Yard
London
WC1X 9HD
tel: 0330 1358 950

Old Street Office

29-33 Old Street
London
EC1V 9HL

Brighton Office

38 Foundry Street
Brighton
BN1 4AT
tel: 01273 056 122

Slough Office

Fourth Floor
The Urban Building
3-9 Albert Street
Slough, SL1 2BE
tel: 0330 1358 950

Edinburgh Office

12 Lower Gilmore
Place
Edinburgh, EH3 9NY


Manchester Office

Bartle House
Oxford Court
Manchester, M2 3WQ
tel: 0161 914 9300

info@projectcentre.co.uk • www.projectcentre.co.uk

Appendix A – Proposal Area Map and Engagement Leaflet Example

Controlled Parking Zone Engagement Bonnington



•EDINBURGH•
THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

Introduction

The City of Edinburgh Council is proposing measures to address parking pressures in your area. As part of the process of introducing these measures, we want to know what difficulties you experience with parking in your area, as well as your views on what is being proposed.

Background

The Council has seen a recent increase in requests from communities across the city, asking us to take action to tackle the issues caused by non-residential parking. In particular, residents have expressed concern that the lack of parking controls is impacting on their ability to park near to their own homes.

In response to those concerns, the Council took the decision to undertake a citywide assessment of parking pressures. By looking at the entire city, including all satellite towns and villages, this review took a strategic, proactive approach to addressing increasing parking pressures across the city.

The review split the city into areas, with surveys undertaken in every street across the city to measure parking pressures. The results were then used to assess the potential need for control in each area.

The overall outcome of the review is a prioritised list of areas, with the Council adopting a phased approach that will see parking controls proposed in those areas worst impacted by parking pressure.

Proposals

We are now proposing parking controls in several areas where we consider that they would provide benefits not only to residents, but also to visitors and businesses.

The second phase of these proposed parking controls includes the Corstorphine, Saughtonhall, Murrayfield (B9 PPA), Roseburn, Bonnington, Willowbrae North, Easter Road and West Leith areas.

Have your say

What parking problems do you face in your area? What would you like the Council to address? We want to know what your views are on these proposals. This leaflet explains some of the main aspects of the proposed controls, with further information on the proposals themselves available on our website.

Share your views online at
www.consultprojectcentre.co.uk/parkingph2

We are also holding drop-in sessions where we will have detailed maps displayed for you to view. Staff will be on-hand to answer your questions.

- Microsoft Teams, Wednesday 24 February at 1pm
- Microsoft Teams, Monday 1 March at 6pm

This consultation will close on Sunday 14 March 2021 at midnight.


What happens next?

The results of this consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the Transportation and Environment Committee, so that the Council can consider your views and comments.

For updates and further information visit,
www.edinburgh.gov.uk/parkingreview

You can get this document on tape, in Braille, large print and various computer formats if you ask us.

Please contact Interpretation and Translation Service (ITS) on 0131 242 8181 and quote reference number 19-5447. ITS can also give information on community language translations.



What type of control is proposed for my area?

We are proposing to introduce Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) in each of the areas covered by this consultation.

What is a CPZ?

A CPZ is an area where all available space is controlled. Kerbside space is either allocated as parking places, or is controlled by yellow lines. In a CPZ there will be no uncontrolled parking space.

How do CPZs work?

CPZs work by managing how the available space is used. A combination of different types of parking places help people who live and visit the area to find places to park, allow loading while yellow lines keep traffic moving and create safer conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. Parking controls can also deter commuting by private vehicle, encouraging non-residents to consider how they travel into the city and encouraging them to use more sustainable forms of transport.

What parking would be available?

Parking will mainly consist of either permit holder parking or shared-use parking, both of which can be used by permit holders. Shared-use parking can also be used by pay-and-display customers, upon payment of the relevant charge. There may also be some pay-and-display parking places near to shops. Existing disabled parking places and city car club spaces will not be affected by the proposals.

When would a CPZ operate?

The times during which parking controls apply vary across the city. The basic hours of restriction are Monday to Friday between 8:30am and 5:30pm. However, the results of this consultation will help the Council decide the hours and days of control in each area.

Am I eligible for a permit?

To be eligible for a resident's permit you must both live and have a vehicle registered at an address within a CPZ. Permits are available for most vehicle types, provided that the vehicle is not more than 2.5m in height. Each household would be entitled to up to two permits, but only one permit can be issued to any individual.

Would I have to buy a permit?

If you are a resident and wish to park your vehicle on-street during the hours of control, then you may need to buy a permit. For short periods you would be able to pay-and-display, but for longer periods residents would find it beneficial to have a permit.

How much will permits cost?

No decision has been made on what the cost of permits might be in your area. Costs will be dependent on a number of factors, including the proposed hours and days when parking controls apply as well as your vehicle's emissions. Details of current permit prices in existing CPZs can be found on the Council's website at www.edinburgh.gov.uk/parking.

How will CPZ affect my visitors?

Your visitors will be able to make use of pay-and-display parking. However, each household within the CPZ would also be entitled to buy an annual allocation of visitor permits. Each permit allows 90 minutes of parking and is a cheaper alternative to pay-and-display.

How will CPZ affect blue badge holders?

Blue badge holders who are resident in a CPZ can obtain a permit at no cost. Blue badge holders also receive an increased number of visitor permits at reduced cost. All blue badge holders can park for free, and without limit of stay, in any shared use or pay-and-display parking place.

Would I still be able to have tradesmen visit?

Yes. You can issue tradesmen with visitor permits or they can use pay-and-display parking. They can also apply to the Council for a Trades Permit.

What parking will there be for businesses?

Certain business types can obtain permits if they can show that there is a business need for their vehicle. Otherwise, all non-residential parking will be subject to the lengths of stay and charges that apply at pay-and-display parking places. The scheme is designed to discourage commuting to work by private vehicle, so options for long-stay parking are likely to be limited.

Appendix B – Interactive Map Comments and Analysis

	Number of Locations Plotted	Number of Comments	Number of Responders	Anonymous Comments/Plots
Bonnington	396	384	203	3
Corstorphine	579	560	412	29 ¹
Easter Road	108	104	72	1
Murrayfield (B9)	238	232	168	16 ²
Roseburn	39	37	30	9
Saughtonhall	259	253	189	8
West Leith	389	363	279	5
Willowbrae North	298	296	196	2
Total	2306	2229	1549	73

¹ 22 responders gave their name as “resident”

² 3 responders gave their name as “resident”

1. BONNINGTON


1.1.1 203 people dropped 396 pins on the interactive map

1.1.2 Of those, 384 had comments and 13 were left blank

1.1.3 12 comments are positive

1.1.4 367 comments are negative

1.1.5 17 comments are neutral



1.1.6 The most common theme of comments was with regards to there being a reduction in parking availability.

1.1.7 The next most common theme was alternate suggestions to what was proposed.

I am a...	Comment	X	Y
Resident	Currently there are no issues parking in Gosford Place so see no reason to bring this in.	55.97275	-3.19102
Resident	Not enough parking spaces in Bonnington Mills Estate and no visitor spaces	55.97001	-3.18984
Resident	There is a yellow line in place where 7 cars can easily park. This is making parking more restrictive by imposing a yellow line which is removing parking for residents. For over 30 years this has never been an issue.	55.96996	-3.18977
Resident	This disabled bay was for a lady who died over 10 years ago. Her son now uses it as his personal parking spot. Nobody will use this bay but there is no sign on a post. This parking bay will become unused and needs to be freed up for general use.	55.9704	-3.18981
Resident	This area needs to be single yellow if its going to be lined so residents can park overnight. There are no restrictions here. This is just crazy !	55.96997	-3.1898
Resident	There are few parking issues in this area. You're placing double yellow lines where people never park. Parking bays on sides of the street where people never park, it is dangerous to do so. What problems are you trying to solve?	55.9708	-3.18878
Resident	Remove single yellow lines from in front of garages and residential parking bays. Remove small sections of double yellow lines. Replace with single white lines. This applies to the whole estate.	55.971	-3.18965
Resident	This can be extended to the corner	55.97048	-3.18915
Resident	This is one the wrong side of the road, dangerous location	55.97106	-3.18876

Resident	This double yellow isn't required, this can be permit parking space	55.97101	-3.18965
Other	Bays as indicated will obstruct already problematic access to Crabbies at the east end of Graham Street	55.97256	-3.18611
Other	Bays as indicated will obstruct already problematic access to Crabbies at the east end of Graham Street	55.97256	-3.18596
Resident	We do not have a problem in Connaught place	55.97085	-3.19244
Resident	There is an error on the map. The spaces marked on the map below are behind a kerb and therefore private and cannot be included in the permit scheme.	55.97035	-3.18939
Resident	Proposal for permit holder bay must cover both sides of street on (redacted postcode). NOT happy with proposal for Pay & Display over bridge near crematorium. This area is ESSENTIAL for spill-over parking from residents. Keep as shared use.	55.9693	-3.19553
Resident	I strongly object to this proposal! We are a small, quiet estate with a lot of elderly residents who rely on their cars being as close to their house as possible.	55.97044	-3.18987
Resident	I object to the enforcement of CPZ in our estate	55.97038	-3.18988
Resident	The proposal will remove existing parking spaces for residents of Bonnyhaugh development through the removal of parking spaces in front of garages and in street. We currently don't have a significant issue with parking in the development.	55.97145	-3.18896
Resident	Removal of spaces in front of garage and mix of permit and non permit provision will create more problems than this aims to solve. Best solution is a resident's only permit. Parking pressure in estate is not 9am-5pm it is 5pm-9am.	55.97133	-3.1889
Resident	no need for double yellow here	55.97035	-3.20003
Resident	Warriston Crematorium should be required to increase parking spaces AND make clear parking is restricted particularly for large funerals to reduce impact on residents parking	55.97037	-3.1967
Resident	This will result in all gardens being concreted over. There is an assumption that we can all take public transport which simply isn't the case. The state of the roads is also so poor that people opt for large vehicles just to survive their commute.	55.97152	-3.19866
Resident	Unfair to residents of the Bonnyhaugh estate who are now to be penalised with fewer spaces & financial expense because of actions of commuters from outwith the city and areas of Leith who've requested a CPZ. Bonnyhaugh residents do not want this.	55.97117	-3.1887
Resident	Not good for the neighbourhood at all	55.97043	-3.19037
Resident	These parking bays are at narrowest point of street and make entry and exit into driveways difficult. Exiting will likely involve mounting pavement so as not to hit parked vehicle. Parked vehicles also block view of cars coming up from bottom flats.	55.97097	-3.19244
Resident	Hill with blind access at top and bottom. Parking on opposite side will reduce this to single lane and vehicles meeting in middle will have to reverse. Impossible in ice and snow like just recently. Accidents will happen.	55.97165	-3.19113
Resident	There is absolutely no need for a CPZ in our lovely neighbourhood. It will cause many problems.	55.97152	-3.19866
Resident	Money making schemes by the council that nobody wants on our estate absolutely scandalous by the council	55.97108	-3.18964
Resident	There are no parking problems in Easter Warriston. All residents can park near to their own homes.	55.97019	-3.19867
Resident	The impact of non-resident parking on residents in the Bonnington area is overstated, and this approach to fixing a problem that doesn't exist will do more to inconvenience the people who live here than improve their environment. Will email to elaborate.	55.96917	-3.18485
Resident	Parking will always be a pain in a successful city. Taxing residents with a permit, adding double yellow lines and reducing spaces will just create more problems. Concentrate on removing bottle necks such as opposite the Bonnington pub on Newhaven rd.	55.97131	-3.18842
Resident	The only reason the parking is busy at burns place/new haven road is because of the building site. After 5pm and before 10am there are usually plenty spaces. I don't want to have to pay for a permit to park outside my home.	55.9709	-3.18721
Resident	If the parking at this location was moved to the other side of the street there would be four more parking spots available. There are also trees on the other side of the road which will impede high sided vehicles hampering deliveries and emergency vehicle	55.97005	-3.18977
Resident	The single yellow line will stop people parking in front of their garages, a very useful source of parking for residents. Should be left available for use as garages are too small for everyday use with current sized vehicles.	55.97013	-3.19029
Resident	The location of this disabled spot is reducing the number of spaces available to residents. Check to see if still required or relocate	55.97046	-3.19049
Resident	Check to see if this disabled space is still current and required.	55.97008	-3.19044
Resident	Check to see if this disabled space is still current and required.	55.97035	-3.19036
Resident	Currently angled parking provides more spaces than head on parking, reconfigure will gain extra spaces.	55.97028	-3.19061

Resident	There is room for an extra spot here, parking is tight but having enough space for residents is a key concern.	55.97031	-3.19035
Resident	Currently angled parking allows for many more spaces here. Maximising residential space should be a priority.	55.97046	-3.19036
Resident	Angled parking here will improve the number of space available. This is currently done by the residents.	55.97042	-3.19053
Resident	Angled parking here will improve the number of space available. This is currently done by the residents.	55.97042	-3.19053
Resident	The opposite side of the street is currently used and in combination with angled parking next to it will achieve a higher number of spaces.	55.97036	-3.18958
Resident	Angled parking here would be preferable.	55.97043	-3.18948
Resident	Is council owned land? It's within a curbed area?	55.97036	-3.18937
Resident	An extra space could be squeezed in here to raise the number of residential parking spaces.	55.97049	-3.18909
Resident	An extra residential space could be fitted into this section next to the garages.	55.97022	-3.19031
Resident	There is room for an extra space or two here. Maximising the number of space should be a priority to ease parking issues.	55.9706	-3.18877
Resident	Parking in front of garages should be encouraged to achieve a higher number of residential spaces	55.97135	-3.18873
Resident	Disabled Bay check to see if relevant and council painted disabled bay lines should be removed if not required.	55.9704	-3.18983
Resident	This area is predominantly used by residents for parking, very little non resident parking takes place. Parking restrictions will increase parking pressure and fail to achieve the councils aim of helping residents and cost us for no benefit.	55.97125	-3.18749
Resident	Why Pay and Display, with more flats being built nearby it needs to be shared use or residents. A reduction in residents space isn't going to help parking pressures in the area. I see no reason for parking restrictions they will make the situation worse.	55.97181	-3.18758
Resident	Bloody disgrace	55.97108	-3.18964
Resident	This is ridiculous, trying to make money and also cut parking Spaces on our estate what a stupid idea.	55.97108	-3.18964
Other	On behalf of elderly parents at 8/1 Connaught Pl, v concerned at permit bays rt outside bedroom windows. These should be reserved for residents/visitors. My father had blue badge, pls advise how to get permission for disabled bay.	55.9719	-3.19133
Resident	To be specific, I am not in favour of the proposals for Bonnington Grove, where I live. The proposal for double yellow lines in the western end of the street, on both sides of the road, between no 22 and 32, will make this street even more of a rat run	55.97276	-3.18922
Resident	The proposed restrictions are more than halving the number of parking spaces on my street which will cause issues. Currently there are no issues with parking with the number of on street spaces and driveways well balanced with the number of residents.	55.97199	-3.19737
Resident	If you are going to remove half the available parking on Chancelot Grove then at the very least all the parking on ferry road nearby should be for residents! This section should not be pay and display.	55.97259	-3.19756
Resident	We have no problem parking in our street at the moment and that will change for the worse if this goes through. There is a large percentage of space for shared parking compared to nearby streets eg Pitt Street according to your map. Why is this?	55.97219	-3.19084
Resident	Happy to have to have permits but will the include others with permits to park in our street already to many cars use our street to park. If you have two cars will it be more expensive for second car and will there be any allowance for low emission cars?	55.9724	-3.18968
Resident	Cars parking here do not display blue badge. Space is so wide it reduces other parking places	55.97065	-3.18899
Resident	How do you stop non residents parking in private parking areas?	55.97052	-3.18907
Resident	How do you intend to stop non residents parking in private spaces	55.97038	-3.18993
Resident	With the yellow lines, there will not be enough spaces for all the residents to park. This will cause anxiety, stress and possible trouble between neighbours. I do not see how this is a better solution for something which is not a problem.	55.9704	-3.18937
Resident	So many parking spaces removed. We are all residents who park here. Where are we to park? We now have parking to worry about as well as Covid. This is not good for our mental health. Please rethink this.	55.97094	-3.18884
Other	The restrictions will cause greater hassle and cost to any of us who live and have our properties there. We do not have an issue with others parking in the area so disadvantages are all we have in this situation.	55.97314	-3.19227
Resident	I'm concerned that single yellow line restrictions in Bonnington Avenue, reduce the amount of resident parking significantly, losing 4-5 spaces. Please replace with resident permit parking.	55.97198	-3.18859
Resident	Reducing the amount of parking in Bonnington Grove will significantly increase parking pressure in the immediate surrounding streets, it's bad enough as it is!	55.9726	-3.19005

Resident	The introduction of double yellow lines in the spaces between driveways of main door properties it too restrictive and at most should be a single yellow line. We need to be able to packages, shopping or grandchildren on the street before parking on drive	55.97151	-3.19227
Resident	Single yellow line only required here to allow residents to use street at weekends when working in garden, on drive or when children/grandchildren visiting, please dont restrict our quality of day to day life which is so important to us in community	55.97151	-3.19226
Resident	No need for a yellow line over driveway. It would be unusual for anyone to park in front of a driveway. I would contest that use of double and single yellow lines proposed in these areas restricts quality of living	55.97151	-3.19234
Resident	My driveway is the only one in the street that is on a slope and has an angle so not ideal for parking on, elongated white H would allow me to park at top of driveway without causing any obstruction to traffic	55.97151	-3.19234
Resident	Im concerned under the new plans the Bonnyhaugh estate residents are in fact losing spaces. Currently I can always find a place to park	55.97025	-3.19029
Resident	There is no parking issues in Bonnyhaugh estate but you're making us have less spaces in the estate and have to pay for this - it makes no sense! I'm totally against this proposal - I purchased my house with parking, which is free and with ample space	55.97134	-3.18902
Resident	I object to the proposals for parking on my estate. Parking at the best of times is difficult for residents this is only going to cause so much more problems.	55.97121	-3.18904
Resident	The parking in this inlet is perfectly well organised and is a shared parking space between the residents. The Mews system would be best used as the addition of the yellow lines and restrictions is a waste of time and money.	55.97102	-3.19223
Resident	What non car driving mad man came up with these plans. Trying to do away with parking on our estate. Total arseholes	55.97118	-3.18883
Resident	I can't see how finding a parking space in my area is considered an issue. There is plenty around also during this period when people are working from home, hence they are not moving the car!	55.97151	-3.17773
Resident	What genius came up with the idea of giving less parking spots at a area that needs more	55.97001	-3.18984
Resident	I have never had issues parking here - your map does not note the new street/s in this development. These permit parking proposals should be postponed to a point after COVID restrictions have lifted, by which time normal parking demand can be ascertained	55.97057	-3.18493
Resident	making this section double yellow, will remove parking. At the moment the the parked vehicles mean that vehicles travelling along Bonnington Grove (between numbers 22 and 30) slow down traffic, making it safer and more pleasant for residents.	55.97259	-3.19004
Resident	Why is this a double yellow? At the moment occasional vehicles parked slow down traffic and reduce vehicle speeds making the street safer for cyclists and pedestrians	55.97283	-3.18892
Resident	Unless the pavements are significantly widened, vehicles will speed along here if it is double yellows on both sides. Parked vehicles currently force vehicles to slow down.	55.97252	-3.19031
Resident	Pedestrians (including many school children) walk on the road because the pavements are too narrow. Putting in double yellow lines on this street will allow vehicles to drive faster that at present..	55.97278	-3.18915
Resident	Why not make Bonnington Grove a no through road, stopping rat racing, being permeable to walking, wheeling, cycling and essential services? This would make the street much safer and quieter.	55.97239	-3.19095
Resident	We do not need it, thank you.	55.97277	-3.19199
Resident	The amount of parking bays and different zones you have in Easter warriston is absurd has anyone actually had a walk around this estate or did you just draw lines on a map from your office in my view completely unacceptable for residents and visitors	55.97152	-3.19866
Resident	At the moment in Connaught Place on street and unassigned parking bay use takes place without conflict. If residents are prevented from parking on street in front of their properties by double yellow lines this will lead to _increased_ parking pressure.	55.97159	-3.19216
Resident	there is no problem currently with parking in Gosford Place. The street scene is lovely with the row of tenements opposite the cycle track. I would really rather not see the street defaced with white lines and signs on poles.	55.97316	-3.19176
Resident	The proposals do not seek to reduce parking on Gosford Place and as such all the white lining and signs on posts is unnecessary. It is already a safe place to cycle due to the narrow road width reducing speed and the low level of traffic.	55.97285	-3.19149
Resident	The narrow available width of road reduces vehicle speed here. Removing parking will likely result in an increase of speed which will make this road more dangerous for walking and cycling.	55.97273	-3.18933
Resident	I am really confused about the mix of parking proposed along Newhaven Road. This road is a nightmare to navigate due to on street parking. In the interests of safety for cyclists and bus movement there ought to be NO parking at all here.	55.97235	-3.18761

Resident	Anyone can currently park on this "Private Road" - parking controls are needed if the surrounding area is going to be a controlled zone	55.96916	-3.18702
Resident	I have lived in the Bonnyhaugh estate (Bleachfield) for years, and have never had a problem finding a parking space. Under the proposed changes, I cannot see how my neighbours and I will all be able to park outside our own homes. Unwelcome & unwanted.	55.97047	-3.18922
Resident	I object. The parking is very limited as it is in the estate, with the new proposals, residents who have lived here 20/30 years will have nowhere to park their cars safely and in result, will have to drive around the area to find alternative parking.	55.97108	-3.18964
Resident	Do not like this at all. Ludacris cutting spaces in a residential area where residents have lived 20+ Years.	55.9713	-3.18878
Resident	More parking allocations for disabled and car clubs/ co-operatives. Fewer shared use/permit holders. Encourage people to share cars so fewer cars on the road and space for bike lockers, cycle lanes & pedestrians	55.97459	-3.19874
Resident	I have been a resident of Gosford Place for 20 years and have never experienced a problem with parking. By introducing a controlled zone I believe you will create problems for residents. Have you done a survey to find out what the issues are? I	55.97281	-3.19132
Resident	No historical issue; displaces parking problems to the area; flaw in double/single lines; likely loss of gardens / -ve environment impact	55.97112	-3.19216
Resident	The decision to put double yellows in location 1 is appallingly bad management. Halving the amount of parking space for a high density cluster of residences like this is an astonishingly bad idea.	55.97313	-3.19393
Resident	No need for parking permits this far out of the city centre. This move will push people to park just outside the new restricted areas, eg in Craighall Road and Newhaven Road.	55.97289	-3.19587
Resident	I do not agree with paying for parking and a sign with resident only should be put in	55.97147	-3.18918
Resident	This is totally unnecessary within the Bonnington Mills housing estate. We have no issues with parking however this scheme would create many as residents would be competing with each other for spaces.	55.96975	-3.18984
Resident	Parking is working well here just now. There would be a reduction in parking spaces. People without driveways and garages would have no free parking.	55.97196	-3.19127
Resident	double yellow lines here mean rRemoval of parking space that has been in constant use since we moved here. Some double yellow useful especially around garage driveway entrance but not the total bit.	55.97215	-3.1918
Resident	Double yellow lines along the streets a bad idea and needs much better thinking as you mentioned at the consultation meeting on Monday	55.97153	-3.192
Resident	big change in parking capacity In the whole of Bonnington Grove - needs coordination with ALL the actual residents of this street to find out there needs.	55.97251	-3.19031
Resident	I defiantly DO NOT agree with the zoned parking, or yellow lines,	55.97049	-3.19809
Resident	It's not helpful taking parking spaces	55.97001	-3.18984
Resident	How can reviving do many spaces be helpful to residents?! There is not currently an issue with parking. These proposals would definitely create big parking issues and could lead to disputes amongst neighbours.	55.96996	-3.18979
Resident	Introducing double yellow lines in this specific spot is unnecessary. People currently manage roadside parking quite well and cooperatively, with cars tightly packed, and any reduction in capacity will be detrimental.	55.97083	-3.18967
Resident	Residents and visitors generally manage their parking well in this area and introducing restrictions and costs, and reducing capacity, will be detrimental. It will cause frustration and driving will become more aggressive, against children's interests.	55.97105	-3.18877
Resident	Yellow line in front of garages. I use public transport for work which means I cannot leave my car there and will have to park in a permit space thus reducing parking availability.	55.9713	-3.18869
Resident	Double yellow lines means we will loose three spaces	55.97125	-3.1887
Resident	Double yellow lines means we loose a space	55.97131	-3.18894
Resident	This double yellow will prevent two cars parking head on. A guest of a neighbour or tradesman could park here and do at present	55.97116	-3.18879
Resident	The drawing is out of date at Bonnington Mill as these buildings have been replaced by new flats that are already on sale. There have been other developments nearby and I suggest this map is reviewed to make sure these have been included.	55.97129	-3.187
Resident	You are taking away far too many places that we, as residents, park in. It will make finding a parking spot incredibly difficult. I agree residents parking permits but disagree with buying a permit and then there being nowhere to actually park!	55.97	-3.18987
Resident	This should be residents parking.	55.96996	-3.18982
Resident	this should be residents parking	55.96996	-3.19002

Resident	Has this disabled been checked that it's still valid? We need to maximise residents parking space which is the aim of the parking proposal.	55.97076	-3.18706
Resident	The section is poorly designed, the other side is better for residents parking.	55.97008	-3.18976
Resident	Parking in front of garages increases the number of spaces available for residents, putting a single yellow in front is counter productive.	55.97015	-3.1903
Resident	I don't think this disabled space is still valid, have the disabled space been checked for validity? more time is needed checking and planning the parking.	55.97009	-3.19044
Resident	The whole proposal is on flawed logic that this area is used by non residents for parking. Parking restrictions in estate will reduce amount of spaces and cause increases parking pressure.	55.97031	-3.1898
Resident	The may be new residents as flats are being built here, not all have parking spaces. The bonnyhaugh estate is losing over 35% of it's spaces. Day time parking restriction will cause issues for residents during the day and then increase issue at night.	55.97124	-3.18745
Resident	This area has a large number of garages which people park in front of, removing the option to park here will cause increased parking pressure. The aim of the restrictions to reduce parking pressure will fail.	55.97096	-3.18972
Resident	The design of the parking here is abysmal, how is this a good design. There is a huge loss of spaces here, it won't help residents parking. The aim of the proposal is definitively not met here.	55.97039	-3.19046
Resident	Look at the slalom design of the parking proposal, it's not safe, it'll impeded vehicle flow and is a poor use of space. This proposal is to help residents, it's failing in all it's aims.	55.9704	-3.1894
Resident	This street is rat run at the best of times, removing space will increase car speed in a highly used pedestrian area. On top of this losing more residents spaces. I don't see how this achieves the aim of helping residents parking pressures.	55.97256	-3.19017
Resident	Again, reducing the number of spaces available. this is completely counter intuitive to the aim of helping residents parking. Parking pressure is high in the area but it's mainly residents parking here but reducing the no of available spaces won't help	55.97361	-3.18885
Resident	There's double yellow line going into non council area, the map is wrong or the proposal is incorrect. it could lead to losing a space. which would increase parking pressure.	55.97085	-3.18844
Resident	This is a cul de sac, putting in parking measures here won't help residents at all. Very few non residents park here, it'll just create parking issues.	55.97097	-3.19271
Resident	There is an industrial complex of garages, they will have lots of cars here during the day it's going to cause major disruption for them. It's not going to help the businesses or the resident who get their cars fixed there.	55.97261	-3.17785
Resident	Another strange slalom design of parking, again in an area not used by non residents, again a reduction in space available for residents. This won't achieve the aim of the proposal.	55.97282	-3.1808
Resident	This is mainly industrial units for car repair, they have lots of cars and need the space during the day. They can't apply for permits due to turnover of vehicles. It's going to affect their business.	55.9722	-3.18514
Resident	Pay and display here? it doesn't make sense, where is the residents space in this section of road. Who's parking here and traveling to town from here? There's hardly any shops here. What's the thinking?	55.97295	-3.18238
Resident	Where's the residents parking? This is now being developed into flats. The proposal needs reworked given all the changes in the area. More flats being built we need more resident spaces.	55.97323	-3.18266
Resident	Another long strip of pay and display. There is a shortage of residents parking space. The proposal is meant to help residents park.	55.96838	-3.18574
Resident	Another industrial complex used during the day, how is parking restrictions going to help the businesses?	55.97237	-3.17728
Resident	Another stretch of pay and display only, who are you expecting to be parking here as pay and display? shared use should surely be the way forwards. or better still not at all as there's no benefit to the proposal.	55.97187	-3.17847
Resident	This needs to be checked as it's part of the ladehead shared area and not council land. again reducing residents space. The proposed plans won't achieve the as we are losing too many parking spaces to single and double yellow lines.	55.97037	-3.1893
Resident	Another pay and display not near any shops and the area has now been flattened ready for more residents flats. The proposal is flawed in reducing the amount of space for residents when we need more spaces. Parking pressure will increase under this plan.	55.97025	-3.18133
Resident	There are no significant issues with parking on Dalmeny Road / Connaught Place, and so the rationale for imposing parking controls seems flawed. The removal of some available parking entirely will likely cause the problem the Council wants to address.	55.9722	-3.1921
Resident	With the exception of the small section of dropped curb on the corner, these double yellow lines don't appear to be justified - there's more space to pass here than in some areas marked for parking bays.	55.97217	-3.19178
Resident	Who has the rights to the private parking. I am registered disabled but I don't have a blue badge yet. I can normally get parked in the area marked private parking ?	55.97134	-3.18832

Resident	Bonnington Avenue has 3 disabled bays at the moment and the map only has 2 all 3 are needed, also the private road is a front garden used by Dunedin Canmore residents at number 6 & 8 and owned by Dunedin Canmore	55.97203	-3.18835
Resident	Would like to keep local resident only parking to be a MEWS	55.97101	-3.19249
Resident	They're are current parking places which are detailed as private property, that is wrong. The designated parking has taken away a lot of current parking which works fine at the moment. Did anyone see view the site prior to drawing up the details.	55.97043	-3.19772
Resident	My husband has a blue badge and would require a disable parking space.	55.97034	-3.19793
Resident	I live in Bonnyhaugh Lane, which is private parking. Concerned that people will park in our private car park.	55.97081	-3.18844
Resident	You introduce these measures under the guise of allowing residents to get parked outside their house but you add double yellow lines outside my property? What justification do you have for such a move!	55.96958	-3.1835
Resident	Previously we had a abandoned van parked here and the council told us that this side of the road was private land so they couldn't act. If that is the case then the council won't be able to add permit holder bays to this area.	55.96958	-3.18364
Resident	The road carrying down from the electricity substation is on a steep gradient and on a fairly blind corner. Navigating this even in non wintry conditions requires care to avoid oncoming traffic. This proposal could exacerbate this.	55.97165	-3.19113
Resident	I am in a "no change" area but consider that a mews parking type would be the most suitable for the lower area of Connaught Place.	55.97165	-3.19113
Resident	The shared parking outside 7-9 Bonnington Terrace would be better on the Newhaven Road side as there is a shop and Vets practice that side.	55.97359	-3.18887
Resident	The yellow lines on the south side of Ferry Rd and at the corner of Bonnington Rd/Grove remove parking spaces when parking is tight.	55.92903	-3.65669
Resident	Double yellow between drives/single yellow across drives is unworkable - gives no options to park for lifestyle activities eg unloading; elderly parents visiting; work on our drive or gardens. A white line/no line across the drive solves the problem	55.973	-3.19214
Resident	My questions is WHY? when our estate in bonnington/bleachfield have not got a problem. This will only create problems.	55.97047	-3.19001
Resident	The narrow road is used as a rat run to avoid the lights at Newhaven/Ferry Road. The presence of cars parked between numbers 22 and 30 cause drivers to go slowly. Removal will cause speed and accidents.	55.97257	-3.19017
Resident	The proposed parking restrictions in my area will mostly have a detrimental effect on my household. It will limit our ability to park and force us to pave our front garden, thus reducing green space.	55.97026	-3.20033
Resident	Chargeable parking bays here would be a terrible idea. There is no requirement for them, and residents like myself do not want to pay to park. There are no issues that warrant this at all. This simply looks like a method for the council to generate income	55.97257	-3.19829
Resident	Iv never had any problems parking always found a space no matter what time of day	55.97248	-3.19104
Resident	I live in Easter Warriston and the proposals will make parking very difficult for residents. The proposed double yellow and single yellow lines are incredibly excessive so that, even with a parking permit, residents will struggle to park in the estate.	55.9707	-3.19999
Resident	This is not beneficial to anyone. How to destroy a city! Absolutely farce!!!	55.97407	-3.18463
Visitor	This is an unfair burden on residents and friends	55.97085	-3.19244
Resident	Parking in and around Gosford Place and Bonnington Grove is absolutely fine at present - no need for any change.	55.97287	-3.19143
Resident	No issue in parking here in 33 years !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	55.97134	-3.18832
Resident	Will make parking a struggle, not beneficial	55.97001	-3.18984
Resident	I am completely against this proposal. Why should I pay to park outside my garage. This is completely unfair	55.97132	-3.18866
Resident	I a against proposal. We don't have issues with parking here i won't pay to park in my garage	55.9713	-3.18866
Resident	Yellow line in front of my garage. I should be able to park in front of my own garage any time of day or night	55.97132	-3.18864
Resident	Two parking spaces lost if lines here	55.97123	-3.1887
Resident	Yellow lines again in front of private land. We should be able to park here anytime of day or night.	55.97137	-3.18894
Resident	This is ridiculous, they are proposing to put double yellow lines outside my house when part of the road is private and the council don't even maintain it. The road in question is the responsibility of myself and the garage owners. Also my elderly neigbh	55.97051	-3.20036
Resident	parking bays should be removed on the east side of the Newhaven Road bridge as they block the line of sight for a safe crossing. The road should also be narrowed to reduce speed.	55.97174	-3.18743

Resident	This is one of the narrowest parts of the street, too near the junction with the very busy Ferry Road to have parking spaces for shared use on both sides of the road; when used it is a hazard for vehicles turning in or out	55.97321	-3.1924
Resident	This should be no parking -blind spot on curve and hill - hazard to cyclists from path, and vehicles to/from lower Connaught Place. In winter this hill is very icy (grit box inadequate) and accidents have happened, the full road width needed for safety.	55.97103	-3.19164
Resident	This is the very narrowest part of the street and whole width needed to reverse in or out safely due to angle of driveways of no.45 and no.46.	55.97099	-3.19247
Resident	Lower Connaught Place (nos 39-71) open plan garden family friendly cul-de-sac, half of which is private land, spoiled by traffic & markings: ideal for a MEWS	55.97155	-3.19107
Resident	no 46. driveway blocked, will require to drive onto pavement to exit, entry. Width of road only 5.46m of standard bay (2.4m) opposite no68 space only 3.06 and is ~90deg angle exit. Also cannot park across own drive in non-peak hours at all	55.97102	-3.19248
Resident	no 46 Drop Kerb to Kerb opposite is 5.46m so plans leave only 3.06m (if standard used of 2.4m width parking space - now PROVEN and images sent that the drive at no46 is BLOCKED if any car parks opposite i.e. at no 68.	55.97098	-3.19248
Resident	No46 drive is BLOCKED if a parking bay at no 68 is in place AND no one can park this single yellow out of the controlled hours it BLOCK roads	55.97102	-3.19249
Resident	Road will be narrowed to ONLY 3.06m here, Residents Bay will BLOCK driveway at no 46 : VW Touareg, Renault Espace , Jaguar etc length is 4.8m+	55.971	-3.19248
Resident	Residents do not park here at present as it is a hazard (blocks line of sight) for vehicles to/from the 16 lockups and 2 houses around the corner.	55.97099	-3.19245
Resident	The addition of shared use bays will see people who don't want to buy permits moving across to single yellow areas. The proposed single yellow area is a 30mph road (shouldn't be) and has nr of driveway access areas. Parking should not be permitted there	55.97375	-3.19018
Resident	If this plan goes ahead it will reduce parking spaces. It will mean residents not being able to park near their home which is a huge safety issue. Parking within the estate has never been an issue, and everyone is courteous is parking	55.97083	-3.18961
Resident	This will reduce the number of parking spaces with the estate. Please can you provide information that claim that there is an a parking issue within the estate.	55.97109	-3.19006
Resident	Having to park outwith the estate late at night is not something I want to do. Safety of women is being highlighted and this is not making women safe	55.9713	-3.18878
Resident	From a safety point of view, this is not good. I feel safe that I can park my car within the estate + go to my flat. I don't want to be driving round the streets then having to walk a distance.	55.9713	-3.18878
Resident	As a single woman I do not want to walking a distance from my car to my flat. I chose to live here because I could park within the estate. The safety issue is huge and parking within the estate give me a sense of security	55.9713	-3.18878
Resident	Parking within the estate has never been an issue. Residents are courteous, but CPZ will create issues within the estate for parking. Please provide information of complaints about inability to park	55.97124	-3.18884
Resident	It is going to create problems for workmen coming to the estate, they will charge more and the pay + display are not close to all the houses/flats. It is utter madness.	55.97073	-3.1887
Resident	*Lived here 3 years & no evidence that commuters cause any parking pressure *Pandemic will likely change commuting habits for a long time *A lot of low-income families in social housing will have to pay for permit for bays already set as 'residents'	55.97366	-3.17843
Resident	Anderson Place currently too narrow to allow free movement of traffic where cars are parked on opposite sides. New residential developments and focus on cycling will not be best served by this. Options are one way traffic or double yellows on one side.	55.9712	-3.18149
Resident	I don't agree with the proposed parking restrictions to the Bonnyhaugh estate	55.97014	-3.19028
Visitor	Outrageous	55.9705	-3.18993
Resident	Strongly object to these parking restrictions/bays. Easter Warriston works well as is. It also acts as a spill over car park for large funerals at the crematorium. Think this is a ridiculous idea and another way of the council wasting money.	55.97045	-3.1998
Resident	Having moved into the new build Miller Homes there is adequate resident parking and since 2019 this does not appear be an issue. The residents parking was an integral part of the cost of the apartment.	55.97075	-3.18433
Resident	The plan does not have enough spaces for all the residents who currently park here in harmony. I am very concerned that all residents will not be able to park in the estate as they have done for decades.	55.9702	-3.19039
Resident	3 cars park here safely. This should still be a parking area.	55.97029	-3.19056

Resident	3 cars currently park in front of garages here without affecting other road users	55.97019	-3.19031
Resident	Herringbone parking has worked here for the entire time ive lived here. Both sides of the street can be used here.	55.97045	-3.1904
Resident	This can all be parking as it is currently.	55.9701	-3.18965
Resident	Parking currently on this side of the road - not on a corner and more room.	55.97037	-3.18965
Resident	I don't believe this is necessary as we are a small estate, that have had no problems for years with regards to parking. So to bring in the proposed lines in a private estate then the parking would cause major issues and tear apart a good community.	55.97035	-3.18971
Resident	Reducing the number of spaces in this off-road residential estate will cause issues for residents, many of whom have children/children's in cars. How will the restrictions be enforced? If a resident purchases a permit, will they actually get space?	55.97098	-3.18994
Resident	This is too many shared-use bays. The permit holder bays seem to be too few considering the street is all tenements. Residents may still have limited parking if P&D users occupy these spaces that cover 60% of the street as proposed.	55.97287	-3.19151
Resident	Communal bin bays are not marked on the map in this location as well as outside the hotel. The bins in the location selected will further reduce Resident parking (the bins can't be removed as they are being used to capacity)	55.97293	-3.19148
Resident	The part of Bonnington Grove that is most difficult to negotiate is not improved by the plan (i.e. outside #14) - there is a bollard on the pavement opposite that makes for a very tight squeeze potentially limiting access for emergency vehicles.	55.97268	-3.18943
Resident		55.97108	-3.18964
Resident	I strongly object to double yellow lines on this part of Bonnington Grove as it will encourage cars to drive faster here, a stretch with inadequate pavement for prams/wheelchairs. It will increase air pollution and make it more dangerous for cyclists.	55.97259	-3.18996
Resident	Currently residents of Bonnington Grove don't have a problem finding parking. This proposal will create a problem by removing spaces, speeding up traffic & risking pushing parking into the garage area, blocking access to garages.	55.97276	-3.18949
Resident	Dismayed that you are improving space for cars and making no improvements to the very narrow pavements, or to enable movement of cyclists who use this street in both directions all the time. It should be safe for them.	55.97287	-3.18877
Resident	Will there be sufficient parking for all residents/visitors on the estate? Do we need to pay? Concerned non-residents will park in the estate which could mean that residents/visitors need to find a space outside the estate. I think it will be chaos.	55.97049	-3.18947
Resident	I have lived at 9 Easter Warriston for almost 25 years and thus far have seen no evidence of problem parking on this estate. We also seem to cope very well with visitor parking and also with those who are attending funerals at Warriston Crematorium.	55.97166	-3.19994
Resident	I believe this will make parking worse in my area. I do not think my family should pay for parking to visit me. I think this will make it unsafe for the families who have children living in the estate as people who do not live here will be allowed to par	55.97019	-3.19004
Resident	We live in no 73 and are concerned about plans to have parking bays across the road from our driveway. This may make it difficult for us to back out our car could also be a safety issue due being a corner and people not being used to any here	55.97046	-3.18995
Resident	This is ridiculous out Parking in this area is already over covered with the new builds being built over the road with work vans and people now parking here.	55.97108	-3.18964
Resident	It is a money making scheme. Not required in Whitingford/Bonnington. Never been problems with parking pre/post covid. Not enough spaces for residents. Yellow lines at garages the council create a problem to charge residents. Is unethical.	55.97134	-3.18832
Resident	The addition of double yellow lines will reduce spaces by 3	55.97028	-3.19058
Resident	Addition of this parking bay will obstruct cars exiting from un-regulated bay	55.97021	-3.18973
Resident	Addition of this parking bay will obstruct cars exiting from un-regulated bay	55.97007	-3.18976
Resident	Space for 1 car reduced with addition of double yellow lines. Cars parked here do not cause any obstruction to car exiting un-regulated bay	55.96996	-3.19004
Resident	7 Spaces for residents reduced by addition of double yellow lines. Permit bays are obstructive in this instance and should not be included to allow for 7 spaces	55.97	-3.18977
Resident	Disabled parking bay is not used by disabled person	55.9704	-3.18982

Resident	Losing 3 spaces here, people generally park here NOT on other side of the road where permit bay has been included in plans.	55.97038	-3.18967
Resident	Plans do not allow for demarcation kerb on the road, it is all wrong, someone needs to come and visit the street. This area should not be regulated.	55.97039	-3.18927
Resident	Losing 2 spaces due to double yellow line placement	55.97059	-3.18878
Resident	No cars are parked here, his bay will create a dangerous blind corner.	55.97107	-3.18876
Resident	Yellow lines at garages reduces spaces for residents if they cannot park outside their own garages. We do not all work 9-5 jobs.	55.97132	-3.18871
Resident	Cars are usually parked on this side reducing spaces by 3 by introduction of double yellow lines	55.97107	-3.18883
Resident	Losing space here due to double yellow line placement	55.97124	-3.1886
Resident	I object to having to pay for parking and for restrictions to be imposed on the residential area in which I live. It's a small development with no through road (bonnyhaugh) When I bought my property parking was a key factor	55.97043	-3.19037
Resident	Dropped kerbs fall within highway code rule 243, residents can register their vehicle with council to permit parking. Elongated white H is all that is needed any other outcome is worse and needs to be justified	55.97151	-3.19234
Resident	Double yellow usually for areas of danger road junctions, narrow roads, street corners. This is excessive street is wide cul-de-sac. At most single yellow required-prevents non residents parking day time and allows residents parking evening and weekend	55.97151	-3.19227
Resident	Proposed double yellow would not allow stop time for carers, families and deliveries. A single yellow line would be better. Over restrictive parking can never take priority over our lifestyle and providing care for residents there needs to be a balance	55.97151	-3.19227
Resident	I was of the understanding that there is residential parking available for residents and it's on the deeds of the house.	55.97001	-3.18984
Resident	The bottom part of Connaught Place is a very quiet residential cul de sac with family homes and children playing outside. Zoned parking would not be beneficial to the residents. Please consider the Mews option for the street to limit incoming traffic.	55.97102	-3.19271
Resident	I have been living in Connaught place for the past 10 years and I have never had a problem in parking my car. Also, by adding parking bays in the road entering the estate, you would create other issues, as it is narrow, and with a blind spot.	55.97108	-3.19155
Resident	This is nothing more than a money grabbing exercise. There is no safety aspect to this proposal. You cannot deny the existence of cars. In the Ladehead area of Bonnington Mills there are far too few private bays	55.97001	-3.18984
Resident	I can't find anyone in Bonnington Mills estate who is in favour of this proposal. There are not enough resident parking spaces for the car owners. This will cause animosity among the neighbours in a normally friendly little estate. just for revenue. .	55.9697	-3.19018
Resident	Parking zone will only make things more difficult, We dont want parking zone in Easter Warriston	55.97152	-3.19866
Resident	Not enough parking spaces on Chancelot grove. Looks like about 8 parking spaces for 44 flats!	55.97201	-3.19739
Resident	The proposed parking bays are not sufficient and no do not represent the most appropriate use of space that is currently utilised. Can this be amended to represent the current parking in the estate	55.97029	-3.1981
Resident	As a parent of 2 young children this would make getting home from my car significantly more dangerous as I would regularly have to park much further from my house with busy roads to cross.	55.97025	-3.19029
Resident	There is not enough parking for residents Easter warriston acts as a good over spill for warriston crematorium. I honestly think what you are proposing is ridiculous	55.96951	-3.20084
Resident	There is no problem around Connaught place area. By introducing this, overnight visitors including family are greatly inconvenienced. These are FAMILY homes. A Residents only zone from the entrance to the estate would suffice.	55.97173	-3.1912
Resident	Please consider Connaught Place (lower cul de sac - house nos >40) for mews parking. The proposed mixed parking on the entrance would be dangerous especially in winter when icy.	55.97108	-3.19167
Resident	Please consider Connaught Place (lower cul de sac - house nos >40) for mews parking. The proposed mixed parking on the entrance would be dangerous especially in winter when icy.	55.97108	-3.19167
Resident	Please consider Connaught Place (lower cul de sac - house nos >40) for mews parking. The proposed mixed parking on the entrance would be dangerous especially in winter when icy.	55.97108	-3.19167
Resident	Please consider lower Connaught Place for mews parking. The proposed mixed parking would be dangerous in winter when icy.	55.97111	-3.19181
Resident	Why would we want to pay for parking? It's fine the way it is, don't want things to be more difficult, leave us alone	55.97261	-3.19795
Resident	Done deal, forget any consultation. Another money grab by the council to penalise car owners.	55.97248	-3.19903

Resident	This proposal is unwanted and not required. to have a mix of resident parking spaces and pay and display and permit holders is unworkable and will cause problems for the residents of this little private estate all to raise money	55.97	-3.1898
Resident	I am disabled but can't afford a disabled spot so won't be able to afford permit either and would struggle to park far away from my house	55.97001	-3.18984
Resident	I hate the car club space, takes up an extra space, they could have put it on Cragiehall road where there is much more space	55.97269	-3.19766
Resident	This has a kerb demarcation so should not be Permit Parking	55.97036	-3.19059
Resident	The location marked on the map is not an official disabled bay. It ceased being a disabled bay several years ago when the resident of "5 Bleachfield" mother passed away. Please remove the markings.	55.9704	-3.18982
Resident	I have emailed with further comment.	55.97037	-3.18987
Resident	Looks like lots of permit spaces where we now park for free, we have bought houses here counting on parking spaces. Restrictions should be on commuters who park near bus stops. I have lived in areas where I have paid permit parking and never had space	55.97123	-3.1889
Other	I am a landlord who owns a property in Pilrig Heights and also Stead's Place. The original plan with controlled zones was to create parking in the centre of the city, not the peripheral areas. This is simply the local authority looking to create income	55.96605	-3.18781
Resident	This seems completely unnecessary here and would change the whole dynamics of the cul-de-sac. I don't believe we need any restrictions here and, if it does become a problem at a later stage, then we should address it.	55.97153	-3.19202
Resident	I think the spaces opposite the Craighall Road exit make it very dangerous when taking a left onto ferry road as the westbound cars are often in the middle of the road. I think there should be double yellows just for the two spaces directly opposite.	55.97298	-3.19507
Resident	I currently own 1A Ladehead (Garage) and would ask that you mark out the area in front and potentially around them (not on public road) as private parking designated to Garages 1A through 1F inclusive.	55.97001	-3.18984
Resident	I own 1A Ladehead (Garage) and your proposals will have an adverse affect on 1A thru 1F Ladehead.	55.9704	-3.18906
Resident	Parking has never been an issue in Bonnington Mill for over 30yrs. Your proposals will beyond any reasonable doubt seriously impact our closed community and you have as a matter of fact drastically and erroneously reduced available parking.	55.96997	-3.18986
Resident	Whole Site. You have made the decision to deny access to non-obstruction out of hours valid resident parking areas by designating double yellow lines. Vastly removing existing parking. Basing your plans on 9-5 surveys is erroneous.	55.96994	-3.18982
Resident	Your reasoning for removing existing parking and imposing reduced more restrictive parking in our estate has no logic or common sense. This will adversely affect the value of our properties not add to them.	55.97029	-3.19056
Resident	I propose that Edinburgh council make provisions to mark out "Private" parking bays in front of each garage with markings stating private property to abate any confusions and rivalry going forward.	55.97038	-3.18902
Resident	Motorcycles - You have not provided any parking areas for Motorcycles and there are none within a reasonable distance. I have marked on the map what I believe to be a suitable location for 2 bays end to end.	55.96995	-3.19002
Resident	URGENT : We were advised by your council via Microsoft Teams that erroneous CPZ plans would not go ahead. Your CPZ plans (including private spaces) will prevent 62 cars from parking. We have performed a parking survey house to house based on your plans..	55.97031	-3.1901
Resident	I have huge concerns about Easter warriston and warriston road. Within Easter warriston there is high pressure from residents but not much pressure from commuters. The proposed double yellow lines will mean many residents will not be able to park.	55.97015	-3.19805
Resident	I don't own a car, but rent one on occasion. With this proposal, I am not able to hold a permit to access this parking spot. If I am able to hold a permit without having to own a car, I will support this proposal.	55.9726	-3.19853

Resident	I don't think there is any necessity to bring in the use of parking tickets. With this proposal there will be less parking available and it will cause problems for residents and require change of life experience in a private estate.	55.97129	-3.18825
Resident	How is private road/ parking going to be 'policed' and will this scheme result in access to garages (for those of us who use them) being blocked?	55.97023	-3.19818
Resident	No need for double yellow lines in Easter Warriston apart from the entrance to allow access for large vehicles	55.97049	-3.20035
Resident	There are about 15 cars in our block of flats on Agnew Terrace. There are 3 designated spaces... this will be a problem to us. Also, there is need need for any restrictions in our street. I have lived here 6 years and have never failed to get a space.	55.97275	-3.19218
Resident	I live in Powderhall Brae. The parking places are owned by the residents, not by the council. I think these plans will encourage more people to use our parking places. At present our private warden cannot enforce parking fines so people abuse us.	55.96653	-3.19461
Resident	Parking currently is not an issue, and the proposed number of parking spaces will only serve a fraction of the cars currently used in	55.97029	-3.19067
Resident	This section currently holds 6 cars but the new proposals will only allow 3. Why?	55.97028	-3.1906
Resident	Parking in front of garages should be allowed to continue. It's a sufficient option for those who own a garage and frees up spaces for residents who don't own a garage.	55.97015	-3.19028
Resident	This is a used and needed parking space currently and should remain as one.	55.97021	-3.19031
Resident	I've lived here for 8 years and this area can comfortably hold more than whats accounted for. People park herringbone and it isn't a problem.	55.97046	-3.19037
Resident	There is no tram line within a 20 min walk, and in rush hour, the number 11 bus is often full by the time it gets to the end of the estate. Public transport isn't sufficient so residents rely on cars to be able to get to work.	55.97022	-3.19064
Resident	Keep the same number of spaces that the estate has but permit all of them. Why penalise the residents? Edinburgh isn't designed to be car free. Public transport isn't good enough and many businesses based outside of city centre.	55.97022	-3.19064
Resident	This is a dead end and if anything should be permitted the entire way around to ensure maximum parking for residents. These are family homes, who need cars for sports clubs, work and kids extra circular activities.	55.97008	-3.18969
Resident	There are no parking issues in the estate at present, your proposals will loose a number of spaces causing major problems	55.97043	-3.19037
Resident	Your proposals are ill thought out as there has not been a parking issue here in the over 25 years staying here. your restrictions will eliminate a number of spaces. We have not had to pay for parking so this is an additional tax, totally unfair	55.97083	-3.18966
Resident	This location is used by residents and there have been no issues getting past - even in large vehicles. Removing this current parking will move the pressure onto Gosford Place where dedicated Resident's bays only account for 40% of spaces.	55.97253	-3.19033
Resident	The idea of parking controls isn't the worst but looking at the map the inclusion of double yellows in the estate would be a nightmare. We're badly stretched for parking as it is without restricting it further.	55.97043	-3.19037
Resident	I'm not in favour of the current plan as it becomes a major issue for residents in our area who don't have driveway parking. Like the majority of our residents I'm in favour of having a Mews parking control instead of the current proposed plan.	55.97118	-3.19305
Resident	Parking in these areas are already restricted with the amount of cars in households so rather than restrict car space we need ore	55.97027	-3.19036
Resident	The residents at no. 46 (my neighbours) will have great difficulty getting into and out of their driveways if this area was to be allocated parking. This area is not currently parked on at all.	55.97099	-3.19243
Resident	We pay for the upkeep of our neighbourhood with a monthly factor fee. The addition of double-yellow lines will ruin the look of the street.	55.97102	-3.19258

Visitor	Regularly bring car around to park and look after grand child or visit my daughter. This will only decrease the number of spaces and make it more difficult to park. Not a good idea at all.	55.97017	-3.19043
Resident	Dangerous - bend has poor visibility. Been near misses recently. People inc kids + dogs cutting across road at gap in wall Can we be a MEWS	55.97141	-3.19111
Resident	I am strongly opposed to this proposal	55.96604	-3.19155
Resident	No parking probs in last 34 years 16 garages at foot of cul-desacralise would be vary dangerous trying to drive round corner with visibility totally obscured	55.97094	-3.19245
Resident	Insufficient parking bays for residents.	55.97101	-3.20039
Resident	I purchased a property not so long ago with free parking in the Bonnyhaugh estate so I do not agree with this now having to pay for a permit. I live in a private housing development. Have you carried out a survey - different requirements out with covid	55.97025	-3.19029
Resident	You're using old maps so it's confusing around Ashley Place where you are going to be placing parking bays. We also have in the Miller new builds free residential parking as per our missives.	55.9702	-3.18458
Resident	I am against the controlled parking measures in Easter Warriston estate-Parking permits and painting more yellow lines etc will only make parking more difficult for residents.	55.97114	-3.20018
Resident	The council making money doesn't solve the issue, this area is already a high enough tax band + road tax without introducing parking fee's. The only way I would agree is if every household in the area was offered one free permit per household.	55.97043	-3.19037
Resident	Lower C Place (39-71) is very quiet residential cul de sac. I worry it would become dangerous as where the parking is suggested it would make blind sections. In winter with icy conditions it would be risky. Mews parking would be a much safer option.	55.97097	-3.19248
Resident	I am not in favour of this at all. No requirement for this in this estate or the surrounding area. Will become an undesirable area to live in with numerous parking restrictions and therefore lead to less green space as a result.	55.9714	-3.19899
Resident	Leith residents can't afford parking fees	55.97257	-3.17617
Resident	completely unnecessary visual clutter - nobody parks on bonnyhaugh lane becuase it is too narrow and we all know that.	55.97085	-3.1876
Resident	It will endanger children - reduced parking will result in frustrated drivers driving round the roads looking for parking - children play out - protect their play.	55.97077	-3.18983
Resident	You will create a divide between private areas and permit holder areas - currently people park anywhere - I was not aware of this divide. Who will police this? Because all areas are flexible, people are friendly.	55.97058	-3.18899
Resident	The Bonnington mills estate is a private estate and should not be subject to parking regulations. The deeds to my home clearly show this estate as owned by the residents	55.97031	-3.19084
Resident	Half of the current spaces are being taken away. We will have to fight to park. How am I going to find a space when I get home from work at 7pm? And no visitor parking. It's shocking, in a housing estate, stopping me parking outside my own home.	55.97034	-3.19053
Resident	This whole area is a dead end and residential. There is room in the entire section for cars. Adding yellow lines is pointless. What happens when I come home from a long shift and can't park outside my own home?	55.9703	-3.19072
Resident	How can it be justified to remove many spaces? You will be forcing people to park further from their homes, when there is not an issue. This is a residential parking area. No one was consulted on this.	55.96993	-3.18986
Resident	Never been an issue parking in this whole estate. Making it a residents parking only would be more helpful. Spaces will be drastically reduced, forcing people away from their homes when there is perfectly sufficient parking here.	55.97043	-3.19039
Resident	This is an entirely residential area. Restricting parking will benefit no one on this estate. It is unfair to ask us to pay to park outside our own home and also reduce the space available.	55.9703	-3.19046
Resident	The proposed permit parking and double yellow lines in Ladehead, Bleachfield, Milnacre and Whitingford is totally ludicrous and will have a huge detrimental impact on the 180 households in the estate.	55.97002	-3.19038
Resident	The residents would loose around 50% of parking they have just now	55.97002	-3.18972

Resident	I don't think this is necessary in Connaught place. How many issues have been reported here to justify it? Yellow lines all along our street is excessive, ugly and unwelcoming for residents and visitors alike. It will mean losing lawns that absorb CO2.	55.97163	-3.19188
Resident	The proposals in Easter Warriston will cause more parking problems for residents than they will solve. Some of the areas are apartment blocks where many tenants have no access to the garages as landlords use them for storage.	55.97101	-3.19866
Resident	Ladehead does not have a parking problem. This proposal would make it a problem.	55.96953	-3.18995
Resident	Bonnyhaugh should be a separate designated parking place and have its own zone. otherwise we will lose our parking to our houses to people from other areas. The proposal already reduces parking and creates an issue where there isn't currently one.	55.9704	-3.18939
Resident	I live in Ladehead. There is insufficient parking as it is. Your proposal would make the situation worse than now, and frankly doesn't make sense! The permit parking is positioned terribly, would make access to house very difficult.	55.96996	-3.18982
Resident	This will cause more disruption to residents rather than solve any minor and short term parking issues on the Easter Warriston estate.	55.97107	-3.19966
Resident	We have no problem parking in our residential area and this plan seems to be a money making scheme rather than an improvement. It would be detrimental to our residential area and take away parking spaces as well as bin spaces	55.97222	-3.19081
Resident	Resident in Bonnyhaugh. These plans include single yellow lines in front of private garages, which are owned by the houses in the estate. These garages are not really big enough for more modern cars. Do not place single yellow lines outside garages.	55.97016	-3.19029
Resident	This space is being removed. There is no issue with this space at present.	55.96995	-3.19001
Resident	these spaces will block my turning angle to park my long wheel base van opposite next to No 2 Ladehead	55.9701	-3.18972
Resident	these spaces will block my turning angle to park my long wheel base van opposite next to No 2 Ladehead	55.97016	-3.1897
Resident	these spaces will block my turning angle to park my long wheel base van opposite next to No 2 Ladehead as shown	55.97015	-3.1896
Resident	This double yellow line should be parking as this is where we park just now with no issues, should not be on other side of road as that blocks spaces next to No 2	55.97007	-3.18969
Resident	Corner is ok but double yellow line on straight bit should be parking as this is where we park just now with no issues, should not be on other side of road as that blocks spaces next to No 2	55.97024	-3.1897
Resident	Currently people park in front of garages this should still be allowed	55.97013	-3.19028
Resident	Currently people park in front of garages this should still be allowed	55.97132	-3.18872
Resident	This disabled space is not required the disabled person died many years ago and this has been reported to council many times	55.97037	-3.1898
Resident	This double yellow is on wrong side people park here not where you have marked the parking opposite	55.97038	-3.18965
Resident	double yellow line is on wrong side people park here not where you have marked parking opposite	55.97108	-3.18882
Resident	double yellow line is not needed people park on both sides here without any issues for access	55.97028	-3.19059
Resident	I don't agree with this. This is a cul-de-sac residential area with no need for it to be as Controlled Parking Zone. The garages are too small for most cars so we are unable to use them. The plan means we will lose essential parking spaces.	55.97065	-3.19779
Visitor	Regularly look after granddaughter in this estate. And we bring the car. Have never had any issues with finding parking. This will seriously restrict visitors as well as homeowners. Really awful idea. Why would lines be needed in front of garages as well?	55.97017	-3.1903
Resident	No no no no, we will not pay for parking, stop this nonsense now	55.97267	-3.19798
Resident	These restrictions will penalise people coming home from work late, where would you propose people then park as not enough spaces identified	55.97043	-3.19037
Resident	Ladehead does not have a parking problem but if these restrictions are implemented there will be a problem.	55.96997	-3.1898
Resident	I am strongly against any parking restrictions in my area	55.97055	-3.19289

Resident	I am strongly against any parking restrictions in my area	55.97055	-3.19289
Resident	I am strongly against this proposal	55.97063	-3.19222
Resident	16 garages at foot of cul-de-sac would be very dangerous trying to get round corner with visibility totally obscured	55.97025	-3.19769
Resident	The proposed changes in the Bonnyhaugh estate (Bleachfield, Ladehead, etc.) would very significantly reduce the available parking for residents and create unreasonable pressure for spaces.	55.97042	-3.19041
Other	Double yellow and disabled spaces right outside no.2 Easter Warriston, will take away amenities from the house and leave us with no parking. It also encourages people to park where currently no one does. It will make it impossible for deliveries and all	55.9714	-3.19923
Resident	I am concerned about the status of the square at the end of Rebraes place as there appears to be uncertainty about its classification as private or public parking. Although there is no agreement regarding maintenance or shared ownership with residents.	55.9693	-3.189
Resident	It seems the CEC hate car drivers but public transport doesn't suit those with families and as a teacher I have too much stuff to take into work which becomes complicated on a bus. You really despise us tax payers!	55.97223	-3.18796
Resident	Currently there is sufficient on-street parking on Connaught Place (lower) for the 16 houses and 16 flats. In the new CPZ, I would like Connaught Pl. to be made Mews Parking to ensure this parking space is kept.	55.97104	-3.19171
Resident	Unnecessary lines in front of garages, will reduce spaces further. The garages are very narrow and it will be impossible to get a baby in and out of the car whilst in garage.	55.97019	-3.19028
Resident	Flaxmill Place 'private parking' is already used by non-residents. Introducing double yellow and permit parking in surrounding areas will cause more problems and leave residents with no alternative parking spaces.	55.96975	-3.18582
Resident	There is currently, and never has there been, a parking problem in the area of Connaught Place. I would like Connaught Place to be given Mews status so that the residents can continue to park, without being penalised.	55.971	-3.19241
Resident	I am aware of commuter parking along both sides of Broughton Road, and along the narrow sections of Warriston Road close to the Crematorium entrance. In the interests of reducing traffic congestion and air pollution, I favour removing this option.	55.96922	-3.19537
Resident	I support controlled parking measures and I hope it will reduce excessive parking in the area.	55.97346	-3.18471
Resident	I have lived in this area for 6 years and Redbraes Place and Grove and can confirm that these streets do suffer major parking issues. I fully welcome the proposals to zone the area with CPZ or parking for residents.	55.96863	-3.18792
Other	Answering as parent of child at Bun-sgoil Taohn na Pàirce. I support the proposal for DYL opposite the school gates as there is a short section which gets used for parking opposite the school gates which is a problem at bell time.	55.9706	-3.18038
Resident	A double yellow line on this corner is required as parking here is dangerous (although I disagree with ALL other parking restrictions in Easter Warriston)	55.97131	-3.19932
Resident	A Residents only sign should be erected here (although not CPZ or PPA in Easter Warriston area)	55.97136	-3.1988
Resident	Investigate MEWS style parking in Easter Warriston with a visitor option included	55.97139	-3.19882
Resident	Bonnington Grove really needs to be made two way for cyclists. Loads of folks use it in this way anyway given how it connects to the cycle path. If car parking is to be removed, then this should be implemented..	55.97262	-3.19002
Resident	Need protection for the entrance to the garages driveway since it is often partially parked across. An improved ramp across the gutter would be great too. We have to drive forwards in then do a 5 point turn to reverse into the small garage!.	55.97209	-3.192
Resident	I am in favour of the proposals. For Ashley Place, I would highlight that there is an area (marked on the map) where up to 3 cars can and do park. These 3 bays should also be included in the scheme.	55.96973	-3.18528
Resident	Very much support the scheme BUT please reduce parking on Anderson Place. Existing neighbouring developments have parking. New development is low car so would benefit from reallocating space to improve active travel links to Water of Leith and Leith Walk	55.97116	-3.18144
Resident	I think permit holder would be good because it would help prevent people who do not live in the street parking. I have a daily struggle finding a space close to home with my young baby.	55.97302	-3.18729

Resident	If parking permits are required then this bit is OK. Although parking is tight, we can all park OK and don't see why we are spending money fixing a problem that doesn't exist.	55.97015	-3.19045
Resident	The entrances to the cycle path need to be protected with some sort of marking. Double yellows preferably. There are two on Gosford Place and two on Connaught Place.	55.97293	-3.19157
Resident	This is outside our flat. if it goes ahead then I would suggest painted parking bays since it is often badly parked just now and only takes 3 cars when 4 would fit..	55.97193	-3.19136
Resident	Ditto marked parking bays to get more cars into the space allowed. In both residents and shared areas?	55.972	-3.1926
Resident	Double yellow lines on corners will improve access for large vehicles eg removal lorries and large deliveries although the bin lorries manage OK.	55.97283	-3.19205
Resident	This double yellow line is a place that is often used for parking now - can it be lessened to give a couple more spaces.	55.9718	-3.19114
Resident	I am writing on behalf of the Powderhall Village Owners Association and Powderhall Village Owners Limited, the legal owners of the private parking and common land at Powderhall Village. To contact us, email admin@powderhallvillage.co.uk	55.96408	-3.18876
Other	There is a planning application for the area under ref.20/01932/FUL which proposes amendments to the street between Anderson pl and Bonnington rd lane.	55.97124	-3.18254
Resident	The disabled bay has extended previously it was only in front of 56 Newhaven rd, rather than 56 and 54 it should be shortened down to its previous length.	55.97077	-3.18708
Resident	A number of areas in the Bonnyhaugh estate are marked as Private, while others are Permit - request for this to be reviewed	55.97095	-3.18955
Resident	The methodology map wrongly indicates retail at the entrance to Bonnyhaugh - suspect this may be reflecting the old Bonnington Mills Business Centre? However this has since been demolished (replaced with new build flats). Request this to be reviewed.	55.97118	-3.18746
Resident	I would like more information about the details of this specifically the costs for permits	55.97231	-3.1872
Resident	I would like to know if it will affect the residents of the housing estate of Bonnyhaugh which includes bleachfield ?	55.97043	-3.19037
Resident	Please could Lower Connaught Place be designated as Mews parking.	55.971	-3.19233
Resident	Permit Holders Baywhat will this cost appropriate residents ??	55.97194	-3.19213
Resident	I live on the Quilts. We have a problem with one resident taking up parking spaces with (probably) undriveable cars filled with junk- there are at least 10 of them on the Quilts & Ballantyne Rd, which causes multiple problems. Will e-mail to elaborate.	55.97383	-3.17984
Visitor	Will there be further restrictions into stanwell street to mitigate school drop off?	55.97054	-3.17926

2. CORSTORPHINE


2.1.1 412 people dropped 579 pins on the interactive map

2.1.2 Of those, 560 had comments and 19 were left blank

2.1.3 31 comments are positive

2.1.4 509 comments are negative

2.1.5 39 comments are neutral



2.1.6

I am a...	Comment	X	Y
Resident	Pinkhill Park private flatted development. No real problems with parking within the development. Residents PAID for the parking bays now we have to purchase a PERMIT to use same bays.	55.94046	-3.26754
Resident	As a resident of Pinkhill Park, and one who currently parks in the pink locations (as highlighted on the interactive map below), I'm very much against having permits if that incurs a cost to the resident. I never have a problem finding a parking space.	55.9402	-3.26756
Resident	Yellow lines outside of 14 and 15 is unnecessary. This space is currently used for parking, and restricting parking here will only reduce the amount of space available to park for residents. It makes no sense whatsoever.	55.94035	-3.26786
Resident	I currently have no problem at all with parking in and around Corstorphine, this looks like a scheme to tax the residents of Corstorphine. It would create excessive parking problems at the areas just outside the control zone I totally oppose this!	55.93958	-3.27768
Resident	Why on earth are you implementing these ridiculous proposals. There are no parking issues in my street. Absolutely none. So why on earth are you doing this? Come along here any day at any time and you will see that what I am saying is correct.	55.94488	-3.28332
	We are not troubled by cars parking in our street. Please leave us out of this.	55.94437	-3.28481
Resident	On our street we have no requirement for permit parking, we aren't close to St John's Road and no issues with commuters/Airport parking.	55.94002	-3.27638

Resident	It's outrageous! Why should we have to pay to park our cars outside our property!!	55.94565	-3.28862
Resident	Why is this even being considered? There is lots of parking in our street and area. There has never been a problem at any time of the day/night. Why create an issue when there isn't one.	55.94485	-3.28332
Resident	Greedy council strikes again, instead of constantly spending all our money on vandalising our roads perhaps you could try to improve the city. Scum	55.94227	-3.27796
Resident	We have a blue badge for our son - do we now need a disabled space	55.94494	-3.28384
Resident	I live in Belgrave Terrace (tenements) been here for 5 years - never once been unable to find street parking nearby. Why should we pay? If it becomes mostly permit bays - will the tenement dwellers be allowed a permit? Where are we supposed to park?	55.94298	-3.28061
Resident	This is small cul de sac which already struggles with parking for the houses here. By placing yellow lines around most of it, it will further reduce parking. We have lived here for 30 years and never had problems with access, pavements being blocked	55.94399	-3.28993
Resident	Why?	55.94017	-3.27653
Resident	The street is hard to park as it is without a double yellow line down one side of the entire street. I'm not sure who thought of this as a good idea, cars parked on two sides currently with ample room for cars to pass one another	55.9415	-3.25555
Resident	Unbelievable stupid decision who thought this up	55.93867	-3.28709
Resident	Please note that if on street parking on Corstorphine Bank Av will become permit we will have to widen the driveway of our property at number 1 to provide enough space for parking. We would like this considered when finalising any bays.	55.944	-3.29241
Resident	There is absolutely no need for this, we have no issues with the streets in Corstorphine being used for park and ride purposes. You are just going to cause major hassle with childcare visitors and for access, I could not object to this more	55.9403	-3.27634
Resident	This is a disgrace, there is no need for this ridiculous proposal, This will cause major disruption to lives of many who have lived in their homes for many years. The residents in Forrester Road are very angry. Stop this NOW..	55.94455	-3.28454
Resident	Do not see the benefit of putting in permits in an area where everyone seems fine with parking arrangements. Where will tenement residents park there does not seem to be enough shared use space on Belgrave Road?	55.94347	-3.28052
Resident	I don't want Mews Parking. I would rather have yellow lines and parking bays. I think no yellow lines or bays will be confusing for public. I am keen for less pollution. Happy to pay for permit if it reduces cars in the area.	55.94196	-3.2834
Resident	Living at the west end of Traquair Park West, I don't feel this is yet necessary. If it does go ahead- which would be a major inconvenience to residents, there need to be more visitor/resident bays.	55.94041	-3.27723
Resident	As in Cobden Crescent, would it be possible to only have permit for 2 hrs a day to avoid commuters dumping cars rather than causing issues for residents and visitors	55.94044	-3.27726
Resident	We have no issue with shoppers or commuters parking in our street. These proposals would incur an unnecessary cost for our young family and cause huge inconvenience for visiting family and friends. I feel this is just a money making scheme!	55.94457	-3.28419
Resident	I live on Meadowhouse Road. Making Traquair Park and Station Road mainly permit parking will move parking of cars to Meadowhouse Road which is already dangerous for schoolchildren due to speeding vehicles	55.93996	-3.27796
Resident	There is absolutely no need for parking restrictions in Old Kirk Road. We are not affected by commuters as we are too far up the steep hill from the main road. This is overkill. And I am not in favour of the massive blanket area proposed either.	55.94504	-3.27562
Resident	I only found out about this through a local Facebook group. I was not notified by the council. There was no information posted to me. Please could you send me this proposal in writing.	55.94446	-3.2751
Resident	This is completely ridiculous. I live on Clermiston Road where most homes do not have driveways and are unable to obtain permission for one due to CEC regulations. We park on surrounding streets where we would struggle to get a permit now. Just, no.	55.94458	-3.2808
Resident	I live in St John's Crescent, and I'm not clear what 'Mews' parking bays mean. Will we need a parking permit and will it only be valid in this type of parking bay or for the whole area? Spaces are very limited and we often have to park elsewhere.	55.94178	-3.27352

Resident	We live in sycamore terrace and have no parking outside our houses therefor our entire row of houses have to park either on Corstorphine park gardens. If CPG turn into park it this will force everyone to park on Dovecot rd	55.93932	-3.28087
Resident	I am a carer for someone who is housebound there. Professional carers 3-times-per-day. Family carers and visitors several times per week. There appears to be (at best) one on-street space for visitors. In no way appropriate or acceptable.	55.9444	-3.27514
Resident	Ridiculous, unnecessary, money-making scheme. At a time when more people than ever are stuck at home, unable to even use their vehicles, experiencing money worries, the council think it sensible to impose parking charges on residents to park. Absurd.	55.94027	-3.27804
Resident	As a resident of sycamore terrace with no parking outside we have to stop to unload our car with shopping for example on an area you will be adding a yellow or double line. How do you propose we now do this. Many have small children here on a busy mainRD	55.93937	-3.28069
Resident	I do not agree with the implementation of a controlled parking zone in my cul de sac	55.94531	-3.28858
Resident	There is ample parking in this area with no need for restrictions. I already pay enough to live here without having to pay for parking too.	55.94058	-3.26754
Resident	This seems like overkill. There is no evidence of parking problems in Traquair Park West; parking is by residents, their visitors and workmen, deliveries etc. Distribution of bays doesn't seem to take any account of the actual housing/parking patterns	55.94037	-3.27653
Resident	Strongly disagree with proposals. No need for permits in local area and putting yellow lines in will make it extremely difficult for residents who need to load/unload cars. Especially those with young children!	55.93956	-3.28051
Resident	I am worried that these plans will force people to park on nearby streets i.e Carrick Knowe and cause problems/ make problems worse for residents and cause a lack of parking. In and around this area with possible blockage of drive ways/ no street parking	55.94047	-3.26955
	Strongly disagree with proposals. No need for permits in local area and putting yellow lines in will make it extremely difficult for residents who need to load/unload cars. Especially those with young children!	55.93932	-3.28082
Resident	Not happy with the double yellow lines proposed in front of my house. There are currently no issues here. Why change it? This proposal will remove too many parking spaces for the residents.	55.94506	-3.2795
Resident	I don't think it is needed and will effect local businesses for the worse	55.94447	-3.2894
Other	The current single yellow lines are not sufficient to make the road outside the school safe and they are heavily parked on. Please consider upgrading this to double yellows	55.94041	-3.28512
Resident	A narrow cul de sac with high density of houses/flats with a dental surgery at the bottom. If half the street is permit holders these proposals will simply cause even more chaos in an area of few parking spaces.	55.94443	-3.28835
Resident	We don't feel there is any need for this at all and entirely object. We live on Dovecot Road which seems to be immediately outside the boundary therefore we are likely to see an increase in traffic and parking.	55.93888	-3.28124
Resident	We don't feel there is any need for this at all and entirely object. We live on Dovecot Road which seems to be immediately outside the boundary therefore we are likely to see an increase in traffic and parking.	55.93888	-3.28124
Resident	The council tax is high enough in this area why should we have to pay to park outside our own front doors	55.94357	-3.29297
Resident	I'm unsure why the location of bays and yellow lines swaps from one side of St Ninians Road to the other. Surely better to have one side blocked and one side with permit spaces?	55.94362	-3.28383
Resident	Do not agree	55.9363	-3.27373
Resident	Having yellow lines at sycamore terrace will make unloading hard for residents, many have children. It will increase speed of traffic, parked vehicles is the only thing that slows traffic to 20 here. Congestion on dovecot and meadowhouse will result.	55.93956	-3.28091
Resident	I am very much opposed to parking restrictions outside our house. The only people who park here are ourselves and our visitors.	55.94625	-3.28925
Resident	So many wrongs ! Visitors ? Business run from home ? Property will devali	55.94149	-3.27299
Resident	All these changes will displace traffic and parking on to Dovecot Road and make it easier for cars to travel faster up Ladywell Avenue. Dovecot Road is heavily used by walkers and cyclists including families with young children heading to the park.	55.93934	-3.28674

Resident	More residents will want to put in driveways, I want commitments that the council won't prevent any drop kerb driveway applications as a result of this. Don't make cars/lorries chicane on St Ninians, single yellow 1 side consistently the length of the st	55.94375	-3.28501
Resident	Are you trying to get us to move home. We love our home but you are making things so difficult for older people with families who want them to visit in their vehicle when they want. Not when they are allowed by zone times. I'm so angry with council	55.94196	-3.28045
Other	Concerned about less parking near Ladywell Surgery. Some people may need to travel 2 miles to see a Dr when ill so walking not an option.	55.94003	-3.28894
Resident	I think people who usually park in traquair park will now park in carrick knowe avenue.	55.94035	-3.27077
Other	This is the opposite of the Corstorphine Connections initiative in that it turns Corst High St/Sycamore Terrace into a fast through route	55.9396	-3.28098
Resident	Why put Permit bays in a cul-de-sac which only has parking on one side of the road and due to house style there is no possibility of having a driveway? Clearly to raise funds from a street that has never seen a road sweeper or a gritter in 40 years	55.94572	-3.28844
Business owner	Would ruin local businesses , visitors and property value. Strongly against.. shocking propos	55.94149	-3.27299
Resident	The proposals a) will speed up traffic on Sycamore Terrace - the opposite intention of the simultaneous LTN/low traffic consultation taking place, b) deprive residents of parking/loading & unloading space - presumably to generate revenue from permits, c)	55.93944	-3.28101
Resident	Absolutely zero communication about this. Why have I not received a letter informing me of these proposals and therefore giving the chance to voice my opinion. I had to accidentally find out about it by coming across a post on a friend's Facebook page!	55.94205	-3.29092
Visitor	It is going to make life a lot harder for residents of Sycamore Terrace and their visitors. They effectively won't be able to load or unload and there are many families with babies and small children living there.	55.93932	-3.28082
Resident	This is unnecessary and a money making scam. Why should residents have to pay to park in their street? What's even worse is I can't even park outside my own house as you have decided to put in a yellow line.	55.94204	-3.29099
Resident	There is no need for parking controls in the streets around Traquair Park West over and above those already in place.	55.94044	-3.27632
Resident	We have a very narrow drive that we are unable to use and like the previous owner we park outside our house. Under the new proposals this area would be a single yellow line. This would have a huge impact on my family life.	55.94427	-3.27368
Resident	Money making scam! Will now need to pay to park my car in my street and what's more it won't even be outside my own house as you plan to stick a big yellow line in front! Strongly object!	55.94215	-3.29093
Resident	The parking restrictions on Belgrade road and others close to st John's will stop me using the local businesses on st John's. I have 2 small children it need to drive and park to go to the bank or butchers. There has never been a problem parking before	55.94333	-3.27796
Resident	As a resident who struggles to park near her home as it is, reducing the number of available parking spaces angers me. If I have to park miles away from my house especially carrying heavy items, this really makes me want to relocate out of the area	55.94083	-3.28202
Resident	There shouldn't be a marked bay at this location. Busy junction with entrance to a cycle path. Cars do not usually park on the raised junction at present but if marked bay present would affect line of sight crossing road to enter/exit Traquair Alley.	55.94036	-3.27122
Resident	You've stopped virtually all parking on St. John's road. And you want to stop all parking close by what are you lot smoking! You are KILLING local business anyway. Do you have shares in hoarding and shuttering business?	55.94484	-3.2765
Resident	This is purely an income generation scheme for the council. I cannot see the benefit of this proposal. Who had requested this? Is it local residents? Local business will suffer as people will not be able to park close enough to shops.	55.94378	-3.27925
Resident	The permit holder only bays within Pinkhill Park are ridiculous. This will prevent my Mother parking to look after my daughter 2 days per week. I feel this is overkill and a money making scheme in a quiet residential estate.	55.93999	-3.26746
Resident	This will have a huge detrimental impact on local business and vital services (e.g. dentist).	55.94269	-3.27313

Resident	We have no driveway. On street parking in permit bays - if available - on the other side of the road with three small children is unsafe, particularly as the road is increasingly busy with people cutting through to avoid Drumbrae.	55.94486	-3.28994
Resident	No need for parking permits or double yellow lines. This would only make parking more difficult (and expensive!) for residents and awkward for visitors. I would definitely not support any of these proposals.	55.9416	-3.28681
Resident	Pinkhill Park - some parts are private road and others permit? There will not be enough permits for the residents to get a space, this area doesn't need this, just another money making scheme from Edinburgh council. No thought for the residents as usual.	55.94058	-3.26754
Resident	Kirk Loan seems to be a go to place for visitor parking. As a nearby resident I struggle to get parked here at the best of times. I feel the allocation for permit holders only might be limited.	55.94078	-3.28133
Resident	1. What is justification /stats for parking permits in featherhall crescent north. 2 Free? or proposed cost for a residents parking permit. 3 Have any residents complained about inability to park in the street. 4 all properties have off street parking	55.94211	-3.29029
Resident	I have never had any issues with over parking in Belgrave Gardens in the 30yrs that I have lived in the area, if permits are to be issued these should be free for residents and their visiting families and friends	55.94461	-3.2765
Resident	Where are the parking for regular people trying to have access to the shops, GP surgery and pharmacies? If youre switching existing parking spaces to permit holders and introducing all these double yellows its going to impact my decision to use these sho	55.94106	-3.28784
Resident	This is another heartless money-making scheme. We pay a lot in taxes already and now you want to charge people for parking near their homes..	55.93948	-3.27769
Resident	Not required in this area at all and will move any parked vehicles to the nearest available areas. Ill thought through and further evidence of anti-car views and a means to increase revenue while pretending to address an issue that does not exist.	55.94422	-3.29086
Resident	Creating an issue where one doesn't exist to make money. Will there be a reduction in council tax in the area, given we cannot utilise space outside our properties due to parking bays that are not needed?	55.94505	-3.28521
Resident	The plans to introduce parking permits, yellow lines and metered parking seems unnecessary for Corstorphine. There are no cars being dumped through the day with people getting buses into town. Wait until post COVID to make a decision on this.	55.94435	-3.28503
Resident	Hello, I object to this parking restriction. It is not needed. It will only create hassle for the residents. Very unhappy that Council didn't send this in post.	55.94521	-3.2849
Resident	The suggested restrictions for The Paddockholm are completely out of proportion to any issues I've experienced during over 30 years living here. I am very concerned that these new restrictions would generate problems where they didn't exist before.	55.94104	-3.27627
Resident	On this map, there is no sign of the short term parking spaces currently available in Station Road, Manse Road and by Inglis Vets. Are these still going to be available or not? I find them indispensable for short visits to local shops.	55.94232	-3.28481
Resident	We just moved to the area on 15th January. This will be detrimental to local businesses and cause particular problems for the elderly visitors to Ladywell medical centre. It seems very odd to be undertaking these things while in the middle of a pandemic	55.94233	-3.28841
Resident	Strongly disagree with the proposal, specifically on Sycamore Terrace and surrounds. Due to direct access required to homes for loading/unloading of shopping and children. Congestion will increase as a result leaving residents battling for spaces.	55.93937	-3.28076
Resident	Strongly oppose proposal, specifically on Sycamore. This proposal removes direct access to properties which is unacceptable and dangerous for families. It will create unwanted demand on Dovecote. Thus penalising the residents with young children further.	55.93938	-3.28079
Resident	It's an outrage to residents of the Corstorphine area, just another thing to charge us for.	55.94504	-3.27598
Other	I am a patient at Ladywell Medical Center West, it has a very large catchment. This will make the poor parking situation even worse for vulnerable people who need to drive there. Parking for centre already terrible on surrounding streets. This is worse.	55.94003	-3.28894
Resident	The proposed permit parking bay blocks the driveway to 24 Barony Terrace	55.94518	-3.28418
Resident	Where is the parking for the Health Centres of Ladywell East and Ladywell west?	55.94086	-3.28823
Resident	Proposed Permit parking bay blocks the driveway entrance to 24 Barony Terrace which is not located where shown on the map.	55.94515	-3.28434

Visitor	There appears to be no parking anywhere in the area for visitors. Only residents parking. Are you trying to kill the shops and restaurants?	55.94489	-3.26438
Resident	People need to park (short term) and as I've said before what we (as residents) need is no parked car closer to our drives than 1 metre on either side, other spaces have painted bays. Parking closer to drives or outwith the painted bays get towed	55.94217	-3.28974
Resident	Driveway to house blocked by permit parking.	55.94514	-3.28422
Resident	Im a patient at Ladywell medical centre East. I live 3.5 miles away. How do I get there. No direct bus, no parking and can't cycle or walk that far. Yellow lines everywhere. No sensible thought given to these plans. Council employed by us to do job	55.94778	-3.29791
Resident	We've been parking outside our house for over 20 years without any major issues. I just don't see the reasoning behind forcing residents to pay for a permit. Those with front gardens are now talking about slabbing over their lawns removing greenery.	55.94175	-3.26767
Visitor	One of the proposed permit bays actually crosses the driveway of my elderly parents! The driveway is not marked correctly on your map (24 Barony Terrace). This would also make it more difficult for us to visit my parents.	55.94518	-3.28418
Visitor	I live in Bughtlin and my doctors surgery is in Ladywell Medical Centre . There is no parking provision on the map. Are they going to move the medical centre?	55.94071	-3.2885
Visitor	How can I collect my carry out from any of the restaurants on the Glasgow Road. There is no parking allowed	55.94288	-3.2912
Visitor	I cant get to my bank.	55.94286	-3.28805
Resident	I have lived at 29 Clermiston Road for more than 20 years and can count on one hand the number of times I could not part my car in one of the adjacent streets. This plan is nothing other than a new council tax premium for me.	55.9441	-3.28077
Resident	What will permits cost? Why have I not been contacted directly by the council about this proposal? Clermiston Road residents will also need permits if this proposal goes ahead.	55.94411	-3.28075
Resident	From the proposal a yellow line will over our driveway where we currently park 1 car. If we can't do this it will take up an additional resident permit space. Pls consider leaving the existing white line Already pressure on space from Clermiston Rd cars	55.94501	-3.28
Resident	Double yellow lines will REDUCE my ability to park on my street and then you expect me to pay for it too!	55.94504	-3.28831
Resident	This is nothing other than a stealth tax. We do not have a parking problem in the area. This whole process is flawed. A large number of the residents in the area are elderly, who may not have the requisite skills to download this information yet alone res	55.94112	-3.27352
Resident	this is nothing other than a smoke screen to raise revenue for the Council. The elderly are being denied the opportunity to comment on this due to the online nature of this survey. it smacks of age discrimination.	55.42439	-1.50236
Resident	I don't want to pay to park outside my house when I have no problem parking at all. I don't want visitors to pay to visit me. Please don't do this.	55.93974	-3.27937
Resident	Putting the parking spaces on the side of the road *opposite* the houses increases the risk for my young children, having to cross the road each time they get in & out of the car, not to mention for the adults, when they, for example, unload the shopping	55.94372	-3.28509
Resident	Reducing the overall parking spaces on our road does not fix the issue of not finding a parking space! Together with our neighbours we have 4 cars not on drive ways, which already fills what's available locally and does not allow for any visitors at all.	55.94374	-3.28509
Business owner	There is no parking issue in this area	55.94067	-3.27936
Resident	Map factually incorrect. Existing dropped kerb location outside 40 and 40a Traquair Park West is incorrectly located. Introduction of parking restrictions will cost me and any visitors money in a street currently without parking issues.	55.94017	-3.27376
Visitor	My regular trips to the shops in corstorphine will not happen as I can find free and easy parking at local shopping centres. Any business who make it through lockdown will struggle due to this planned scheme.	55.94153	-3.27937
Resident	I have parked my car in the last 20 years in Orchardfield avenue and have only once not found a space to park on the western street side. I would doubt if residents have any trouble parking on the proposed permit holder east side of the avenue.	55.93994	-3.28337
Resident	There is no requirement for this. There is no issue with parking here. I strongly object to these plans.	55.94443	-3.27516

Resident	I don't understand what problem we are trying to resolve here. Feels like the creation of problems for residents. Is this simply about raising money while inconveniencing residents, their visitors and people parking to go to local businesses?Disappointed	55.94044	-3.27974
Resident	I'm concerned that the proposed parking restrictions on Ladywell Avenue will have an impact on Dovecot Road which already gets congested at school drop off and pick up times with cars overhanging gates etc	55.93896	-3.28266
Resident	For safety reasons parking should only be allowed on one side of Pinkhill (section that leads to corstorphine road) the junction there is awful when cars exiting block the road , preventing cars driving into pink hill , and then blocking visibility	55.94201	-3.26423
Resident	I do not want parking permits on this road. There is no issue with non residential parking.	55.94426	-3.27867
Resident	Too many permit spaces will drive increased traffic and parking to nearby streets	55.94007	-3.27095
Resident	More yellow lines space at corner of traquair - dangerous corner	55.94081	-3.26903
Resident	Parked cars in quiet streets is not a problem, St. John's road is a traffic disaster, sort that please!	55.94416	-3.2771
Other	Drastic measures leave it how it is, I live and work around Corstorphine as do my children this is scandalous.	55.93888	-3.2862
Other	Drastic measures leave it how it is, I live and work around Corstorphine as do my children this is scandalous.	55.93888	-3.2862
Other	Drastic measures leave it how it is, I live and work around Corstorphine as do my children this is scandalous.	55.93888	-3.2862
Other	Drastic I live and work in area my daughters all live in areas affected with small children scandalous anyway to make money	55.94407	-3.28809
Resident	Proposals will encourage parking on the corner of Meadowhouse and Carrick Knowe creating bottle neck and increasing accident risk.	55.93947	-3.27097
Resident	Concerned that the new parking proposals at Pinkhill are on both sides, congested traffic and making entry and exit difficult. Suggest traffic light to improve flow and safety	55.9421	-3.26506
Resident	Concerned about parking at top of Pinkhill. Should be in one side only. Congested traffic backs up on both Pinkhill and Corstorphine Road. Also traffic light at junction would improve safety and flow	55.94219	-3.26505
Resident	I have no desire to have a parking bay outside my house. Nor the additional cost of a permit. Totally unnecessary and unwanted	55.94349	-3.27668
Resident	The measures are too draconian for a suburban area and will have a detrimental effect on access to local amenities. The entire parking proposal will limit the ability of family and visitors from parking when visiting our property.	55.94406	-3.28935
Resident	At the rear of 38 Templeland Road we have a back gate to our property and we have parked there for the last 40 years though custom and practice. Rather than double yellow lines we would want a Permit bay plus signage preventing parking near garages.	55.94406	-3.28935
Resident	The issue in terms of Kaimes Road relates to the section below Gordon Road. I will provide further details by email but this is the section that needs to be addressed.	55.94255	-3.27311
Resident	I have been in Belgrave Rd. for 53 years. While parking has steadily got heavier I have never failed to find a spot outside of my house or nearby.	55.94357	-3.27917
Resident	Very angry about these proposals. Total lack of notice from you/Councillors. Cost? Who wants this-evidence? Public safety-streets are not wide enough for parking both sides. Huge aesthetic damage.	55.94474	-3.27646
Resident	There is no need for the single yellow line south of 25 Kaimes Road. Kerb space on the west can be used for resident or other spacing. Trades access also affected: many traders won't have permits or are not on approved trade list.	55.94413	-3.27377
Resident	Residents should not be made to pay for parking outside their own property	55.94432	-3.29092
Resident	There is no issue with parking locally. There is plenty of available parking for everyone. Introducing parking restrictions will cause problems for local residents rather than provide a solution.	55.94398	-3.27492
Resident	Think this is totally unnecessary as we have never had any issues with parking in our area.	55.93974	-3.27438
Resident	My husband and I would like to object. Our street has no problems at the moment so don't see why anything needs to change. Think it will cause more problems.	55.94437	-3.28251
Resident	People will park further up and gardens will be paved over	55.94568	-3.28974

Resident	I don't believe these plans address the actual issues and there is a lack of detail as to how much the permits will cost residents, how many you can have and how many bays are in the permit zones.	55.94222	-3.27253
Resident	There is no issue with on street parking in our street. Why introduce something that is not needed?	55.94372	-3.275
Visitor	You are restricting location of people wishing to participate in lawn bowling at Corstorphine Bowling Club	55.94227	-3.27796
Resident	Ridiculous, shared parking will make it worse for residents. Yellows outside sycamore terrace, how are residents to unload shopping safely outside our houses. Single and double yellows on sycamore terrace will encourage fast traffic. Bad plan	55.93972	-3.28107
Resident	Traquair Park West is a residential with on street parking predominantly used by residents. There is no benefit for residents in introducing parking bays and restrictions. It is an absurd waster of tax payers money.	55.94012	-3.27515
Resident	This solving a problem which does not exist. There is no issue with parking in my area, but this scheme will remove on street parking outside my house which displaces two car and causes a problem for my disabled daughter to access a vehicle.	55.94408	-3.27629
Resident	Commuters do not park in the Pinkhill Park estate. Spaces are already hard to find for residents adding double yellows everywhere is going to be a real issue now that everyone works from home. Permits are expensive for an area that doesn't require them	55.9402	-3.26731
Resident	Putting double yellows in the estate would be pointless, no commuter park in Pinkhill park. Parking isn't an issue. Permits are expensive, I would need to move somewhere else if the council was trying to get more money out of us during this pandemic.	55.94041	-3.26745
Resident	We do not want any parking restrictions on Templeland road.	55.94506	-3.29311
Resident	There are no resident parking spaces proposed for residents of the tenement in Corstorphine High Street, with all the surrounding streets becoming mixed use bays or residents where are we supposed to park? can we apply for permit for surrounding streets?	55.9407	-3.28198
Resident	There will be less space for residents to park. It will not reduce parking but just charge residents a lot of money for parking which is free. Permit residences are fine but should be issued free. No reason for charging other than money making by Council	55.94458	-3.28844
Resident	I Don't see why I should be penalised to park out my own front door by needing to pay for a parking permit when I rarely have a problem to park outside my door , I have lived in my house for nearly 40 years- MONEY MAKING EXCERISE that's all !!!!!	55.94017	-3.27258
Resident	I Don't see why I should be penalised to park out my own front door by needing to pay for a parking permit MONEY MAKING EXCERISE thats all !!!!! don't look like theirs enough shared parking bays for the whole street if this gets the Go head either	55.94017	-3.27258
Visitor	Health and wellbeing of my parents for family/ friends visiting but this proposal will put a a lot of strain on this,especially both not on a bus route if they cant get there car parked ,40 years my parents have lived there and parking not been a issue!	55.94017	-3.27258
Resident	So between keeping our driveways clear and yellow lines on the street there's not enough room for all the cars after issuing permits -so we will all be fighting to parkfor shared bays- I've never understood how you are allowed to sell more than spaces	55.94017	-3.27258
Resident	There are no parking issues in this area.This method of informing people is flawed .It disadvantages the elderly.Nothing more than another stealth tax.	55.94078	-3.26956
Resident	At a time when the high street is dying and in need of every available assistance you decide to introduce parking restrictions that will exasperate its demise. This is typical of short term council planning leading to long term pain for all concerned.	55.94375	-3.28122
Resident	There is no problem parking on Gordon rd, there are plenty of spaces for residents plus visitors. Putting in parking controls will bring disadvantages (restrictions to visits, trades etc) without any advantage.	55.94422	-3.2783
Resident	I strongly object to this ridiculous money-making scheme. I have lived here for 45 years paying council tax and road tax and you now want to extort more cash with no return. The road surface is a disgrace and the neglected gullies cause flooding.	55.93844	-3.2923
Visitor	Ridiculous money making proposal from the council when we should we working as a community helping each other. Why should residents have to pay to park outside a house they have owned for over 40 years!!	55.93797	-3.29307
Resident	This is so bad for the local businesses. If people cannot shop easily in their local neighbourhood, they will be forced to spend more time driving to larger retail parks where they can shop easily and freely without concern re cost of parking	55.94232	-3.28481

Resident	We need to be able to access local pharmacy and health care providers without concern over parking fees to this	55.94236	-3.28629
Resident	There is no need to introduce these parking zones. Corstorphine is not in the city centre, it isn't over run with commuter parking is very residential. It's only a money making scheme and another disaster scheme by the Council within Corstorphine!	55.94381	-3.28666
Resident	There is absolutely no need for parking restrictions in this area as there is and has never been a problem with parking in this area.	55.94228	-3.261
Resident	A this is absolutely ridiculous. All your going to do is push the parking onto surrounding streets. The parking round here is diabolical at the moment as it is. You are going to kill the high Street off.	55.9505	-3.2935
Resident	The proposals are unnecessary and will adversely affect local businesses.	55.94227	-3.27796
Resident	Cars will be parked in surrounding streets making traffic heavier as people try to find a parking space	55.93934	-3.28674
Resident	This is a housing estate at the edge of the city. It is not necessary to have metres and yellow lines. Specifically why do we need a yellow line across our driveways. Other people do not park here. This should be free for residents to park.	55.94392	-3.29106
Resident	I am strongly against this proposal. This will negatively impact the residents of Corstorphine and visitors to the area. The proposals will discourage visitors to local shops, during a time when we need to be protecting them.	55.94348	-3.27878
Resident	The proposed restrictions within Pinkhill Park are unnecessary and will add to parking problems rather than reduce them	55.94063	-3.26788
Resident	We are concerned that there is no proposed "residents only" parking in Barony Terrace from nos 10 to 20 on one side and 7 (our residence) to 7a on the other.	55.94492	-3.28306
Resident	The new proposal will mean a single yellow line outside my house meaning i can no longer park there. Parking permits are £109 so I am being penalised every year for not installing a driveway. Parking is not the problem in CPG speeding cars are.	55.93991	-3.27896
Resident	A significant number of older, less mobile, people drive to the Carlton Bridge club the buses is not practical. Parking restrictions may reduce people attending bridge club, leading to increase in social isolation	55.94171	-3.26481
Resident	Never had any real problems parking in my street or across the road in Belgrave Road. Am surprised the evidence backing the proposal is substantial enough to warrant a parking zone. Am cynical on this one.	55.94151	-3.27466
Resident	Remove the bay between the bus stop and Featherhall Avenue	55.94001	-3.28814
Resident	Remove at least 2 bays here as it is very tight having parking and 3 lanes of traffic	55.94009	-3.2916
Resident	People will park elsewhere rather than pay for a permit, especially if there are several adults with cars in the one household. Other roads will become clogged with cars from residents in other streets	55.9381	-3.28613
Resident	Where my locator is should be two more permit bays. Most of my neighbours have more than one car, where would my visitors park when there's such limited space? I want to be reassured that no one else can park in front of my garage which I privately own.	55.94398	-3.28986
Resident	As a resident just outside of the proposed zone, I believe I would be unfairly disadvantaged from this proposal as residents within the proposed zone would simply park on my street rather than pay for a permit.	55.94513	-3.27946
Resident	Improved park and ride facilities on the outskirts of Edinburgh would be a far better solution. This proposal will damage local businesses and negatively impact elderly residents by restricting free parking.	55.94278	-3.28302
Resident	We've never found there's a problem with parking - almost always a free space outside our own house, and this appears to be the case our near neighbours too. So having to purchase a residents' parking permit would - for us - be an unwelcome new expense.	55.94516	-3.28618
Resident	I do not think any parking restrictions are necessary. There are not currently any problems with parking in the residential streets in the Corstorphine area, and I think these proposals will cause problems.	55.94422	-3.27836
Resident	I'm struggling to understand why so much effort is being put into solving a problem that doesn't exist, particularly given the current pandemic. This isn't going to help visitors and looks more like a money raising scheme.	55.94344	-3.27399

Resident	I don't feel there is a parking issue on this street and would oppose parking controls as these would impact on family and friends who visit. Many of my neighbours use the street for parking and this would also adversely affect them.	55.94001	-3.2793
Resident	I am very preturbed that I have not received any formal notification of this proposal, I only heard about this through a neighbour. I think parking restriction in my area are totally unnecessary as we have no issues with parking.	55.94046	-3.27132
Resident	it is just a money making scheme from the council, if it is not then ever householder in Corstorphine should get 1 free permit every year. We pay road tax and council tax the motorist is just an easy target, parking is no bother for me.	55.94036	-3.2805
Resident	The parking bay and yellow lines should be swapped from one side to the other. PB on the West YL on the East	55.93954	-3.27764
Resident	This road is too narrow for traffic to pass safely with cars parked on both sides, bays should be interrupted to allow "passing Places"	55.94113	-3.2677
Resident	This road is too narrow for traffic to pass safely with cars parked on both sides, bays should be interrupted to allow "passing Places"	55.94132	-3.26592
Resident	This road too narrow for cars to be parked on both sides and this causes congestion and potential accidents on Corstorphine Road when cars cannot turn into Pinkhill as cars backed up. Ideally one side of the road should have NO PARKING at all.	55.94212	-3.2651
Resident	Seems unnecessary and will make the problem with parking worse. This map is also not up to date as it shows a planned bay over our existing driveway.	55.94504	-3.28757
Resident	Why would you have yellow lines in front of my driveway? Why are you doing this when there is no problem on most of those streets? Why can we no How many spaces are you proposing in front of my house - as if more than one it makes it dangerous for access.	55.94419	-3.29114
Visitor	I have elderly parents who live on Maybank Villas. I have concerns that they may be unable to park outside their house and to have to pay for permits for parking. I am concerned I will have to pay to visit them.	55.94437	-3.28829
Resident	Double yellow lines and residents only/permit parking around Ladywell Medical Centres is unacceptable. Car travel to and parking close to the Medical Centres are essential.	55.9403	-3.2891
Resident	No current problem with parking. Against permit zone. Understand others troubled by 'park and ride' cars so supportive of restrictions for limited period during middle of day.	55.94285	-3.27536
Resident	This is unnecessary. I do not wish any changes to the existing parking on my street.,	55.94437	-3.28823
Resident	We have no parking issues on Gordon Road or in the surrounding roads of Gordon Loan and I have been here for 20 years. We get occasional parked cars during the international matches. These proposals will create more problems for no benefit	55.94374	-3.27515
Resident	We often have visitors who come to stay and there has never been a problem with congestion or spaces on Gordon Road. I have lived here for 20 years and object to these proposals	55.94379	-3.2751
Resident	I refer to the "Controlled parking and priority parking protocols", Section 2 part A, In this area there has never been any non residential vehicles parked in the parking spaces. We feel there is no CLEAR NEED for this imposition.	55.94102	-3.27567
Resident	I would like parking permits introduced on my street and locality (Glebe Gardens, Glebe Road, Glebe Grove, Glebe Terrace) to reduce the problem with commuter and shopper parking.	55.94184	-3.28226
Resident	The problem in St Ninian's Rd is not parking but its use as a cut through to/from St John's/Clermiston Roads. This is a nuisance and danger to pedestrians/residents. The proposals will make this worse by allowing faster traffic flow.	55.94371	-3.28413
Resident	The proposals for St Ninian's Rd reduce parking by half. The 2 churches in the street both have halls used heavily by many groups as a key part of the vibrant village community. By restricting parking they will be used less affecting the community.	55.94378	-3.28554
Visitor	These proposals would mean that it would find it difficult to park and cost us as well to provide child care for our family which is unacceptable. It would also mean that street would also become even more of a rat run.	55.94359	-3.28472
Resident	Discourages use of local shops at the east end of Corstorphine. Free parking and a time limit would be more appropriate there.	55.94231	-3.27929
Resident	Parking essential for visitors to GP surgery. This will disadvantage many elderly people and those with health and mobility issues.	55.94068	-3.28751

Resident	I do not support these proposals. I am very concerned that any type of parking restrictions as proposed in our adjacent streets will quite simply move the commuter or holiday parking elsewhere eg into our street. Introduce a commuter charge instead!	55.93748	-3.28532
Resident	I object strongly to the introduction of permit holder bays. There is no issue with parking in my street. This is a council money making exercise by forcing residents to pay to park where they live.	55.94031	-3.27621
Resident	I live in a quiet cul-de-sac with private parking. Your map shows a single yellow line around the the whole area. This is quite unnecessary and overkill since Covid 19.	55.93979	-3.28187
Resident	Your Controlled Parking Zone Engagement form for Corstorphine came through the door today. However, the first drop in session was yesterday. What is the point of that?	55.94051	-3.2757
Resident	There's too much bureaucracy and not enough consultation. No matter what the outcome the CEC will do whatever it wants. You have already been told that there is no need for a cycle path on Clermiston Road and yet you are making plans to implement one	55.93987	-3.28223
Resident	We have no issues with parking on our terrace and disagree with the council's proposal to introduce parking permits. There is no need for them in our road and it will increase the annual costs for each of the families for no reason.	55.94171	-3.27687
Resident	This is nothing other than a mechanism to add further taxation measures by the back door .The leaflet sent to the residents does not show the fact that consideration has already been given to various controls that the Council wish to implement .	55.89213	-3.57007
Visitor	Permit parking spaces in St Ninian's Road/surrounds are not required as properties have garages or driveways. Busiest time are weekends when church services are on. Disabled spaces would ease access for elderly/disabled parishioners attending services.	55.94376	-3.28517
Resident	Strongly opposed. This is not needed in Pinkhill Park. Aside from being financially in affordable it would be cause a lot of headaches for residents, short term renters and those using air bnb in the development. It also causes problems with UG parking	55.94058	-3.26754
Resident	There is not enough space for 2 sides parking. It is dangerous due to the blind corner. There should be no parking outside 46. Cars outside 40 and 42 both park on pavement as no space when parked on road. No emergency access.	55.94546	-3.28604
Resident	The councils attention should be focused on fixing the potholes and road surfaces, not just looking at ways to extract further revenue's by the back door.	55.94227	-3.28335
Resident	This is just a tax. The introduction of yellow lines and bays will significantly reduce the car parking on our street during the day. No evidence of any benefit to residents or visitors or businesses has been provided for our street.	55.94485	-3.27792
Resident	I would have to buy a resident permit, I dont know how much for and if there would be enough spaces for all the residents. I do not think this would resolve the situation. Turning cars is an issue. High volume of number of people parking who use surround	55.93999	-3.27845
Resident	I live at 149/3 St Johns Road. At present it is difficult to park my car and this looks like it will be 10 times worse. What happens all day if i am not using my car that day, say, because i am feeling unwell or working at home?!	55.94261	-3.28215
Other	As a regular church goer attending St John's RC church in St Ninian's Road, I feel very strongly that at weekends there should be no parking restrictions here or on St Ninian's Drive, to enable church goers on Saturday evenings and Sundays.	55.94379	-3.2858
Resident	There is no need or reason for parking charges and single / double yellow line within Pinkhill Park. The development is very well self regulated, and you will forcibly constrain parking availability for no valid reason.	55.94035	-3.26785
Resident	I live at Pinkhill Park, and I believe there is absolutely no justification in introducing parking charges or yellow lines into our development, which combined with the private road, will lead to strife between the residents.	55.94064	-3.2681
Resident	Parking spaces are currently inadequate for the number of local residents in Pinkhill Park. This is excluding additional capacity required for visitors, constant delivery vans and weekly engineer access to the BT Openreach and CityFibre pcg cabinets.	55.94069	-3.26804
Resident	Terrible idea, no need	55.94027	-3.27804
Resident	I think the whole thing is ridiculous. Doesn't take into account residents and peoples homes. Family visitors now can't park near your home if parking is full or have to pay to do so. No parking near a doctors surgery!!!!	55.93854	-3.2867
Commuter	St Andrew's Fox Covert RC Pupils regularly attend services throughout the year at St John the Baptist RC Church, St Ninian's Road, and, as it stands now, on-street parking is extremely difficult in this area and surrounding streets.	55.94371	-3.28508

Resident	Increasing the cost of road markings & signage, payment machines and administration of parking permits is unnecessary. Improve bus routes to the areas where "commuter parkers" live. Why not survey the people who park in these locations?	55.94489	-3.2738
Resident	We do not have a parking problem in Corstorphine. This will push commuters to park hillview terrace which is the 1st street outside the proposed parking zone) and is designed to put money into council coffers. Edinburgh traffic planning is a disgrace.	55.94549	-3.28402
Visitor	The majority of corstorphine does not have an issue with parking - why put this in now? Covid means fewer people will be commuting in the long run. Wait a few years and see if an issue arises before looking into things again.	55.9413	-3.28918
Resident	It will only make life under pressure for resonate and for visitors ! Please don't develop this initiative	55.94066	-3.26912
Resident	Parking issues on Victor Park Terrace will not be fixed by reducing parking spaces. This is not a street used by commuters to park and get a bus, this is a street with lots of residents in a small space. Most elderly or have young families.	55.94524	-3.28845
Resident	Not in agreement with this whatsoever	55.9403	-3.27875
Resident	Featherhall Rd & Manse St have tenement buildings, hence a large number of households without access to off street parking. It is entirely inappropriate to reduce the number of parking spaces in this area in the name of improving parking for locals.	55.94146	-3.28681
Resident	The restriction of vehicle heights to 2.5m makes no sense. This will prevent owners of taller private vehicles from parking anywhere near their home. If this restriction is to prevent commercial vehicles, then limit it to applying to commercial vehicles.	55.94241	-3.29316
Resident	There is no problem with the parking on Traquair Park West. Restrictions are completely unnecessary.	55.9404	-3.27822
Resident	We are furious that this is being proposed for our road. It is not necessary at all . Residents would NOT benefit from such a proposal.here.and the fact that you would ask us to pay for this is ridiculous.	55.94167	-3.26756
Resident	Will affect businesses in Corstorphine Not required in the Paddockholm. We have a control in place. Don't need fix for something not broken. Will restrict visitors further	55.9413	-3.27807
Resident	Proposed single yellow line in front of garages has potential to obstruct access to garages outwith restricted times, but will also prevent garage owners parking for a longer time period on the road in front of their own garage.	55.94563	-3.28807
Resident	Road too narrow parking here already causes problems turning into St. Ninnian's Rd.	55.94343	-3.28623
Resident	More bicycle parking required near the shop entrances.	55.94254	-3.28182
Resident	More bicycle parking and traffic reduction measures required to encourage workers to make sustainable travel choices and not park on local streets.	55.94153	-3.27085
Resident	Double yellows are needed on at least one side of St. N Dr btwn 160 & 162 St.J Rd. Currently it is dangerous as only one car can get past if cars are parked on both sides. Given cars are usually backed up St. N it makes it difficult to get off st. J Rd	55.94321	-3.28629
Resident	Is there room to get past these cars if positioned like this? Cars are usually parked on one side for that reason. Staggering it will make it dangerous for all travel modes	55.94509	-3.28761
Resident	This general area is positioned along way from any form of visitor parking	55.9453	-3.28757
Resident	Residents of T/Park West with commercial vehicles may park in the nearest available street which is Meadowhouse Road. This narrows at its junction with Carrick Knowe Av so presenting a dangerous route to school	55.94017	-3.2711
Resident	Those wishing to avoid parking charges/permits will simply park at the bottom of Station Road, ie Meadowhouse Road. This is a major school route and cannot take any more parking.	55.93934	-3.27765
Resident	I am very very opposed to parking restrictions on my street. In the thirty years I have lived here there has never been a problem outside of our house	55.94037	-3.28914
Resident	I am strongly against the Council's plans for parking restrictions on my street	55.94225	-3.27861
Resident	Strongly object to paying for parking in Corstorphine Bank Drive. I feel it is bad for us, local shops and restaurants, doctors and dentists	55.9358	-3.27766
Resident	There is no need to extend traffic restrictions in the Corstorphine Area. There are ample parking spaces which overwhelmingly are used by residents. This proposal is basically to increase income .	55.94279	-3.28062
Resident	i don't approve of the proposal as there is plenty of parking space for residents. i would require a white line across my garage entrance in order to maintain access	55.94335	-3.2807
Resident	Terrible idea, patrol area & charge the people that cant park properly, why should residents pay more money, try mending the roads instead of wasting more money & annoying residents	55.9414	-3.28895

Resident	More very poor ideas by council, probably by people that don't stay in the are, most of the complainers are retired & nothing better to do than moan	55.9414	-3.28881
Resident	All this will do is move the problem out by two streets. Don't think these restrictions are required but if they do go ahead then they should be expanded ie to Caroline Terrace.	55.94551	-3.28166
Resident	Nothing wrong with the status quo and parking is FREE - not a money making council scheme. I've never had trouble finding a parking place in my street. I have experience of living in a permit zone when it is more difficult to find a bay!	55.94368	-3.27951
Business owner	Unless the controlled hours are in the morning otherwise it will have a bad effect on the New Melville Bridge Club.	55.94215	-3.26483
Resident	55-77 Forrester Road. 1)Proposed zig-zag parking on both sides - more unsafe than present. 2.)Loss of 3 or 4 parking spaces - not compensated for anywhere else within the zone. 3)Why pay for fewer options than now?	55.94467	-3.2873
Resident	Three garage businesses in St Ninians Drive. They currently totally dominate the proposed shared areas in this street, Forrester Road & St Ninian's Road, leaving no sharing options for residents and visitors.	55.94455	-3.2862
Resident	55-63 Forrester Road. Introduction of unnecessary yellow line here will result in the loss of four parking spaces, not compensated for anywhere else in the street plans	55.94459	-3.28721
Resident	Many patients at the Ladywell East and Ladywell West medical centres travel there by car. It is already difficult to find parking spaces anywhere in the vicinity of these medical centres and these proposals will make it worse.	55.94012	-3.28932
Resident	Please consider extending the double yellow lines in front of the drive at 5 Barony Terrace into the proposed residents parking bay. The proposed bay will cause traffic to move into the middle of the road on a blind corner.	55.94469	-3.28241
Resident	I live in Hillview Terrace and on the printed map that was supplied it was one of the roads included. I see that this map is different and it is not included. Due to this misinformation by the Council and short form field entry I cannot comment	55.94551	-3.28166
Resident	I do not think this is necessary and it will adversely affect me	55.94551	-3.28166
Resident	Unnecessary money making scheme which will be misused by this awful Council	55.94042	-3.27293
Resident	I have not been consulted on this before. The information leaflet arrived the day after the first drop in session. I have lived here for 18 years and have never had a problem parking.	55.94032	-3.27563
Resident	There are no parking issues outside our house and in the street in general.	55.94397	-3.27546
Resident	Not a significant parking issue. A greater focus to improve park and ride from out of town and improved cycle/footways. Open toilets and cafes might make them more attractive. Parking on one side would help.	55.94163	-3.26735
Resident	My intention is to create off-street parking in our front garden for a second car. Your interactive maps shows permit parking spaces in front of our property. Can these be removed to allow us access to this 2nd off-street parking on my property.	55.93998	-3.27885
Resident	What is the backup to the Council's claim that there is a real "parking pressure issue" in Gordon Road. It is certainly not consistent with my first hand observations. This proposal therefore simply punishes local residents practically and financially.	55.94378	-3.27554
Resident	I can clearly see the need to control traffic and parking in this area. My objection is the Shared Parking bay outside the only 2 houses in the street that have no driveways. Both houses belong to pensioners with a need to park near home.	55.9414	-3.28818
Resident	Detailed plan needs revision. Results in 30% approx loss of street parking. Not allowed to park over own drive adding to parking problem!!!	55.94505	-3.2783
Resident	My house is very close to the boundary of this proposed parking zone. All that will happen is that drivers will move from the zone of parking restrictions into adjoining roads such as Hillview Drive where there are no parking restrictions.	55.94583	-3.29163
Resident	The proposed resident parking on Broomhall Drive and in particular outside the shops which are frequently used for short term parking to visit the shops is completely unnecessary as there are no adverse parking issues in this whole area.	55.93791	-3.29165
Resident	NO issues with parking on Old Kirk rd. Introducing extra costs of parking in this economy as we are suffering the hardships of covid is punitive at best.	55.94504	-3.27598
Business owner	Insufficient parking for patients visiting the pharmacy. There is no indication in the consultation when the restricted times are	55.94313	-3.28828

Resident	There is no current problem at Corstorphine Park Gardens with commuters parking and cannot see any point in this proposal as there is no problem	55.93998	-3.27862
Resident	I am almost certain that residents who have no access to this forum or the internet and who would have a very negative view on this in my opinion	55.93997	-3.27863
Resident	Residential parking is not currently a problem. These proposals will unnecessarily penalise the people who frequent St John's Church for worship and also funerals, many of whom are elderly and need vehicular access.	55.94365	-3.28603
Resident	The proposal will reduce the available parking space on my street where parking is already at a premium.	55.94448	-3.28815
Resident	This intended shared use bay runs across the entrance to the driveway of my property and if marked could deprive me of vehicle entry.	55.94511	-3.28431
Resident	We live on 61 Forrester Road on the corner and do not have a drive way. Parking has never been an issue for us. From your plan there is not enough parking bays for the whole street. This will create a problem rather than help the residents.	55.94474	-3.28741
Resident	I do not want to have any double yellow lines in my street. Not all residents have drive ways and the elderly neighbours have family visiting that needs space to park their cars! We do not have any parking issues. Please do not enforce this on our street	55.94535	-3.28732
Resident	I totally disagree with this proposal and don't see the need for CPZ. I have no issues parking in my street. If CPZ is introduced in surroundings areas then this could have an impact with non resident cars parking in my stree.	55.93998	-3.27856
Resident	This is all about raising more money out of us. Disgraceful. This has nothing to do with the view of residents. Our council tax is already like another mortgage.	55.9427	-3.29211
Resident	I totally disagree with this proposal. I have a driveway with dropped curb. My visitors (which's includes my elderly mother) can park in front of my driveway with no impact to other residents CPZ will not allow me to do this.	55.93997	-3.27858
Resident	This consultation feels unnecessary. There's never been outrageous problems with parking in this area so why choose to charge these residents? I expect people who do park in the area will try to travel to nearby streets causing more problems elsewhere.	55.94249	-3.28195
Resident	Why are there double yellow lines here	55.94397	-3.28987
Resident	There are not enough spaces for all residents to park one car here	55.94397	-3.28963
	What are you going to do to compensate me for the reduction in value of my property	55.94403	-3.28977
Resident	Why are you not giving two free parking permits to residents	55.94406	-3.2898
Resident	Insufficient resident parking bays. Too many shared user bays, additional double yellow lines restricts residents being able to park in our street. Maybank Villas	55.94471	-3.28847
Resident	Residents should be free. If it goes ahead it should continue up Hillview drive as it goes up to the top of corstorphine bank drive, if not it will just mean we will have all the cars. Enough problems with construction traffic that has lasted 19 years.	55.94537	-3.29173
Resident	As an essential user of the lady medical centre east as is my Dad where can we park?? The Health Centre doesn't have a car park and you never know how long you will be in there if we have to pay and display	55.93317	-3.28487
Visitor	Parking to go to hairdresser and St Johns Road shops. No car park so we have to park on street but where now. Passenger with mobility issues	55.94279	-3.28289
Resident	There is absolutely no requirement for controlled parking in this street. (Traquair Park West)	55.94033	-3.27633
Resident	I prefer no change to Belgrave Rd. If a change is required use system for Craigleith Rd which stops all day commuter parking but allows free visitor parking part of the day. Proposed controls are not justified as post Covid there will be more working fro	55.94308	-3.27635
Resident	We live in Meadowhouse Road. If permits start in neighbouring streets then non permit holders will come to ours and clog it up. However there is no need for it in neighbouring streets in the first place..	55.9392	-3.27873
Visitor	When I attend Ladywell Surgery there will be difficulty parking. Back pain precludes cycling.	55.9401	-3.29121
Resident	Worried about the effect on local shops. People will pave over gardens, increasing flooding and less plants and trees to absorb pollution.	55.94638	-3.26638
Resident	I fear the full resident permits at Traquir park may force an overspill onto Meadowhouse which is a rat run to The gyle particularly for commercial traffic	55.93143	-3.27968

Visitor	I use a local nursery so changes will make drop off and collection very difficult. Also very difficult for users of GP. It will adversely impact businesses.	55.94225	-3.28863
Resident	The current proposal shows a Shared-Use Bay immediately in front of my house. Given the limited number of such bays this will make it extremely difficult for me to park in front of my own home	55.94025	-3.27316
Visitor	I come into the centre of Corstorphine for shopping, hairdressers and church and these proposals will make it very difficult to continue to do this. It will also make it difficult for things like weddings and funerals if non residents are unable to park	55.94364	-3.28503
Resident	These restrictions are not required on Templeland Road, as always plenty of parking and also plenty of room for emergency vehicles	55.94447	-3.2894
Resident	The 2 churches, St John the Baptist and St Ninian's often have week day services which many people need to drive to due to mobility issues. Exemptions to any charges should be made for church goers	55.94393	-3.28543
Visitor	The parking restrictions in Costorphine should not happen as it will have a detrimental effect on the number of people going to worship in the churches nearby and on those using the local shops. Costorphine will suffer tremendously.	55.94376	-3.28517
Resident	I am concerned that a number of residents in the area did not receive the leaflet informing us about the current phase of the project. This means that an unknown number of residents will not have had opportunity to provide input to the consultation.	55.94028	-3.27605
Resident	The consultation is being conducted electronically. I am concerned that an unknown number of residents may not have adequate IT facilities to contribute to the consultation.	55.9403	-3.27755
Resident	The survey results depict Traquair Park West as an area of high parking pressure. This is wrong due to the way that this has been determined. I and my neighbours have no trouble parking at any time. There are no shops, businesses or schools closeby.	55.94032	-3.27759
Resident	The survey was conducted in 2018. In the light of the recent pandemic, will the Council take into consideration the fact that work patterns are likely to change going forward with increased home working and less travelling to a place of work?	55.94032	-3.27759
Resident	Will drive non-residents to this street due to shared use parking and with no off-road parking available unlike other streets, which are designated as permits, restricts resident parking	55.94456	-3.28831
Resident	Why are the disabled bays near to each other. One should be outside 5 Pinkhill Park	55.9405	-3.26766
Resident	There is no off street parking in Victor Park Terrace/Maybank Villas and the street includes tenement flats. Putting shared use parking here will only increase parking problems as people have limited other options.	55.94407	-3.28809
Visitor	There are a number of businesses on St. Ninians Drive, the customers of which often need to park on the street. Adding double yellow lines and parking bays will significantly restrict the available parking for these customers.	55.94399	-3.28644
Resident	Introducing controlled parking will simply displace the problem to an uncontrolled area nearby. Also, as a resident, I do not wish to pay to park outside my house.	55.94579	-3.28965
Resident	1. What justification /statistics for parking restrictions in featherhall cres nth. 2 If introduced no cost for a residents parking permit. 3 Have any residents complained about inability to park in the street. 4 All properties have off street parking	55.94211	-3.29016
Resident	People need to park free of charge to go to Churh	55.94358	-3.28571
Resident	Map for 42 Traquair Park West is incorrect as it fails to show a driveway of the left of the building. Elderly disabled residents need space for essential carers..	55.94023	-3.27339
Resident	Why should residents of this street have to pay for parking. It is non residents parking in the street that cause issues. Cars are left in street by people going into city by bus. Where will residents 10 -25 Victor Park Terrace be able to park to park.	55.94536	-3.28824
Resident	I am long term resident, and disabled, and reliant upon visitors and professional careers and family. They travel by car and park in the street, I must be able to access a car parked on street for mobility.	55.94433	-3.27516
Visitor	I am a frequent visitor to 42 Traquair park West, and I notice from the map the this address doesn't state that this property has a drive way. The proposed area infront of said property is incorrect.	55.94022	-3.27461
Resident	The proposals for the area around St John the Baptist's Church in St Ninian's Road will make it difficult for those attending services to find a parking space. This will impact severely on older people with limited mobility.	55.94376	-3.28533
Resident	I am of the opinion that we do not need permit parking. There is minimal parking apart from residents in our street. This will make it expensive for friends/family/carers to support us in our caring role.	55.94448	-3.28542
Resident	I have no difficulty parking in my street and am against the introduction of a CPZ.	55.94037	-3.27716

Resident	Permit parking should be restricted to 2 hours a day as originally proposed. This is the suburbs and not city area. Choose to live here for that reason. This is a money making exercise by Edinburgh Council.	55.94319	-3.29081
Resident	All the parking round my own house is for shared parking it should be half shared and half permit holders at least with a minimum for 2 residents cars outside my own property. My property is on the corner and these restrictions affects me on multiple si	55.94159	-3.29166
Resident	My daughter and family live over 360 miles and they visit maybe twice a year. Not being able to park locally would be devastating. Current arrangements are just fine and cause no inconvenience	55.9442	-3.29112
Resident	Our house has two driveways. Both currently have white lines on the road to deter parking and allow access. You are proposing to have a Permit Parking Bay across the drive that gives access to our garage, thereby preventing reasonable use of our property	55.94484	-3.27562
Visitor	This would have a major detrimental effect on accessing our churches for daily/weekly visit and making life a lot more difficult for the elderly and infirm. I also shop in Corstorphine difficult at the best of times but this would make it impossible..	55.94352	-3.28581
Resident	Traffic calming reduced parking spaces. Proposal reduces parkingfurther reduces spaces. Yellow lines waste 2 car spaces at nos. 23 & 25. A space for parking across my driveway will be lost. Perverse incentive to pave over garden areas	55.94304	-3.27622
Resident	Proposals are ridiculous my street classed as a mews it is not it's a cul de sac of 25 houses it's a wide street with a turning circle you can't have visitors passes for a mews where are visitors to park streets away	55.9388	-3.28733
Resident	I have lived at 6 Kaimes Road for over 23 years and have never had difficulty finding a parking space near my house. Due to COVID, more people are and will continue to WFH. CPZs are not needed.	55.94352	-3.2736
Resident	The drives shown on the map for numbers 40A and 42 Traquair Park West are shown in the wrong place.They should straddle the boundary between 40a And 42,not 40A and 40.Please advise what is proposed outside numbers 40A and 42 once drives correctly located	55.94022	-3.27361
Resident	Parking on both sides of this street creates a narrow corridor which is too narrow and dangerous for the volume of traffic that uses it. The traffic backs up onto the main road when there is only one lane for two directions of travel.	55.94184	-3.26496
Resident	Parking on both sides of this street creates a narrow corridor which is too narrow and dangerous for the volume of traffic that uses it. Its not possible to get to the main road when there is only one lane for two directions of travel.	55.94128	-3.2658
Resident	Parking on both sides of this street creates a narrow corridor which is too narrow and dangerous for the volume of traffic that uses it. Its not possible to or from the main road when there is only one lane for two directions of travel.	55.94108	-3.26763
Resident	This is confusing - double yellow lines and shared use parking shown at same location - what is proposed?	55.94105	-3.26835
Resident	We do not need this. The Council should pause and re-assess matters in 12 months time to gauge the post-Covid situation. We have no parking issues in our street - or streets close to us - and I am unhappy at having to pay to park outside my own house.	55.94363	-3.2744
Resident	There should be at least 2 resident parking spaces outside my house as the multi use will be so busy that I will never get a space as it is at the end of the street and very limited.	55.9416	-3.29162
Business owner	Businesses like mine have been hit very hard with COVID and if the parking restrictions go ahead this will have a horrendous effect and could be the last nail on the coffin as there is not enough parking available for clients to visit.	55.94104	-3.28408
Resident	We are the only house in our street with no resident parking around us, we should be entitled to at least 1 or 2 resident car spaces outside of our house as we are in close proximity to the main road therefore the mixed bay will be full of visitors.	55.94164	-3.29158
Business owner	After truely awful year being severely impacted with covid this would totally destroy our business out of town clients unable to park our elderly and infirm not being able to either. Not to mention myself who has to bring boxes of stock into work daily.	55.94048	-3.28474
Resident	No issues currently with parking. Feel very strongly that there should be no restrictions. I work at a local church - we serve a huge number of people in the community - that would most certainly change if parking restrictions were brought in	55.94291	-3.27588
Resident	Resident >25 years, no requirement for parking restrictions in Featherhall Cres North or South. All residents have off street parking. Any parking restrictions imposed make only 1hour to avoid any perceived commuter parking.	55.94211	-3.29016
Business owner	Trying to survive during/after a global pandemic this will destroy our business! Clients visiting the salon, after a lot suffering financially!	55.94048	-3.28489

Business owner	This is going to have a massive impact on my business clients need somewhere to park , after the aftermath of COVID and being closed and now this I dread to think what my clients will do or go .	55.94043	-3.28431
Resident	No issue in road I have parked outside my home for 20 years. All cars are residents to my knowledge and this is unnecessary restrictions and cost to all for a minority if pinch points if any in the area.	55.94526	-3.28758
Resident	You are creating a problem where one doesn't exist in certain streets.	55.9453	-3.2875
Resident	This is A culdesac dead end we don't have a parking issue. So creating a problem where none exists.	55.94557	-3.28808
Other	My mother is 90 and housebound. She requires frequent visits from family and carers. I see no provision for this kind of requirement. Are we required to pay? How are visitors to park?	55.94435	-3.2749
Resident	Yellow line outside no 25 is not just over driveway but removes onstreet parking outside no 25 and 23. Why? There is no issue with traffic flow as the drive way entry for 25 and 27 gives ample room to move in.	55.94302	-3.27623
Resident	No bays opposite and these bays are under trees used by nesting birds in summer. The bird droppings make these bays unuseable at certain times of year. Please provide bays opposite not yellow line.	55.94316	-3.27636
Resident	Why yellow line between driveways? Please allow bays. New town houses being built opposite will only increase demand.	55.94369	-3.27677
Resident	Proposals need to be reviewed post covid restriction parking usage. Perhaps restricted parking as In Morningside Drive with the 1.30 - 3.30 boxes would be more suitable for many side streets rather than resident parking permits.	55.94067	-3.27936
Business owner	This will have a massive negative impact for my business for myself and my clients.	55.9405	-3.28478
Visitor	I attend Church in St Ninians Road and also to shop. These will be harder for many people due to reduced parking. The Church has a hall which is used by the wider community who will suffer unless parking is improved. Small shops will lose valuable trade	55.94378	-3.28555
Resident	This will result in those residents who do not have driveways concreting gardens for parking - a particularly negative ecological effect. Loading will be seriously curtailed for businesses and access to them seriously restricted for the disabled.	55.94573	-3.28191
Resident	No parking issues here. No case to include this part of Corstorphine Bank Drive in any scheme.	55.94562	-3.2899
Resident	No parking issues here. No case to include Barony Terrace in a parking zone.	55.94513	-3.28494
Resident	Please don't restrict on Sundays as most parishioners travel to St. John's church by car. Mon-Fri need more parking spaces for daily Mass-goers as many are elderly/disabled. Could restrictions be peak hours only to allow access for 9.30am services?	55.94378	-3.28566
Resident	Effect on local businesses, restrictions on my visiting family and friends, CPZ too drastic. I've sent email expanding on my concerns.	55.94332	-3.28676
Resident	no parking issues in this street so should not be in a parking zone	55.94501	-3.27871
Resident	no parking issues in this street so should not be in a parking zone	55.94419	-3.27756
Resident	No parking issues in this street so should not be included in a parking zone.	55.94213	-3.28974
Resident	No parking issues in this street so should not be included in a parking zone	55.94121	-3.28931
Resident	no parking issues in this street so should not be included in a parking zone	55.9402	-3.27464
Resident	no parking issues in this street so should not be included in a parking zone	55.94124	-3.26648
Resident	no parking issues in Pinkhill so should not be included in a parking zone	55.94169	-3.26485
Resident	There is no recognition on the map in the leaflet that there is a sizeable medical practice here and Government offices	55.94011	-3.28919
Resident	there is no recognition on the map in the leaflet that there is a sizeable NHS dentist's practice here	55.94338	-3.28828
Resident	there is no recognition that there is a nursery school here requiring parking bays offering free parking for pick ups/drop offs	55.94249	-3.28833
Resident	there is no recognition in the map in the leaflet that there is a nursery school here requiring adequate free parking bays for drop off and pick up	55.94112	-3.28798
Resident	There are no parking issues what so ever on our street or surrounding streets. There is simply no need for this. You are creating a problem by limiting parking. How can my Mother visit without paying a fortune to park outside my house?!	55.94515	-3.28516

Visitor	Do not feel parking restrictions necessary for this Street. Access required 24/7 by family and appointed carers to support disabled family member.	55.9443	-3.27493
Resident	There is always plenty of parking space here.	55.94436	-3.29116
Resident	Faulty information - there is no medical centre here, or hospital.	55.94226	-3.27263
Resident	There is always parking space here.	55.9452	-3.29189
Resident	There is always space for cars in this street.	55.94578	-3.28983
Resident	Always free space in this street.	55.94125	-3.2896
Resident	There is always free space in this street.	55.94222	-3.29017
Resident	Ladywell Medical Centre is here but not identified. More than two disabled parking spaces may be required. Also parking for other patients.	55.94008	-3.28877
Resident	There is always parking available in this street	55.94433	-3.29246
Resident	I certainly would not like a double yellow line across my driveway. At most a single yellow, but I see no need for any yellow line across my driveway.	55.94491	-3.27733
Resident	Further restrictions (double yellow lines) needed on St Ninians Road around junction with St John's Road (this may be the plan but not shown on map).	55.94322	-3.28615
Resident	This is a difficult junction to cross and has been narrowed as part of Sfp which makes it much safer for families walking to school/playgroup/shops etc. The road should remain narrowed permanently at this section and parking removed.	55.94072	-3.2816
Resident	Further disabled parking bay(s) required near school for disabled pupils/families to use at drop off/pick up. Suggested location marked on map but Manse St/Manse Rd/Featherhall Ave/Featherhall Rd may be more appropriate.	55.94011	-3.28355
Resident	Parking should start further back from junction with Clermiston Road. This section can be difficult and dangerous to navigate as only one lane with not enough space to let cars past at junction.	55.94374	-3.2809
Resident	There are only Permit holder bays adjacent and close to our house. Where can visitors, carers and tradesmen park? Would need at least one shared use bay nearby. I feel we do not need parking restrictions in this area.	55.94498	-3.27725
Resident	I am against the proposed parking restrictions to be imposed on the Corstorphine area. I live in a cul-de-sac, Victor Park Terrace, whose Parking will be reduced under proposals. No proper consultation held with residents. Will detrimentally impact life	55.9453	-3.28859
Resident	The halving of available parking space in Gordon Loan will force residents from that street to park in Gordon Road and other surrounding streets thereby creating a problem that doesn't presently exist	55.9441	-3.27521
Resident	Where are people supposed to park if they are going to the doctors surgery or dentist? If someone is unwell they shouldn't have to walk a long way. The shops will lose a lot of trade as no one will be able to park anywhere.	55.94144	-3.28856
Resident	There have been no issues with cars parking both sides of Templeland Road. Reducing parking available here will create a new capacity problem, especially if additional overflow cars come from Victor Park Terrace and Templeland Grove.	55.94432	-3.2895
Resident	I have a toddler and expecting a baby. I'm worried how their English grandparents will come to stay/ help with childcare without extortionate parking fees just to park outside our house. We can't use visitor passes for weeks at a time.	55.94421	-3.28944
Other	THE INTRODUCTION OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS WILL MASSIVELY REDUCE THE AMENITY OF THE AREA. IF THIS GOES AHEAD WE WILL BE PUTTING IN TWO DRIVEWAYS IN THE AREA MARKED ON THE MAP SO YELLOW LINES INSTEAD ON PARKING BAYS WILL BE REQUIRED HERE.	55.94199	-3.28573
Visitor	If these proposals are introduced then on-street spaces for visitors (shared bays) are needed on the west part of Traquair Park East.	55.94045	-3.27008
Visitor	Double yellow lines are needed to provide manoeuvring space for two way traffic at this tight bend with very limited forward visibility. Providing parking bays at it, and therefore saying it is okay to park here is madness.	55.94049	-3.26949
Visitor	Double yellow lines are needed to provide manoeuvring space for two traffic near this tight bend with very limited forward visibility. Providing parking bays immediately after it, and therefore saying it is okay to park here, is madness.	55.94086	-3.26905

Visitor	These double yellow lines should be extended westwards around this blind corner in the interests of road safety and reducing conflict.	55.94092	-3.26893
Visitor	This bay maybe needs to be shortened to increase space for two way traffic at the main road junction.	55.94218	-3.26513
Visitor	This restriction maybe needs to be lengthened to increase space for two way traffic at the main road junction.	55.94225	-3.26516
Resident	Unless the Council provide large parking facilities with cheap fares into the city this proposal with will create a ghost town. Re the plan - the parking layout allows parking too close to the dangerous corner between 8 and 14 Barony Terr.	55.94493	-3.28251
Resident	The proposals will help with commuter parking and airport parking however this is at the cost of a substantial reduction in the quantity of parking in Oswald Terrace/Featherhall Road and Manse St. in the evening both sides of these streets are full parked	55.94104	-3.28664
Resident	We are just outside the proposed zone. We already get commuter parking. Immediately after your proposals are effected we will be flooded with commuter parking. Please either abandon your proposals or include our street (Hillview Drive). Thank you .	55.94558	-3.29174
Resident	Our home is .5miles from St Johns Road. Lived here 19 years never any parking issues. We have no drive so will be charged to park outside house. Unacceptable. Proposal total over reaction when no problem parking.	55.93815	-3.28615
Resident	Parking restrictions are not required. There is no issue with parking in this area. The proposals would adversely affect me and make it very difficult for visitors, careers and tradesmen. I will require a disabled space outside if this goes ahead.	55.94305	-3.27371
Resident	I do not like that this misses Hillview Drive. The bottom end of the road is already terrible for parking and action needs to be taken. These plans will make it a lot worse. Can cpz please be introduced for us too?	55.9455	-3.29161
Resident	There is sufficient space for residents Problem only arises as people use our street as a park and ride. Introducing restrictions at peak times would solve this. I would like better provision for shortstay parking in the High Street to help business.	55.94333	-3.27792
Other	Could the area specified be allocated as disabled parking spaces? This is the disabled entrance to St Anne's Church and is also used by elderly community groups.	55.94222	-3.273
Other	Need to have parking spaces in St Ninian's Road and around for people visiting churches for worship and community services and funerals. Most properties have off-road parking.	55.94374	-3.28514
Resident	Please please add Hillview Drive to the proposals. We already suffer from lots of non resident all-day parking on Hillview Drive. We are closer to St Johns and Drum Brae buses than some streets being helped. We will suffer further with these plans. HELP	55.9453	-3.29152
Resident	No disabled parking. Church users who attend daily services will now be required to pay to attend church. Will it be adequately patrolled to catch dodgers?	55.94378	-3.28566
Resident	This area designated for residents parking is right in front of a flat window with no pavement for car occupiers to exit on to, it's a landscaped area. This also allows for parking in front of a Bin Store which has no drop down kerb area.	55.94025	-3.26732
Resident	Why should we pay to park in our street, and you can't say how much it will cost? If it is minimal/yr, then ok. The other main issue is the volume and speed of traffic	55.94168	-3.28463
Resident	I don't think the random distribution of Yellow Lines, Shared-Use and Permit Holder Bays on Kaimes Road - between Gordon Road and Old Kirk Road - reflects the requirements of the residents.	55.94364	-3.27361
Resident	There are no issues with residents parking. Parking controls will adversely affect us as residents, don't put them in.	55.94345	-3.27854
Visitor	This makes it very difficult for visitors. Unnecessary and massively inconvenient and repeated across a number of areas including Saughtonhall.	55.94091	-3.27404
Business owner	See email of 14/3. Not enough shared use bays on Victor Park Terrace. Many residents take cars to work (incl vans) - make spaces during day available for NHS dentist with 17,500 patients incl. 4800 over 65 & 1980 over 80yrs who can't use active travel.	55.9433	-3.28809
Business owner	See email of 14/3. Please also make available some free short stay parking (e.g. 60 minutes) for visitors to NHS dentist with 17,500 patients who come from all over Lothians & Fife & 4800 are elderly (1980 are 80+) so active travel not possible.	55.94332	-3.28789
Resident	I live close to the junction with Templeland Road where the proposed parking control zone ends. I am concerned that non-resident drivers will simply move their vehicles out of the parking zone into adjoining roads like Hillview Drive.	55.94593	-3.29152

Resident	I'm not in favour of changes being proposed to this area. Making residential into permit is only going to limit the already limited spaces for residents from both sides to the street, I don't see this as a viable idea	55.94424	-3.28808
Resident	I don't agree with changes to this area, we have a very limited street with so many residents and to limit this with permits is only going to hinder all current residents	55.94424	-3.28808
Commuter	I need to travel to work in this area as do my colleagues but now will not be able to park within a decent distance to get to work? It's ridiculous and will effect the business of the pharmacy in which I work	55.94292	-3.28788
Other	Insufficient parking for the pharmacy	55.94275	-3.28816
Resident	Please leave Corstorphine parking as it is. We already have a lot of road works and congestion as it is. We don't need to encourage more people to be parking on our street.	55.94394	-3.28798
Other	This needs to be free parking for the pharmacy	55.94256	-3.2882
Other	Insufficient free parking for the GP practice	55.94087	-3.28808
Other	Normally 2 cars are parked here for the home owners. Absolutely no need for yellow lines here	55.94271	-3.28827
Other	Is this still a registered disabled space?	55.94268	-3.28813
Resident	As resident at no. 15 Victor Park Terrace, life would become very difficult with a double yellow line outside my front gate. I have family with young children who require to visit for childcare and this will cause significant problems.	55.94524	-3.28845
Other	This proposal will badly hit businesses in Corstorphine. There is insufficient shared use bays to support the number of customers who visit the hairdressers, pharmacies, cafes etc. It is completely unreasonable to expect everyone to be able to walk or cycle	55.94227	-3.28494
Visitor	I have a parent living in this street and hugely concerned this proposal will affect his ability to park near his home. This proposal is not in the best interests of residents at all!	55.94524	-3.28845
Resident	The proposals on the number of permit bays are insufficient for the area, given the number of households. How do the proposals take account of the number of households with cars. The yellow line on St Ninians Road will push businesses to park here	55.94501	-3.28757
Business owner	I have emailed a separate objection. Insufficient parking for the pharmacy and no provision for pharmacy staff	55.94288	-3.28819
Business owner	Insufficient shared use parking for patients visiting the pharmacy to access services such as flu and Covid jabs	55.9423	-3.28846
Business owner	No parking provision for staff or locum pharmacists	55.94256	-3.28821
Business owner	There is sufficient parking for both residents and shoppers at the moment	55.94226	-3.28893
Commuter	I work in Corstorphine and take my car as it's too far to walk (chronic knee condition). I can't even manage the 300m walk to the bus stop	55.93994	-3.28921
Visitor	Going to be difficult to access GP surgery and pharmacy as I have a health condition and can't walk long distances need more free parking	55.94009	-3.29001
Visitor	I would like to object to the whole concept of CPZ	55.94223	-3.28296
Resident	I live in Craigmount Loan but Ladywell West is my GP surgery. Most times that I am unwell enough to need to attend the GP, I will need to drive. I'm very concerned about removal of free parking here, especially as GP appointments often run late	55.94003	-3.28894
Resident	Streets like Barony Terrace used for locals accessing local shops, optician so may need to shop elsewhere. Not busy with cars so seems just like a money-making scheme	55.94504	-3.28345
Business owner	No provision for staff parking who need to use their car for patient visits	55.94272	-3.28833
Visitor	Insufficient shared use parking so will not be using the cafes in Corstorphine for meeting friends for lunch as too stressful to find parking	55.94272	-3.28119
Resident	The introduction of parking zone charges will be detrimental to a lot of individuals and businesses within the area.	55.94473	-3.28829
Resident	DOUBLE YELLOWS ON THIS SECTION OF THE STREET WILL TAKE AWAY EVEN MORE PARKING SPACES FOR RESIDENTS	55.94488	-3.2884
Resident	Wife is disabled. Necessary vehicular access is increasingly restricted.	55.9423	-3.28731

Resident	putting paid parking on this street will make this cul de sac even busier than normal and the go to street for all none permit parking in Corstorphine	55.94431	-3.28823
Resident	.cul de sac with houses on one side and flats on the other side, putting in shared use bays reduces parking for residents. There are a lot of families and older people on the street depending on their cars	55.94427	-3.28816
Resident	double yellow lines reducing already tight parking for residents	55.94508	-3.28852
Resident	The traffic volume is very different to when it was measured in 2018, I feel that a reassessment would be fair in 2022 to gain an accurate measure of traffic volume to determine if these changes were needed.	55.94227	-3.27796
Resident	there are no difficulties with parking in this area	55.94484	-3.29247
Resident	This is NOT work in this street. There is already not enough parking in this street what with the dental surgery and connecting to St Johns Road. There are houses and flats in this street so we have to sometimes park in surrounding streets as it it.	55.94425	-3.28838
Resident	no difficulties with parking in this area, I have been parking here for more than 20 years	55.94497	-3.29313
Resident	Templeland Road is quite wide from Templeland Grove up the hill. There is currently ample parking on both sides of the road. The plan is to limit parking to one side of the road, which will reduce the amount of available parking unnecessarily	55.94421	-3.28942
Resident	limited parking for those visiting shops having an economic impact on our area	55.94364	-3.29237
Resident	This will make parking even worse in this street. Not better! Have anyone even been here to understand the problems will already face.	55.94427	-3.28816
Resident	Parking in Corstorphine isn't a problem, we've lived here more than 20 years without difficulty. There are less commuters due to culture of working from home and it is wrong to base decisions on information from 2018/2019.	55.94133	-3.28639
Resident	Can the single yellow line along the whole side of Templeland Road be changed to more parking bays? Cars currently park on both sides of the road without a problem.	55.94438	-3.28951
Resident	limited parking for those attending funerals, classes and local businesses	55.94379	-3.28532
Resident	This is insane for this street. This will make matter worse!	55.94428	-3.28827
Business owner	limited parking will have an impact on our small business	55.94366	-3.29434
Resident	This will make our life's even more difficult than it is already with regards to parking.	55.94427	-3.2883
Resident	I own my flat and park on street, which has more dwellings than available parking. Proposals will force me to pay but still leave me without an available parking space on my home street.	55.94358	-3.28674
Resident	I own my flat and park on street, which has more dwellings than available parking. Proposals will force me to pay but still leave me without an available parking space on my home street	55.94407	-3.28809
Resident	Against the proposal	55.94407	-3.28809
Resident	Please ensure no parking is allowed in the turning circle.	55.94236	-3.28765
Business owner	Double yellow line takes up an extra parking space	55.94272	-3.28814
Resident	Penalises residents who may not be able to afford and people visiting community. Please make sure turning circle on Featherhall Grove is parking free as problems with ambulance access/mortuary van recently for neighbour.	55.94236	-3.28765
Business owner	Too many residents only parking spaces. Need parking for pharmacy staff to enable them to do house visits and deliveries	55.94219	-3.28936
Visitor	Completely against any CPZ proposal. It will kill the local businesses	55.94172	-3.28633
Business owner	CEC have given no indication of residents only parking times	55.94285	-3.28817
Resident	Just making other street busy	55.94194	-3.28618
Resident	On busy days at the zoo, both sides of Pinkhill have parked cars and its impossiblke to have 2 way traffic. Road markings should be staggered either side of the road to enable staggered parking and cars to easily move in both directions.	55.94177	-3.26486
Resident	This no longer a hall, but residential housing(4)	55.94333	-3.27645
Resident	Car space unnecessarily removed from in front of no 9 Forrester Rd	55.94389	-3.28237
Resident	There are already speed issue on this junction. Cars barrel up and down and the increased visibility at this junction will just mean drivers even less likely to slow down needs speed control measures	55.94388	-3.28234

Resident	There has to be a different way to stop non-residents parking around Corstorphine - give residents the badge FOR FREE and penalise others for parking here . Personally I don't think its a problem but this way - you would know and residents would not pay	55.94457	-3.29683
Resident	Lack of parking bays outside Inglis Vet inconveniences both customers and a local business	55.94333	-3.28777
Resident	Significant lack of provision for visitor parking on Traquair Park West where parking controls are unnecessary anyway because most of those parking are residents	55.94037	-3.27653
Resident	Significantly reduced parking around doctor's surgery severely inconveniences less mobile patients who require vehicle access	55.9409	-3.28796
Resident	This has been my home address for over 30 years and I have never experienced any parking difficulties which could possibly justify the introduction of such a scheme.	55.94045	-3.27598
Resident	This is a private lane providing owner access to the rear of the adjacent properties in Traquair Park West. There is a servitude right of access to the electricity sub-station, granted to the provider authority.	55.9407	-3.27578
Resident	Having spent time talking to my neighbours - we find the proposals unsatisfactory, while there are issues (particularly from one of the local garages) with regards to parking. This proposal will impact residents massively, we don't want it!	55.94463	-3.28611
Resident	I do not support this proposal. There are no issues with parking in this area. These restrictions will just result in residence paying for parking permits that were not needed in the first place.	55.93854	-3.29275
Resident	Many unnecessary zones created that are currently not a problem. Broomhall Drive not needed - will prevent people accessing the local shop and post box. Will push what parking there is in Featherhall Drive etc further out and impact residential streets	55.93768	-3.28889
Visitor	I live semi locally. I am a patient at Ladywell East Medical Centre, with chronic health issues and two children. I'm extremely concerned at the lack of parking (even in a pay and display) near ladywell east. How can this be changed	55.94088	-3.2879
Resident	These measures will make it extremely difficult to give my elderly parents a lift to wherever they need to go in Corstorphine. Any commuter parking will simply move to streets outwith these zones so the problem won't be solved, only moved elsewhere.	55.94227	-3.27796
Resident	The proposed project adds street marking and furniture, paid for by resident permits. There is no parking problem, indeed St John's road has paid parking that is used sparingly, like the business carparks. This is totally unnecessary overhead.	55.94348	-3.2765
Commuter	Ladywell Road already has double yellow lines and cycle lanes why? How shameful to stop elderly and handicapped people who park in the road and attend not one but the two gp surgeries. How shameful of you to do this.	55.94003	-3.28894
Resident	We have no objections to the introduction of permits in and around Corstorphine but I don't understand why our cul de sac on Templeland Grove needs to be double yellowed. In the proposals there are only a couple of permit bays in the cul de sac.	55.94399	-3.28993
Resident	This is an extremely unnecessary parking scheme in a residential area that does not have problems with parking. This project is purely income generating for the council and does not benefit residents.	55.94332	-3.27374
Resident	Double yellow lines and limited parking bays severely restricts parking options for people reliant on car use eg disabled and elderly who are unable to walk any distance and may struggle to use public transport.	55.93999	-3.28921
Resident	Upper corstorphine bank drive is often used for parking by local residents in order to access shops on St John's Rd. I am completely against restrictions in this area.	55.94548	-3.29002
Resident	Parking is nearly impossible some days, lots of cars from the garages make it just a nightmare. I've mobility issues and it means I didn't want to go out some days	55.94468	-3.28606
Resident	Dependent on cost of permit	55.94378	-3.28278
Resident	I'm generally in favour however permit bays as opposed to shared bays along the front of houses on Maybank Villas would be good (only shared bays down by the dental surgery). Due to amount of houses / flats and no retail on street	55.94408	-3.28813
Resident	I think there needs to be a better balance of pay parking and resident parking.	55.94021	-3.28019
Resident	I am in favour of much of what is suggested. Much of the parking in streets are non residents, many of whom also reside in Corstorphine and may stop using their cars for local transport if they are now dissuaded.	55.94104	-3.28996
Resident	It will deter 'rogue' parking.	55.94507	-3.28002
Resident	It will deter rogue parking.	55.94508	-3.27998

Resident	Long overdue, area plagued by long term commuter parking, city centre shoppers and airport users. Consider extending double yellows where marked, eliminates parked cars encroaching on dropped kerb for wheel chair / pram users.	55.9439	-3.2827
Resident	Please make sure this goes ahead	55.94098	-3.29025
Business owner	I hate cars, so I am all for this clampdown on parking.	55.94313	-3.28947
Resident	Can I ask that you consider more parking for shoppers with a limit of one hour and more shared bays? and consider turning the green space next to Ladywell east into additional parking, as I believe this was being considered before?	55.94099	-3.29059
Resident	Area should be extended north as it will just push the parking elsewhere	55.94295	-3.28792
Resident	Residents permit parking should be throughout the whole Corstorphine Conservation area. The area South of St. John's Rd as far as Dovecot Road. Where existing double yellow lines exist, these must be enforced especially at school times.	55.9416	-3.28681
Resident	Please do not changes these Double yellow lines to a Parking Bay	55.94407	-3.28973
Resident	Whilst my house is just outside the zone, I believe non-residential parking will be displaced into streets like Hillview Terrace by the scheme. Consider extending the scheme to Hillview Terrace, where majority of houses have off street parking.	55.9464	-3.28979
Resident	I live in this street and extremely happy with restrictions proposed except for yellow lines outside numbers 9 and 10. There's ample space for a car outside each so reckon it would be OK for these to be permitted.	55.94121	-3.2802
Visitor	Proposals are necessary, and long overdue, to improve road safety and provide manoeuvring space at this very tight corner.	55.94136	-3.26493
Visitor	Long overdue to provide space for traffic entering this road to be able to pass traffic waiting to exit on to the main road.	55.94217	-3.26501
Visitor	Long overdue to provide space for traffic entering this road to be able to pass traffic waiting to exit on to the main road	55.94207	-3.26496
Resident	30 minutes free parking bays needed here for drop off/pick up for nursery school close by	55.94238	-3.28843
Resident	30 minutes free parking bays needed here for drop off/pick up for nursery school close by	55.94236	-3.28866
Resident	30 minutes free parking bays needed here for drop off/pick up for nursery school close by	55.94231	-3.28839
Resident	30 minutes free parking bays needed here for drop off/pick up for nursery school close by	55.94207	-3.28519
Resident	Double yellow line on Forrester Rd should be extended further back from Clermiston Rd. With parking on both sides of the road near the junction, the junction gets easily clogged with cars from Clermiston Rd being unable to enter Forrester Rd.	55.94366	-3.28081
Resident	All the addresses at the eastern end of Barony Terrace (low numbers) have at least one driveway. This area should therefore primarily be allocated as shared spaces and with perhaps some 'all-day business employee spaces' allocated to local businesses.	55.94449	-3.28253
Resident	I fully support the introduction of double yellow lines at all the corners of Forrester Rd / St. Ninians Rd / Barony Terrace junction.	55.94411	-3.28268
Resident	st johns terrace is generally completely full with residents vehicles. the entire street should become resident parking only with no pay and display option.	55.9419	-3.27676
Resident	It should be extended. I live in Craigs Avenue all the cats that used to park in the area you intend to zone will just move up and cause more problems for the resident on the other side of Drum Brae!	55.94293	-3.2964
Other	I own a flat in the Pinkhill area and lease it out to professional tenants through a management agency. I am not opposed to permit parking but my concern is whether there will be enough spaces to cater for the number of flat owners in the complex.	55.94015	-3.26735
Resident	Zero detail here of how much these residents parking permits will cost or the hours of operation. How can you comment properly if that very important detail is not available?	55.94139	-3.28787
Visitor	Hi wondering why the end near the houses at templeland Grove is meant to double yellow lined? People park there all the time at the moment and it's easy enough to get turned. Especially when the yellow lines are put at the top of the road/cul de sac	55.94392	-3.28972
Resident	It is unclear for the image what the situation directly outside my house will be (in cul de sac shades in red) the rest of featherhall crescent south has permit bays will this cul de sac park of the street have the same ? The colour coding does not match	55.94078	-3.29072
Resident	Bit of a difficult one, in general I'm in agreement with the logic of the proposals. I have an issue about the border at the shops at Broomhall Rd, it's going to push more cars onto the end of the road for parking and make it more congested.	55.93803	-3.29177

Resident	Can mews permit holders park in other mews streets? Does a mews permit allow parking in a permit slot in Corstorphine. More residents cars than spaces so need to park in Belgrave Rd. Map difficult to understand	55.94149	-3.27299
Resident	Will the existing red route/restrictions continue to apply along St John's Rd ?	55.94185	-3.27375
Resident	On Saughton Road North opposite No1 Sycamore Terr the double yellows end approx 10ft from the junction of Dovecot Road... or at least the Map ends there. What are the plans for this Junction and indeed the entirety of Dovecot Road (Not on Map)	55.93925	-3.28078
Resident	More detailed information needs to be given - for example 1) can you park across your own driveway without a permit, 2) can residents apply for visitors' permits even if they do not have a residents' parking permit	55.94482	-3.27867
Resident	The plan indicates a single yellow line outside our house. We have used up most of the front garden to create one of road parking space but also use the location directly outside for our second car or for visitors etc. Does this mean that we will not be	55.94258	-3.28822
Resident	Cars frequently park on the double yellow lines at the top of Orchardfield Ave. This is v dangerous for pedestrians as the pavements are narrow & cars are driving on the wrong side of the road to avoid the parked cars - mounting p/ments. Red lines?	55.94045	-3.28381
Resident	rev@davidmcarthy.org.uk for replies, please. What are the costs of the implementation, maintenance and enforcement of these plans? What is the projected income from them and how will it be used? What will the costs be for residents' permits?.	55.94282	-3.27492
Resident	If it goes ahead please make some attempt to limit the number of notices/signs put up. Look at Orchard Road as a comparator to housing type and see the ridiculous number of signs that have been put up.	55.94091	-3.26819
Resident	I am the owner at 18 Kaimes Road. You don't have the correct information about drop-down kerbs outside my house. Allocation of permit bays outside of our house is incorrect. There should be an additional permit bay outside my house between 18 and 20	55.94435	-3.27363
Resident	Why is there a gap in the yellow line and no permit parking outside the front of no11 Corstorphine Bank Avenue?	55.94463	-3.29247
Resident	No problem with resident parking here at present. Restrictions may not be needed unless parking displaced from elsewhere.	55.94571	-3.28852
Resident	Parking at present appears mainly occupied by garages/vehicle servicing. Shared use bays may not be needed if restrictions prevent use of the on street parking by the garages in the industrial units.	55.94417	-3.28639
Resident	Please clarify residents free to park in grey private road areas	55.94148	-3.27707
Resident	My fear for Corstorphine Bank Drive is that it is currently 20mph but like the whole area cars still speed through and use it as a rat run. Removing parked cars removes natural obstructions which slow traffic down.	55.94437	-3.29094
Resident	The interactive map is not easy to use on my chromebook, the pin doesn't accurately describe the restrictions making it difficult to give a meaningful comment. These 'brown' shared use bays are used by residents so should be permit holders only	55.94229	-3.27463
Resident	I would be in favour of the proposal IF parking spaces were only allotted to residents of the street but with other residents of the zone being allowed to use shared spaces	55.94299	-3.27499
Resident	Some things I worry about .. I am elderly ,what are parking arrangements for carers etc. If I buy a permit will others in Corstorphine be eligible to use the space outside my house .	55.95084	-3.27855
Resident	There seem to be many places where there is space for a parking bay but it is proposed to have single yellow lines. More of the single yellow line space should be given over to parking bays (resident or shared use)	55.94458	-3.28545
Resident	I am concerned that the parking restrictions will make the businesses along Ninians Road not viable and this source of local employment will be lost from the area	55.94416	-3.28651
Resident	Removing parking from Clermiston road will speed up cars on this road particularly those travelling down hill. If this road could be effectively narrowed by allowing parking spill over from the side streets then this would passively slow down speeding car	55.94451	-3.28077
Resident	There needs to be some sort of parking restriction at the s end of St Ninian's Rad. Currently parked cars on both sides cause blockages when cars turn from St Johns road into this road when another car is trying to exit onto St Johns road	55.94319	-3.28625
Resident	Removal of parking on High Street effectively widens the road which will lead to higher car speeds, if parking is to be removed then the road needs to be narrowed	55.94037	-3.28473
Resident	There is plenty of space for parking bays here, it should not be a single yellow line. it should be shared or residents bays.	55.9447	-3.28735

Resident	There is plenty of space for parking bays here, it should not be a single yellow line. it should be shared or residents bays.	55.9447	-3.28687
Resident	There is plenty of space for parking bays here, it should not be a single yellow line. it should be shared or residents bays.	55.94494	-3.28315
Resident	There is plenty of space for parking bays here, it should not be a single yellow line. it should be shared or residents bays.	55.94548	-3.28768
Resident	There is plenty of space for parking bays here, it should not be a single yellow line. it should be shared or residents bays.	55.94571	-3.28897
Resident	There is plenty of space for parking bays here, it should not be a single yellow line. it should be shared or residents bays.	55.94381	-3.28548
Resident	There is plenty of space for parking bays here, it should not be a single yellow line. it should be shared or residents bays.	55.94386	-3.28593
Resident	There is plenty of space for parking bays here, it should not be a single yellow line. it should be shared or residents bays.	55.94377	-3.28502

3. EASTER ROAD


3.1.1 72 people dropped 108 pins on the interactive map

3.1.2 Of those, 104 had comments and four were left blank

3.1.3 23 comments are positive

3.1.4 74 comments are negative

3.1.5 11 comments are neutral



3.1.6 The most common theme of comments was with regards to there being a reduction in parking availability.

3.1.7 The next most common theme was alternate suggestions to what was proposed.

I am a...	Comment	X	Y
Business owner	Our buildings have a high number of disabled staff and visitors. We would like to ask for for designated accessible bays and a drop off point near the street entrance between 53 and 57 Albion Road along with a dropped kerb at the entrance.	55.96157	-3.16747
Business owner	I am a commercial landlord providing office space in Albion Road since 1973. Your proposal will have a significantly negative impact on my tenants if they have to pay for parking. The interests of people who work in the area should not be ignored.	55.96085	-3.1664
Commuter	I would like to see the double yellow lines extended further along this bend. Parked cars here narrow the road and make it dangerous.	55.96251	-3.16641
Other	Parking here can be challenging with people leaving their cars to then travel further into the city for work.	55.96389	-3.16718
Other	There are over 200 people working in 23 organisations in the Norton Park Centre many of whom and their visitors use onstreet parking - can the bays closest to the Norton park centre be join permit/pay ones?	55.96114	-3.16666
Resident	I cant afford this extra expense.	55.96673	-3.16924
Resident	This is absolutely DISGUSTING. I'm a resident and I own my flat + I pay a company to monitor who can park in my own street. Since we already get the drunks from the stadium (fouling where the bin sheds are!) W no council control, NO TO PUBLIC PARKING!	55.9666	-3.16867
Resident	Broadly supportive, if operating Mon-Fri 08.30-17.30. Or shorter periods during the working week. Main issue is parking during working hours.	55.96188	-3.16854

Resident	This is creating a situation rather than resolving one, we've never noticed any issues with parking around here, there is adequate parking without any obstructions. Introducing controlled zones would be a serious challenge and financial burden.	55.96236	-3.16349
Resident	This creates a strange setup in the area where the residents of Urban Eden would see themselves living in a free open to the public parking "enclave" while surrounded by CPZ. This is not great for residents who pay factor fees for this road.	55.9596	-3.16536
Resident	Conversion of a turning area into permit parking will make Hawkhill close a dangerous and impractical roadway - Especially worrying for emergency services being unable to turn (along with deliveries/vans/etc.)	55.96215	-3.16252
Resident	I am a resident of Hawkhill Close in a rented flat. The use of the residents underground parking is not available to me as the landlord did not give us access to the underground parking facility. Landlords should provide access to residents parking.	55.96252	-3.16414
Resident	Double yellow lines are long overdue at intersection of Lochend Butterfly Way and Albion Road as this junction has long suffered from consistent parking on the corners and over the dropped kerbs.	55.9602	-3.16408
Resident	DYL are required where Albion Terrace meets Albion Road as these corners and the dropped kerbs are consistently parked over, making it hard to see when crossing or turning the corner by bike.	55.96123	-3.16727
Resident	This is ridiculous and once again punishes the less well off. Those of us who cannot afford new, electric or low emission vehicles of course will be charged more. It also causes huge difficulties for guests and visitors wishing to stay more than 90 mins,	55.965	-3.16893
Resident	The only reason I don't like this is because there will be a charge to buy a permit. In my opinion these should be free to residents as we already pay council tax and road tax. Get non residents to pay and I'm fine with it!	55.96528	-3.16916
Resident	I do not support controlled parking in the area. It will cause more problems.	55.95836	-3.17173
Resident	The car park at West Kilnacre was built for the use of residents of the flats at Cityscape, and I don't see why some residents will have to pay for a permit to park in their own car park and others will not.	55.96176	-3.16322
Resident	In addition to adding CPZ I would ask the council look at making the S section as marked on the map double yellows on both sides. A very narrow section that's had near misses due to obstruction by parked cars	55.96061	-3.16517
Resident	This S junction can be quite difficult sometimes when full of cars - particularly on match days. Plenty of near misses have occurred	55.96251	-3.16625
Resident	This would definitely benefit from double yellows as it's quite narrow	55.96078	-3.16341
Resident	This section is quite often congested and would benefit from double yellow lines	55.96035	-3.16381
Resident	Proposal will not work for Lawrie Reilly Place, should be excluded from edge. A mix of unadopted & controlled parking would put pressure on side roads & underground. Parking is mostly outside of each house & used exclusively (and paid for) by the owner.	55.96021	-3.16702
Resident	This is a private road and should not be marked for permit parking.	55.9666	-3.16868
Resident	There is absolutely no need to implement this. At present there are no obstructions or traffic problems. It seems to be a money making exercise. Not all residents have a dedicated parking space so some park on the street without issue.	55.96144	-3.16919
Resident	Thorntreeside is private property with private parking. Not the councils	55.96661	-3.16874
Resident	There is no parking issue in our area, the only people who park there are residents, this is another way of the council raising indirect taxes through parking permits. Very disappointing but not unsurprising for Edinburgh Council.	55.95925	-3.16562
Resident	All Easter Road should have marked bays where there is nose to kerb parking, to eliminate poor parking that reduces the number of available spaces. Spaces should be controlled but even if they're not, they need bays clearly marked.	55.96609	-3.16993
Resident	Clarification needed about permit holder spaces. At least one parking space must be guaranteed for each household living in the blocks. First come first serve is unfair for owners/residents. Abandoned cars need to be cleared.	55.96167	-3.1636
Resident	We are currently parking at the grey area. Now it proposes parking control right next to our private parking area. The consultation meeting did not bring any clarity regarding how to manage this controlled/noncontrolled issue. We need solutions	55.96161	-3.16371
Resident	There is no need for permit bays within Hawkhill close. There is always on street parking available on Hawkhill avenue and residents also have access to a private car park.	55.96264	-3.16401
Resident	West Kilnacre is only half highlighted on your map. Having half as permits is not fair on residents who have to pay for a permit when my neighbour does not	55.96149	-3.16352
Resident	I feel some more spaces need to go on Lochend Butterfly Way. Buildings 22 and 4 only have on-street parking and more may be needed for overnight	55.96125	-3.1627
Resident	Will anything be done abandoned cars in the spaces? There are a few cars that haven't moved in very long time and are taking up valuable spaces	55.96178	-3.16356

Resident	West Kilnacre will become a problem area as the grey area is free to use. Anarchy.	55.96142	-3.16352
Resident	More spaces needed to residents of Lochend Butterfly Way. How are we supposed to park anywhere near our flat when the spaces are full?	55.96145	-3.16246
Resident	The parking places in Thorntreeside are private and are in the deeds to our property. The road only is public and owned by the council.	55.96621	-3.1683
Resident	All of the spaces private not a few, in Deeds, we pay maintenance, insurance and just paid a £500 Street light repair bill, have parking management already. If issues let us know as we will take legal advice as 12 years bills paid for carpark .	55.96615	-3.16824
Resident	Thorntreeside has a residential car park and we are paying for it to be checked.	55.9666	-3.16867
Resident	Thorntreeside is a private land	55.96658	-3.16856
Resident	The section on the corner should be double yellows. People always park too close to the junction causing countless near-collisions with vehicles coming the other way. I don't think these streets need permit holder bays but some double yellows are welcome	55.96025	-3.16425
Resident	I live in Thorntreeside and don't understand why it has not all been zoned as private parking. We currently have private parking permits, and recently paid for our own street light repairs.	55.96672	-3.16886
Resident	I support the parking measures for non residents, however specifically where I marked on the map I encourage the council to look into also adding double yellow lines to restrict parking as there is difficulty seeing oncoming traffic here.	55.96058	-3.16513
Resident	This corner can be quite dangerous to drive around so I full support the addition of double yellow lines to have clear vision when navigating	55.96225	-3.16654
Resident	Another junction that would benefit from double yellows. I'd also ask that clearer markings are provided for stopping as well as this tends to cause non locals confusion/near misses	55.96189	-3.16769
Resident	I feel that this first section should be double yellows and not mixed used. There is quite a lot of traffic that results in stand offs and horns quite often as it's so narrow	55.96013	-3.1638
Resident	This section of road has been dangerous for quite some time. Having clear access on both sides would make thing way better	55.96074	-3.16321
Resident	This corner can be difficult to navigate when full of cars. Would benefit from double yellows	55.96128	-3.16721
Resident	The addition of a double yellow line at the end of Albion Terrace should be 2 spots permit parking. Safe turning is achieved using the drive between 7/9, 3. The plan creates an unsafe foot traffic bottleneck on game days. Parked cars here prevents this.	55.9609	-3.1682
Resident	We see no issue with the parking situation around our area. Like many of our neighbours, we moved to this area because there is ample parking & it's free. This was a major contributing factor in our decision to move to the area.	55.96238	-3.16335
Resident	There is no reason to justify the double yellow, or any controlled zones in our street (Hakwhill Close), residents respect each other and access and introducing these measures will have a severe negative impact on our living arrangements.	55.96226	-3.16317
Resident	Lawrie Reilly Place / that is private housing there. It should be only for residents but not CPZ.	55.95926	-3.16558
Resident	I can't see albert street included here, we, the residents, can't get our cars parked for commuters parking during the day and weekends, also people dropping off cars for repair and leaving them there for day's, weeks and even months,	55.96193	-3.17741
Resident	Lawrie Reilly Place already has an issue with non-resident parking, for example during matches. This will push cars to our non-permit area and prevent residents parking. Spaces are already 50% fewer than needed..	55.96038	-3.16753
Resident	How can Lawrie Reilly Place be included when the council do not own the road? We pay factoring fees for the upkeep of the estate, which includes the road and parking bays.	55.95962	-3.16648
Resident	I have lived here for 10 years. I have never had a problem with parking outside my flat, day or night. Even when there's a game on at Easter Rd. There has never been any pressure on parking for residents in the Easter Rd area you propose.	55.96181	-3.16345
Resident	I am fortunate to live at the end of Drum Terrace where I have an allocated space. But the park and ride situation is problematic in this whole area. While restrictions on the Terrace might impact on residents in numbers 16 and 18, I still support it.	55.96237	-3.17036
Resident	This car park is currently private parking (horizon) will this change or remain the same?	55.96523	-3.16795
Resident	At this end of Easter Road, I believe the majority of parking is residents. There are very few businesses or attractions, so I do not think this will improve the situation	55.96702	-3.16932
Resident	Thorntreeside is a community of 89 apartments in private development, we've had parking issues but we manage them. This will not resolve parking issues it will create them. I've lived on Easter Road for 30 years, so understand parking situation well	55.96625	-3.16833
Resident	The private spaces at the front of Thorntreeside are generally free during the day, and used by taxi drivers, delivery drivers (including PO) and utility vehicles when they provide services to this area of Easter Road. Where will they park now ?	55.96687	-3.16894

Resident	Is this an existing disabled space as i have no knowledge of one here. My wife has applied for one hopefully just down from here.	55.96618	-3.16986
Resident	This whole area and surrounding streets are bad for out of town parkers taking up spaces.	55.96361	-3.16836
Resident	Use of double yellow lines in Albion Terrace is not necessary not only will it reduce the number of potential spaces but it is designed to create a turning space this is already available using our neighbours driveway.	55.9609	-3.16812
Resident	There is absolutely no issue with parking near my flat. In fact, there is an abundance of spaces. If all residence have permits this won't mitigate any issue if there ever was one as there will still be the same number of people looking to parking	55.96171	-3.16298
Resident	There is no need for a CPZ as there aren't any parking issues apart from the days when there is a Hibs game which is about once per fortnight. It is likely to create parking issues in streets where there isn't a CPZ. It's money making in a poor area.	55.967	-3.16942
Resident	Less parking more work in the community and people lives	55.96121	-3.16268
Resident	Have lived in this development for 12 years and my title deeds state that we have designated parking. There are 89 flats in this development and 79 spaces, your proposal for our car park will make parking for us even more difficult.	55.96672	-3.16886
Resident	As a resident/homeowner, I am concerned about the proposal to make part of West Kilnacre permit-holder/shared-use only. There is currently no shortage of places. Will cause people to flock to spaces on the small area of private road outside our property.	55.96147	-3.16356
Resident	Parking in the area can be a mess, I think this should hopefully help.	55.96277	-3.16402
Resident	The parking at Thorntreeside is private and is controlled already with a paid permit parking through Horizon parking. There are no parking problems here either.	55.96605	-3.16801
Resident	Not useful or helpful in any way or form. Will consequently cause more disruption than there is now for current residents, as from the proposed there is not enough for all residents cars	55.96225	-3.16315
Resident	Proposal is unsuitable for Lawrie Reilly Place. A CPZ must include 'no uncontrolled parking' however LRP has unadopted side roads and free underground parking. Residents pay £180 a year for maintenance incl parking. Deeds limit to 1 car per house not 2.	55.95982	-3.16691
Resident	Moved Easter Road 2004, I'm blind, don't drive & have blue badge, which I don't often use, as can generally find parking on development. We maintain carpark & streetlights. I'm concerned this will start to cause parking friction which doesn't exist now	55.96625	-3.16833
Resident	Double yellow lines here would greatly improve visibility	55.96018	-3.16416
Resident	Although I agree that Lawrie Reilly Place should not be permit parking, I am concerned that other nearby residents will end up parking in our spaces, I'm not sure the best way to prevent this.	55.95936	-3.16541
Resident	I only see one car club space in the area, it may be beneficial to have more	55.96109	-3.16271
Resident	This is residential area with the only pressure caused by lazy parking by football fans from the stadium, instead of punishing residents patrol further with the car towing on match days and not just outside the stadium. Also paint some double yellows on	55.96013	-3.1642
Resident	This is a new build residential development. It is only residents that park in this area. We do want parking meters nor do we want to have to purchase permits. There is no need for this street.	55.96	-3.16707
Resident	This area is visitor's parking for the Hawkhill Close residents. By restricting the whole street with double yellow lines, nobody will be able to visit. This area should remain as free for parking for all visitors.	55.96248	-3.16402
Resident	This area is used as turning point for vehicles, including bin lorries. This should not change as it will cause disruption.	55.96213	-3.16236
Resident	I am extremely unhappy about this plan. I don't agree in charging people for permits to park outside their own home. It's a disgrace.	55.96129	-3.16751
Resident	I own a flat in block 4, Thorntreeside and the parking spaces are on private land and are included in our deeds. We currently pay to have the spaces maintained privately and have our own parking permits in place. It is not council owned.	55.96623	-3.16823
Resident	I currently have access to up to two private parking spaces (one for visitors). There is no problem getting a spaces as the car park is restricted to residents. A council permit would open it to non residents so would create a problem for residents!	55.96611	-3.16776
Resident	I currently have access to up to two private parking spaces (one for visitors). There is no problem getting a spaces as the car park is restricted to residents. A council permit would open it to non residents so would create a parking problem	55.96612	-3.16771
Resident	In an area of vast poverty this is the last thing Leith need.	55.96673	-3.16942
Resident	In an area of vast poverty this is the last thing Leith need.	55.96673	-3.16942
Resident	Leith is already in poverty, it's the last thing we need.	55.96688	-3.16946

Resident	There is not a huge issue with non resident parking, except when there's football on, but that is covered by temp traffic orders.. There is no need for permit bays. Feels like a money making exercise, penalising car drivers, with no benefit for residents	55.96109	-3.16748
Resident	This corner is a nightmare for pedestrians and road users - cars park right up to the junction with Butterfly Way and it creates a blind corner. Without expanding the double yellow around the corner, the problem will continue.	55.96023	-3.16424
Resident	You are missing half of Lawrie Reilly Place. These proposals also risk shifting residents who currently live and park on Butterfly Way onto Lawrie Reilly Place, which is prevented by CEC from making parking residents only. How can this be fair on LRP?	55.95961	-3.16497
Resident	I live in Lawrie Reilly Place which appears to be excluded from the proposed CPZ area but will obviously be affected by this proposed change.	55.96	-3.16707
Resident	I've lived here since 2013, the only people who park in Lochend Butterfly Way and West Kilnacre are residents. There is zero need for this measure on these streets or the dedicated parking bays that are already used by the residents.	55.96139	-3.16289
Resident	When there's no cars parked on this set of corners cars passing through do so at significantly higher speed. I'd suggest some form of speed controls to keep speeds down.	55.96075	-3.1633
Resident	These shared use bays are around 50-60% occupied by residents during the day and nearing 80-90% at weekends and overnight.	55.96183	-3.16295
Resident	Leaving this segment of West Kilnacre uncontrolled would cause significant pain. I'd strongly prefer to see West Kilnacre and Lochend Butterfly Way either uncontrolled or this segment included in the CPZ. Half and half will cause chaos.	55.96148	-3.16361
Resident	This section of street up to the park entrance is full of football traffic on match days. I'd hope the Stadium Review completes before these double yellows are put in place, it's super busy with cars parked around Marionville Roundabout on match days.	55.96281	-3.16248
Resident	I do not think the proposed parking restrictions are fair and I don't believe there is a need for them.	55.96275	-3.164
Resident	We've been told by the developer of Urban Eden that Lawrie Reilly Place was adopted by the council, and therefore isn't a private road. As such, I think permit holder bays are required throughout Lawrie Reilly Place.	55.95959	-3.16501
Resident	I can't comment on the status of the street, but it'd be a lot safer for everyone if the double yellow lines could be extended further into Albion Road	55.96024	-3.16419
Visitor	This section can be quite dangerous at times with people going too quickly and not being able to see what's ahead in either direction	55.96069	-3.16514
Visitor	I cycle through here regularly with my son going to school, and it's really difficult with all the cars parked in the road. Unclear why they are since the flats all have garages! So really glad to see double yellows.	55.95954	-3.16326
Visitor	I cycle through here a lot and there are often cars parked on both sides, with the tight bend it creates a dangerous bottle neck. So it's good to see reduced parking here.	55.96219	-3.16645
Visitor	More car club bays please!!! This area needs them!	55.96083	-3.16581

4. MURRAYFIELD (B9)


4.1.1 168 people dropped 238 pins on the interactive map

4.1.2 Of those, 232 had comments and six were left blank

4.1.3 30 comments are positive

4.1.4 185 comments are negative

4.1.5 23 comments are neutral



4.1.6 The most common theme of comments was with regards to there being a reduction in parking availability.

4.1.7 The next most common theme is people stating that the current layout/restrictions work well as they are.

I am a...	Comment	X	Y
Resident	Currently vehicles pavement park on both sides as the road is too narrow for legal parking on both sides. Changing one side of road to double yellows would be a solution.	55.94912	-3.2426119
Resident	There is never a problem parking in my street, traffic is quiet, it will be a nuisance if any visitors have to pay	55.948535	-3.2441849
Resident	There is absolutely no need for this. Certainly there is no sense in double yellow lines from Murrayfield Road to opposite 7 Campbell Avenue and shared bays thereafter. The road widths show that.	55.948222	-3.2447433
Resident	17 Cumlodden Ave has 2 yellow lines outside it. Shared zones will force visitors to park outside the same homes. The street aesthetics will suffer if white/yellow lines, ticket machines and signs are implemented (in a street which has no current issues).	55.949318	-3.2455872
Resident	Campbell Avenue properties are generally flats. Parking should be unrestricted. If restricted it must be much more heavily resident permit biased.	55.948616	-3.2442659
Resident	No necessity for this. No parking problems, area not used by commuters. No businesses in area. Viewing road currently - not a single vehicle is parked on south side of road. All residents are able to park outside their own homes.	55.94824	-3.2448399
Resident	The proposals will reduce parking for residents way below what is required. Removing parked cars eg from Coltbridge Terrace or Murrayfield Road will increase the speed of traffic. Inadequate provision for longer term visitors eg relatives on holiday.	55.947435	-3.2341561

Visitor	The proposals will cause serious issues for people dropping off / picking up at St. George's school for girls. I have mobility and health issues so can't use the bus, but don't have a blue badge. So the times need to avoid these school times	55.948845	-3.2354343
Resident	I recently bought 1 Belmont Gardens I had no idea til I moved in the difficulty getting in & out of my own drive, cars are too close to my entrance no sufficient turning space with the cars parked opposit I have to shunt a lot to get in & out.	55.945182	-3.2518471
Resident	I live at 37 Murrayfield Gardens and we have a carport gated access via Kingsburgh Road. We've submitted on 2 occasions that the no parking white markings outside our drive is too short, it means cars often park slightly overlapping our drive.	55.947357	-3.2410185
Resident	a better proposal will be to make the whole of murrayfield gardens permit holders only to stop non residents and workmen parking all day long thus pushing permit holders fighting over parking spots.	55.94801	-3.247759
Resident	This is long overdue and will improve the neighbourhood by reducing the volume of cars & prevent them from obstructing junctions as they do now. Coltbridge Ave (certainly pre-covid) has been used as a free car park for commuters and local businesses.	55.94681	-3.23495
Resident	I would like to see the permit time in the bays extended into the weekends as on days there are games at Murrayfield stadium it becomes impossible to leave the house via car as finding parking upon return is impossible.	55.946511	-3.2437449
Resident	I don't want to have all bays Permit Holder only. I want to keep the existing system of mixed permit/unrestricted.	55.947279	-3.2400223
Resident	The current parking provisions at Murrayfield Gardens are entirely satisfactory. The introduction of increased parking controls will worsen rather than improve the parking situation for residents, and I object to the proposals.	55.948394	-3.2417549
Resident	Visitor parking would be helpful	55.947047	-3.2326272
Resident	Campbell Avenue and the other streets north of us don't appear to have a parking problem. We can always find a space (except on match days, when we can use our drive if necessary). Bringing in controlled parking would make it harder for tradespeople to w	55.948818	-3.2427447
Resident	There are no issues with parking on murrayfield gardens. Please don't change them	55.94718	-3.2393503
Resident	I believe the whole of Garscube Terrace needs to be permitted for part of each weekday to avoid commuters leaving their cars here for the day / week. We are now one of the closest streets off Corstorphine Road without permits. Many thanks.	55.948965	-3.2353849
Resident	Though we think your permit bay proposal should go further. We would expect Garscube Terrace and Succoth Gardens to be fully residential permits, both sides to stop all day commuter parking. Edinburgh has a park & ride! Commuters need to use it!	55.950732	-3.2370248
Resident	Currently parking on pavements risks impeding council and emergency services. Preferable to remove pavements, have 10mph limit, create more parking spaces and give pedestrians priority.	55.94511	-3.2513567
Resident	I think the current permit system works to reduce commuter parking so paid parking isn't necessary. I do agree that double yellow lines on corners would be an improvement.	55.948526	-3.241256
Resident	This is long overdue. We are repeatedly obstructed by cars left for the long term. One at present has been outside our home for three months.	55.950813	-3.2373059
Resident	Double yellow lines down one side of Abinger Gardens are not needed. We do need the yellow lines at the west end of the road to be extended by around 2 metres to make parking more safe.	55.945974	-3.2393128
Resident	We don't want double yellow lines along one side of Abinger gardens. We need parking for visitors and workmen. We do need the yellow lines at the west end of the street to be extended by 2m for safety reasons.	55.945866	-3.2396937
Resident	Heavy traffic uses Murrayfield Road at SPEED the only thing protecting the children coming from school and other pedestrians are the parked cars which form a barrier. I do not believe the area has much of a parking problem with existing restrictions.	55.948299	-3.2478905
Resident	A) What instigated this? I was quite happy. B) What are ALL of the implications of finding myself suddenly being designated a "mews" property owner?	55.945181	-3.2556666
Resident	We would prefer a short period (1-2 hours per day) resident permit to prevent commuters using the street like a park & ride seven days a week. Hopefully not too expensive for residents who already pay Council Tax.	55.949636	-3.2377155
Resident	The proposal only has benefit within 5 minutes' walk of the A8. They are ugly, expensive and unnecessary elsewhere.	55.948754	-3.2427514
Resident	Murrayfield drive parking. I do not accept that any restrictions are necessary and that this is only a money making exercise.	55.947274	-3.2448089

Resident	I would like you to leave this area alone. You have already made a shambles of the parking in our street and I would like you not to make any further changes in our street.	55.939007	-3.2499042
Resident	No need to put a yellow line here. Grey triangle is a private car park and nobody would ever park over the entrance to it	55.947272	-3.2344149
Resident	Residents would like a garden/parklet here where parked cars once were. This would reduce speeding and would be run by residents. Could we do this?	55.947513	-3.2342814
Resident	These plans would encourage/force some residents to get rid of their car as there is not a space for every house. There is strong support for Enterprise Car Club bays amongst residents to replace private car ownership.	55.94717	-3.2346013
Resident	This would be the ideal location for a cycle hoop. There is demand for one of these from residents of the street. Several have already requested one.	55.947075	-3.2345811
Resident	Coltbridge Avenue & Gardens is a cul de sac in a conservation area. Could mews designation be appropriate to avoid spoiling appearance with yellow lines and parking meters?	55.94681	-3.23495
Resident	Proposal to add single yellow line in front of garages/drives does not make sense as white lines in place & are observed. This means residents will not be able to park in front of their own residences	55.946421	-3.238767
Resident	I suspect a number of residents will require to use these spaces to park. Therefore my concern is the potential lack of space for visitors/tradesmen.	55.946231	-3.2384143
Resident	There is no requirement to introduce parking controls on Ormidale Ter. This will penalise residents financially & cause inconvenience for us/visitors. The circumstances here haven't changed - it's solely residential & no shops/schools/change of use.	55.947202	-3.2422125
Resident	The proposals would not provide any benefits to my family or neighbours, indeed it would be detrimental. We do not have any difficulties parking. There are more than sufficient parking spaces on the street, for us, our visitors and any tradespeople.	55.947521	-3.2448618
Resident	No consideration for how difficult off street parking actually is, especially in snow and icy conditions.	55.94565	-3.25626
Resident	I object to this outrageous proposal. There is no parking issues in the Murrayfield area and I object to having to purchase a parking permit when this is not required. I have never experienced any issue with parking in my area.	55.94745	-3.2495199
Resident	I strongly object to this proposal there are no parking problems in this area	55.94687	-3.2492055
Resident	Generally supportive of these proposals. Presume shared areas allow permit-holder use. Would like to see extension of restrictions on Murrayfield International match days.	55.94745	-3.2425
Resident	I do not wish to have a yellow line painted across my drive (20 Murrayfield Gardens)	55.946558	-3.2387165
Resident	I do not want a yellow line across my drive (20 Murrayfield Gardens)	55.946558	-3.2387487
Resident	I don't like the proposal, and cant understand why it is proposed. The removal of white lines and replacement with yellow over drives will remove parking spaces from an already busy area - this is not logical, and the 1.30-3 limit is fine.	55.946909	-3.2386972
Resident	This plan will make things much worse for residents. The loss of white line parking. The changed hours. Lack of visitor space. Poor Planning Proposal.	55.946484	-3.2386396
Resident	Proposal loses parking space, penalises residents and harms the ability to have carers / visitors.	55.946484	-3.2386396
Resident	I regularly use the white lines over our drive. I am in and out as a professional athlete from here to training and this will make my life nearly impossible to find parking. The change in hours and more restrictions does not help. Please don't do it	55.946484	-3.2386396
Resident	The current parking situation in the area is good. It works well as it is. The proposed restrictions will make the situation far worse, not better. The result will be others parking outside our flat. We will have to buy permits and park blocks away.	55.949983	-3.2406952
Resident	I oppose the changes. Local parking here is just fine. Restrictions will make situation worse, not better. We, and our elderly neighbours, will have to park blocks away.	55.950086	-3.2408309
Resident	There is no issue with parking in the Murrayfield area. This is driven purely by the Council looking to make more revenue through parking charges.	55.948325	-3.2459949
Resident	Am concerned that the parking bays opposite our two garages on Belmont Crescent (right hand side of road looking down to Corstorphine Rd) will make it difficult for us to reverse out.	55.945245	-3.2544949
Resident	I do not have problems with parking at or near my house on Kingsburgh Road at present and therefore have no desire for the additional permit system for the area. However if the council do go ahead then obviously my road needs to be included.	55.9462	-3.2446079
Resident	Problem with parking verges/bumping cars. Sufficient space for residents Bigger concern is rat run, suggest blocking end of Campbell Avenue	55.948792	-3.2430857

Resident	There needs to be a holistic, integrated approach to parking. You've pushed cars to suburbs after you pushed them from the city centre & west end. You need to fix this as a totality not on an area by area basis. You are just shunting the problems on to	55.948347	-3.274385
Resident	North part of Ormidale Terrace is safe & traffic-light, with no parking problems for residents/visitors. No nearby businesses create traffic pressure. Many residents have garage/drive parking. Mixed use bay limits resident parking.	55.947334	-3.2425268
Resident	I'd prefer you add electric charging to the streets and improved roadways for cyclists	55.94843	-3.24814
Resident	Please could you put double yellows at the top of the steps from Murrayfield Gardens to Campbell Av (plus there's a new drive / parking for #73 Murrayfield Gardens which is not on your city map, opens out here too).	55.948869	-3.2424014
Resident	Why have we not got any permit parking outside out 4 house 23a 23b 23c 23d you have given us a yellow line in our parking place whilst or our neighbours have got permit parking please look at this again right now there are 4 parking spaces available and	55.949421	-3.2473506
Resident	This section on S/S of Campbell Av would be better for visitor parking than the area just opposite the junction of Cumlodden Av which is narrower. The road is wider here and would be safer. Also please avoid parking near the access to Campbell Av Woods.	55.948115	-3.2449945
Resident	Coltbridge Avenue, Gardens and Vale are designated as areas for residents' parking, as they are now with no problems. Suggest they are all designated as a Mews area like the Vale, so there is no need for unsightly stream furniture.	55.947488	-3.2341415
Resident	If this proposal does go ahead parking bays should be on the road outside nos 17 -25, rather than on the opposite side outside 54 - 62. Gives more parking spaces, and there are gardens in front of the houses, not houses opening directly onto the pavement.	55.947467	-3.234222
Resident	My reservations are solely due to insufficiency of permit parking spaces if I am correct in assuming that double yellow lines are being proposed. If this is the case I would suggest that the spaces be expanded to include 7 & 9, & 26 to 28 between drivewa	55.947319	-3.2354162
Resident	No need for double yellow lines outside our house. Would be ok with permit parking if required. Problem parking is usually tradesmen with vans. My wife has serious mobility issues and at some future date we may need to apply for a disability space at our	55.948768	-3.2485899
Resident	You have taken our parking spaces away from houses 23a, 23b, 23c 23d and given us double yellow lines Campbell Road, come and have a look please	55.949201	-3.2476041
Resident	Belmont Terrace will be residents only parking with no road markings. Will the turning circle at the top be zoned off/no parking. It needs to be.	55.945078	-3.255756
Resident	I am in support of some changes, but in my street in particular, having no parking options is just not practical. On the stretch of road between 3 - 19 Ellersly Road, I think there should be 5 parking bays created	55.94658	-3.24806
Resident	This is at least the third time the council has proposed adding parking restrictions in our area and every time all our neighbours agree that we do not want them. There is absolutely no need between Murrayfield Drive and Ravelston Dykes	55.9475	-3.24475
Resident	Double yellow lines outside 36D Murrayfield Road seem unnecessary. We rarely experience unwanted parking and tighter restrictions would severely restrict access for visitors and tradespeople.	55.948796	-3.248649
Resident	Additional double yellow lines outside 17-23 and 46 Coltbridge Ave are unnecessary. That would reduce available spaces which are not a problem at present; indeed they encourage traffic to slow down.	55.948357	-3.2306451
Resident	Succoth Park is used by residents, carers & workmen. There is no reason for double yellow lines. If there has to be restrictions then no parking between 11 & 2 would be more than adequate.	55.94975	-3.2412849
Resident	I'm happy that a permit system be introduced. However, clearing parking from one side of the street in places will speed up through traffic which is a serious problem for all the schoolchildren. Also, please use existing poles/lamposts/walls for signage.	55.947761	-3.2350312
Resident	There are 54 flats in Succoth Court & your proposal takes away their parking. Double yellow lines are meant to keep traffic moving so do not make sense in Succoth Park, a cul-de-sac!	55.94975	-3.2412849
Resident	I feel it is unnecessary to have all day parking restrictions in this residential area. If paid parking is in place I feel strongly that it should not be expensive and should have a long time limit on it, eg 4 hours.	55.94832	-3.2344222
Resident	Home owner with 2 cars and no off road parking with double yellow lines proposed outside our house and all along Ellersly Road with single lines on the other side where are we expected to park? We have 2 young children and it's unsafe to cross road	55.94682	-3.2464936

Resident	The proposals would take away a large parking space directly outside our home 23a. We have used this space for 30 years with no viewing problems We have 2 cars necessary for work and childcare this proposal would create a parking problem for us	55.949146	-3.2472943
Resident	The current parking arrangements on Succoth Gardens are adequate and not causing any particular issue that I am aware of. Adding in more restrictions to residents and visitors is not welcome. If the restrictions do go ahead can it be limited to Mon-Fri	55.95008	-3.237917
Resident	Parking in this area works. Don't need more restrictions. Will cause residents to park far from their homes.	55.949989	-3.2410026
Resident	The current parking system works well. Almost no problems. Restrictions will make the situation worse. Much worse. Will cause residents to have to buy permits and park away from home.	55.94571	-3.2497499
Resident	Do not like the proposals. We don't need new restrictions. Parking works well here. Restrictions will make it worse.	55.945664	-3.249414
Resident	While there are times of the school day that parking is difficult in Garscube Terrace, at all other times there is plenty of parking space for all residents and visitors. These proposals will reduce the amenity of the area for residents and visitors.	55.949975	-3.2362551
Resident	Please extend shared parking to outside 26 and 28 Coltbridge Terrace. Thank you.	55.947761	-3.2350312
Resident	In Coltbridge Terrace there needs to be more permit only spaces. The slip road at Murrayfield Place should be left open to help traffic flow. The area needs to be monitored at 3-4pm as parents park in front of drives, on corners, in restricted area with no	55.947674	-3.2350572
Resident	I am opposed for many reasons including (1) there is no parking problem as evidenced by your survey (2) negative impact on appearance of the area (3) impact on local businesses and economy (4) will cause problems for parents of children at local schools	55.949755	-3.2476042
Resident	The safety proposals for Ellersley rd are encouraging but would be vastly improved if there was a double yellow line on the north side. The road is a "rat run" and is extremely busy all day	55.946677	-3.2480729
Resident	I don't see any need for parking restrictions on Ellersly Road between the "elbow" and the junction with Kinellan Road. The road here is wide and does not suffer from any parking issues.	55.94622	-3.2501007
Resident	The street is used for drop off and collection of pupils attending St George's School. It is likely to become chaotic with double parking and road blockages, making it difficult for residents to access their parking and for others to use as a route.	55.949833	-3.2356344
Resident	It's great news that permit parking is proposed on the SE side of Succoth Gardens (house addresses 6-12), but my fear is that leaving the NW side of Succoth Gardens as Shared Use simply moves (and doubles) the issue on that side of the road.	55.950148	-3.2379625
Resident	There is no issue with commuter parking at the moment, we are at the top of Belmont Gardens (29). The PPZ may be something that might need to be brought in only if this changes due to the introduction of other CPZ in other areas.	55.945782	-3.2567106
Resident	If the scheme is to go ahead, parking on Belmont Crescent south of its junction with Belmont Terrace should be on the west side of the road. Parking on the east side will restrict site lines and cause safety issues.	55.944844	-3.2546497
Resident	Currently have a 1.30pm to 3.00pm restriction which works fine and deters commuters from parking here. I'm also against a yellow line across my garage as if I have visitors they then can't park across my garage and will have to take up a parking space.	55.946418	-3.2387576
Resident	The status quo works very well currently. This proposal would reduce the parking for everyone and is not required.	55.948061	-3.240788
Resident	There is plenty of capacity for parking in this area. There has been no issue with commuters parking since restrictions were imposed. I would prefer existing restrictions to be removed. There is no case for further restrictions	55.948077	-3.2407022
Resident	I'm extremely upset and concerned by the motives of this proposal. I was born in 29 Belmont Gardens and moved to 23 Belmont Gardens age 24 in all my years in this zone I have never once had an issue with lack of spaces	55.945419	-3.25623
Resident	No changes to existing rules are required, and any would be counterproductive. You are also proposing putting a bay in front of the access to 94 and 98.	55.94861	-3.24183
Resident	I am extremely unhappy with this proposal. There is absolutely no problem with parking where I live on Belmont Gardens.	55.945665	-3.2564105
Resident	The commentary about why this review is taking place mentions residents concerns about parking provisions but this proposal would go against all residents views as would massively impact the ability of residents to park anywhere near their homes.	55.947314	-3.2356362

Resident	This proposal will be opposed using all legal means available. It ignores all residents amenities, disadvantages families , does not target existing traffic issues and is utterly preposterous	55.947399	-3.2355396
Resident	Charging on top of council tax is Bad idea as never an issue parking here at top of hill in 26 years & Impacts visitors. One neighbour already excavating alternative- contributes to floods if more.	55.945573	-3.2563846
Resident	Much prefer status quo.Unfair our stretch would compete with Pay/Displayers and be subjected to meters/poles.Good deal of Shared Use on map for M'field Drive/Campbell Ave and more available in Kingsburgh north side.Otherwise all Gdns to be permitholders	55.947823	-3.2411287
Resident	Will make parking for residents impossible. Removes huge proportion of spaces and will cause stress to residents.	55.947337	-3.2356039
Resident	We (and most other residents of Murrayfield Gardens) do not see a need for change of the status quo, which has been working well. We wish to retain the current parking arrangements and have the basic hours of restricted parking between 13.30 -15.00h	55.948183	-3.2411757
Resident	Current B9 restrictions work in this area, the proposed CPZ would extremely limit resident parking	55.946502	-3.2357139
Resident	The consultation for improvement of Coltbridge has agreed bins will be moved to the bottom of Murrayfield Avenue, so would not be in place at 12 Murrayfield Place.	55.946557	-3.2355094
Resident	B9 restrictions could be extended to more than the 90min parking to further deter commuters in the permit zones	55.947109	-3.2356382
Resident	Road markings for Murrayfield Place/Coltbridge Terrace would drastically reduce resident parking and speed up traffic going up and down the road, the current parking ensures cars go slower, also previous consultations have considered a one way system	55.947007	-3.2357991
Resident	Disproportionate pay and display outside 3 shops and the present B9 restrictions provide a good balance for shops and residence	55.946196	-3.2360244
Resident	I am furious that this proposes double yellow lines outside my house and my neighbours, plus hugely reduced the amount of parking available to residents even allowing only one car per household.	55.94737	-3.23553
Resident	I object to yellow lines in this location.This is a residential street & like many I don't have the ability to park on my listed property. Instead of yellow lines, why not make it all permit holders & make extra revenue.	55.947399	-3.2355137
Resident	Do not limit my ability to park on my street by introducing yellow lines. If you must, just put resident parking bays and then at least i have a choice if i want to pay etc.	55.947369	-3.2355454
Resident	Please consider shortening the use of double yellow lines along Coltbridge Terrace as the proposed availability of permit holder bays appears well short of what I believe residents will need to successfully park.	55.947417	-3.2355209
Resident	Double yellow lines offside street compounds problem. Extend dble yellow at both ends to improve access. Residents parking full length of onside to accommodate 2 cars per h/hold. More practical to have full day permits for tradesmen/visitors	55.946028	-3.2390089
Resident	There is absolutely no need to bring in more permits. I totally and utterly disagree with this proposal	55.94715	-3.23746
Resident	I'm all for it! We regularly have commuters park and go into town. I live down the bottom end though and I doubt the residents up the top have this problem	55.946699	-3.2373366
Resident	We oppose this plan entirely. The plan is unnecessary and unwanted. There are no parking problems in Murrayfield to warrant this proposal.	55.947238	-3.2458716
Resident	I am opposed to this proposal on the basis that there is sufficient parking available for residents, visitors and tradespeople etc.	55.947238	-3.2458716
Resident	I object to the CPZ proposal for Murrayfield	55.94725	-3.2394298
Resident	I strongly oppose the introduction of a CPZ in Murrayfield. It is not needed, would create less parking for residents, would cost residents more to obtain a permit, and would make having daytime visitors/carers very difficult and expensive.	55.947165	-3.2397072
Resident	I would like the status quo to remain. It's enough to deter non-residents from taking up the spaces.	55.948641	-3.2423652
Resident	The status quo should be left in place. Commuters are already prevented from using resident parking through the existing permit bays, there are no safety issues (traffic in and around Murrayfield Gardens drives very slowly)	55.947928	-3.2410809
Resident	I would like it to remain as it stands	55.94856	-3.24193
Resident	Status quo on murrayfield gardens works well. Any change would be detrimental for residents	55.94684	-3.23921
Resident	I do not want CPZ parking to be brought in to our street- Murrayfield Gardens. It would not suit residents and would transform the character of the street.	55.948394	-3.2417549
Resident	We already have permit zones on our street that work. They've stopped commuters and people leaving their car for weeks to use the airport bus down the road for holidays. The 1.30 - 3pm zone already works well.	55.947829	-3.2404635

Resident	I am opposed to this proposal. The existing parking arrangements work well for residents, and further controls will be to their disadvantage, as well as altering the character of the street.	55.948527	-3.2417965
Resident	DY lines here. Upper Coltbridge Tce is narrow, congested and risky - safe access for emergency services is needed. DY lines along the north side and parking on the south side would improve access. Ambulances, bin lorries etc have failed get down	55.948452	-3.2346904
Resident	Strongly supportive - the cycle path provides sustainable transport. Put pedestrians first. Concentrate double yellow lines down one side of Upper Coltbridge to allow access for emergency vehicles.	55.94849	-3.2345143
Resident	23 houses in my street. four have made their garden hard parking. the proposals do not allow enough parking for each house to park one car?how is this a good proposal. does the council really want each character property to have its garden removed?	55.947434	-3.2354054
Resident	The current permit is sufficient for residents and visitors.	55.94837	-3.2415081
Resident	I am afraid that I do not agree with the current proposals for Coltbridge Terrace. They would certainly allow freer movement up and down the Terrace – at present it is a single traffic lane. This could result in faster traffic speeds than is desirable	55.947962	-3.2349462
Resident	Why is a double yellow line proposed along a large part of the Terrace on the east side? This would prevent any stopping other than to drop off passengers. What happens on occasions when loading/unloading has to take place involving one of the house	55.947893	-3.2349971
Resident	It would appear that the only parking for Tradesmen, visitors, etc. in both Coltbridge and Upper Coltbridge Terraces will be two rather limited lengths of “Shared-Use” bays in Coltbridge Terrace. These also have to cater for “Permit Holder” parking.	55.948004	-3.2350132
Resident	What is the reason for a single yellow line being in place outside Nos. 10 and 12 Coltbridge Terrace (quite appropriately), whereas elsewhere in similar circumstances (e.g. outside Nos. 26, 28 and 36) a double yellow line is in place.	55.947291	-3.2354893
Resident	I don't see any benefit to this proposal.	55.9456	-3.241
Resident	Driveway for no.6 is angled South West. This space will block access and obscure vision, creating danger exiting driveway.	55.94501	-3.2546774
Resident	Proposed bay blocks access to garages opposite.	55.944896	-3.2546945
Resident	This is not a driveway. There is no drop kerb and gates are permanently shut.	55.944824	-3.2547149
Resident	Cannot have parking bay in the middle of the street!	55.945226	-3.2545568
Resident	Parking bays on East side block view along the Crescent. People naturally park on West side as is safer. Also more space for additional bays.	55.944853	-3.2546479
Resident	Road will first need resurfacing, as there is a continual trench running from number 2 to number 10 that has removed existing white lines outside properties.	55.944738	-3.2545376
Resident	Parking bays would block access for bins to be collected for no.4 and no.6. Currently not an issue, as people park on West side of road.	55.944905	-3.2546586
Resident	Driveway to no.6 is angled. Placing parking bay here will impede access to the driveway and also obscure the view down the street making it dangerous to pull out of driveway	55.945003	-3.2546774
Resident	Proposed parking bay will impede access to garages opposite	55.944902	-3.2546742
Resident	Proposed parking bay will block access for refuse personnel to collect bins from outside no.6	55.944911	-3.2546375
Resident	People naturally park their cars on the west side of the street. The proposed parking bay will block the view of traffic travelling down the Crescent - this is a danger for other drivers and pedestrians.	55.94482	-3.254613
Resident	At the consultancy evening on 2nd March. The council representative stated that the 3rd party had recorded leaflets being delivered to all residents. We know that the majority of Belmont residents did not receive leaflets or notification	55.945153	-3.2546885
Resident	This section of residents parking looks perfect, thanks.	55.947778	-3.2376451
Resident	We wish parking restrictions to stay as they are. This works well. We do not want a yellow line across our drive. We would like a white line at the dropped kerb as this would prevent parking too close. This is a safety issue to help o	55.946858	-3.2388772
Resident	Dangerous to have vehicles parked on bends	55.950642	-3.2446289
Resident	Dangerous to have vehicles parked on bends	55.949128	-3.2425046
Resident	Dangerous to have vehicles parked on bends	55.950245	-3.2464743
Resident	Dangerous to have vehicles parked on bends	55.950185	-3.2481051
Resident	Dangerous to have vehicles parked on bends and hill without visibility	55.948587	-3.2442642
Resident	Dangerous to have vehicles parked on bends and hills without visibility	55.948671	-3.2444144

Resident	My road is currently private. If the proposals (which I fully support) go ahead, we will attract the displaced parking. Our street needs to be adopted and designated as a mews	55.945436	-3.2496314
Resident	The proposed 'shared use bays' shown on your map in Lennel Avenue at the Ravelston Dykes end . At a blind corner will result in an accident. The bays will force entering/exiting Lennel into the middle of the road. You can't be serious!	55.950473	-3.2445753
Resident	dangerous	55.949149	-3.2425422
Resident	dangerous	55.950449	-3.2445431
Resident	dangerous	55.950041	-3.2479763
Resident	dangerous	55.948263	-3.2459164
Resident	Do not think there is any need for permit parking. The street is not over used by people out with parking their vehicles	55.949176	-3.2425286
Resident	There is currently no requirement for additional zoned parking On Lennel Avenue. We do not have a problem with parking. Shared bays and permit zones will not make any money for the council as most houses here have a driveway. parking locatn is dangerous.	55.949882	-3.2439579
Resident	Double yellow lines required from Ravelston Dykes to drive way at number 26 Lennel Avenue , same on other side of road. Do not feel the need for permit parking bay in Lennel Avenue and surrounding streets .	55.950257	-3.2442213
Resident	Suggested alterations to Coltbridge Avenue and Coltbridge Gardens	55.94901	-3.23243
Resident	Double yellow line not needed here. Change to permit holder bay as not enough spaces for residents otherwise. Also having cars parked on both sides of the road will reduce traffic speed. Volume of traffic does not require cars to pass side by side.	55.947508	-3.2343326
Resident	Change double yellow line one one side of the road to permit holder spaces or shared use for the business at 64 Coltbridge Avenue. Parked cars will slow the traffic speed in the run up to the blind corner which is just before access to the bowling club	55.948029	-3.2332096
Resident	Consider making Coltbridge Gardens a mews for parking purposes (as Coltbridge Vale has been designated)	55.94879	-3.2330809
Resident	I live at 35 Ravelston Dykes and am concerned that this will increase parking outside my property. I would be happier if the permit zones were also put on Ravelston Dykes between Garscube and Succoth to stop this happening.	55.95125	-3.2391007
Resident	There are no places at all on ormidale terrace for visitors to residences. Also the church hall is very busy under normal circumstances so where will the users of the hall such as parent and toddler or tumble tots park?	55.946244	-3.2409168
Resident	The proposal indicates that a yellow line will be outside my property which means there will be no parking there. At the moment there are no parking issues in this street.	55.950137	-3.2440107
Resident	The proposal to introduce double yellow lines from 7 Coltbridge Terrace to St Georges School contradicts the purpose of the proposal, namely to increase residents parking. I'm fearful that it will be more difficult to park outside my own home.	55.94737	-3.23553
Resident	My more general comments will be sent by email. Specific point relating to identified location: no designation shown for north side of Ellersly Road east of Kinellan Road. This should be single yellow line plus bus cage.	55.946709	-3.2479055
Visitor	I would like to see more dual parking on Coatbridge Terrace especially due to it close proximity to St George's school George's	55.94676	-3.2355449
Resident	I think the proposals for Coltbridge Avenue are massively over-restrictive. This stret has an open and friendly almost village-like vibe at present which these proposals will destroy. Far better to lok at designating it as a mews	55.946679	-3.2352975
Resident	Please may the parking restrictions to be time limited to avoid full day parking by non residents. However it is vital the teachers at St Georges school can park all day - can they get special permits?	55.948447	-3.2364817
Visitor	There are no parking issues in Succoth Park and it should not be included in the Zone.	55.950329	-3.2424832
Visitor	This stretch should be permit or mixed use bay not yellow lines. The road is perfectly wide enough for this.	55.950149	-3.2401765
Visitor	All the yellow lines in Succoth Avenue should be permit holder or shared use bay. The street is perfectly wide enough to have ;parking on both sides.	55.95057	-3.2400102
Resident	the doubler yellow lines between nos 17 and 23 is totally unnecessary. The 10 houses 17-25 and 54-62 have 12 cars yet you are providing 3/4 spaces whilst also reducing parking elsewhere in the avenue. It will be a nightmare.	55.947428	-3.2344167
Resident	the double yellow line here create a double width road which will increase car speeds and reduce safety. In the 27 years I have lived at no 17 there has not been an accident in this section with parking on both sides.	55.947427	-3.2344194

Resident	double yellow line imply it is dangerous to park. That is not the case outside my house. This is a cul de sac in a conservation area with a village character and slow traffic: your proposals will increase speeds and damage it visually.	55.947421	-3.2344247
Resident	these double yellow lines are totally unnecessary and visually very inappropriate. This is a cul de sac with a rural village character, not a main highway! Occasional parking here is not a problem and essential for the bowling club on match days.	55.947968	-3.2332273
Resident	Create 2 disabled parking bays outside 9 & 11 Murrayfield Road and widen vehicle entry gap due to sightlines. As a disabled resident there are no disabled bays on proposal for Murrayfield Road.	55.946498	-3.2454698
Resident	there is no need for yellow lines between nos 38 and 46 (except for the existing ones) . the proposals are simply removing yet more resident parking, meaning the proposed resident provision willll many many times oversubscribed for absolutely no benefit.	55.947062	-3.2345791
Resident	Coltbridge Avenue and Gardens are a cul de sac with a village like character. Traffic is slowed by parked cars - like a single track road with passing spaces. People walk down the middle of the road, kids play in the street. The proposals destroy this.	55.947433	-3.2344462
Resident	Priority parking has resolved non resident parking problems in Coltbridge Avenue. There is currently just sufficient parking for residents. However, the proposals cut resident parking drastically, destroy that fine balance and will create major problems.	55.947415	-3.2344462
Resident	We believe the existing PPA works well. We think the introduction of the CPZ is highly undesirable and would be detrimental to residents, visitors and local businesses	55.946707	-3.2387844
Resident	Proposed restrictions are unnecessary for this area. Proposed bays at the junction with Ravelston Dykes would be dangerous.	55.949535	-3.2434004
Visitor	Parking at Succoth Court is not a problem. There are plenty of spaces for all the surrounding residents and always somewhere available to park.	55.950305	-3.2425797
Visitor	Parking restrictions are completely unnecessary in Succoth Park. There is ample parking space in Succoth Park and at Succoth Court and in Succoth Park most residents have driveways. This functions perfectly well as it is.	55.94993	-3.2410214
Visitor	Parking restrictions are completely unnecessary in Succoth Park. There is ample free space for parking and spaces at nearby Succoth Court. The area functions well and intrusion is not called for.	55.950101	-3.2403642
Resident	Double lines are unnecessary- no parking issues here - if restrictions are deemed essential , a single line offers greater flexibility to allow residents and visitors	55.948801	-3.2485791
Resident	What will happen when our Private Road of Westerlea Gardens is adopted? I understand its current status is "prospectively adopted". Meantime there is nothing to stop anyone just parking on our road or in our Visitors spaces.	55.946586	-3.2471816
Resident	Broadly in support but with objections/reservations for specific locations	55.946515	-3.2455017
Resident	HAZARD: Have NO PARKING restriction for 10 to 15 metres downhill from exit of 11 Murrayfield Rd	55.946515	-3.2455017
Resident	Restrict parking bays to only one side of Kinellan Road	55.947376	-3.2494342
Resident	HAZARD: Eliminate all parking bays on 'Odd No's' side of Murrayfield Road between Ellersly Rd and Ravelston Dykes	55.947265	-3.246587
Resident	In agreement with parking controls in principle, but believe they should be enforced for a short (eg. 2 hour) period in the middle of the day to effectively prevent commuters from using the streets as park and ride.	55.946166	-3.2449615
Resident	Ellersly Rd is a rat run and with double yellow lines cars will still be able to flow fast along here. The Bays on Murray fieldRoad will mean the street is narrower and so used less. Ellersly Rd Should be traffic calming/one way	55.946617	-3.2478583
Resident	I think people should be able to block their own drives, if required. Not sure if single yellow line allows that.	55.94883	-3.2427497
Resident	Shared use bays should not be right outside no 31 & 33 - if any shared use bays are implemented they should be right at top end of street only, where there are only properties on one side. Plan will severely impact our ability to park outside our door.	55.94735	-3.2425154
Resident	I live at 17 Coltbridge Ave. I am medically retired and on ESA benefit. I need to be able to park outside my house or very near to it. Double yellow lines prevent even loading and there are a radically reduced number of parking spaces in the street.	55.947427	-3.2344247
Resident	There is no parking problem this far up Ravelston Dykes. The proposals are unnecessary and a waste of Council resources. The cost of road painting, signage and meters will be considerable. Firmly against the proposals.	55.95069	-3.2448886
Resident	There is no issue with informal 'park & ride' or parking congestion in Cumlodden Avenue. I see no need therefore for my council tax to be spent on meters or other road markings.	55.950025	-3.2465926

Resident	There is no need to restrict parking and levy charges at residents. The only time parking is pressurised is when there's a match or other event at the stadium and on the rare time this happens, you just don't move your car to travel anywhere.	55.94872	-3.24328
Resident	Currently the residents park here - making this double yellow will mean there will not be enough space on the street for residents to park. There is a mixture of elderly and young families that rely on their cars and being able to park close to homes	55.947474	-3.2343282
Resident	To combat full day parking by non residents, any pay & display or resident parking needs to be time limited. For example short term permit zones similar to those that are already in place and pay & display limited to 2-4 hours.	55.94835	-3.2363283
Other	Henderland Road Tennis Club: this is used by the local community (members & non members) and parking access is required. We suggest pay & display limited to 2 hours to ensure people can access this sports facility.	55.948038	-3.2370257
Resident	There is nothing in these proposals to combat congestion or antisocial driving and parking at school drop off and pick up times.	55.94839	-3.2362613
Resident	Murrayfield Parish Church and Centre rely on easy access to their buildings. Preference would be to retain free parking outside both buildings or at the very least time limited free parking.	55.946148	-3.2409168
Resident	Time limited free parking of up to 2 hours would prevent all day parking by non residents and would also allow local people to access the tennis courts.	55.948086	-3.2369399
Resident	Preferred option is for short duration permit zones (as elsewhere in the street) to prevent full day parking by non residents.	55.948542	-3.2361245
Resident	More than sufficient parking capacity on street, currently not pressured traffic non-resident traffic. A CPZ only penalises current residents, with no fall in overall traffic. Visiting medical/care professionals would be unfairly charged.	55.948913	-3.232799
Resident	You have omitted my dropped kerb at the driveway of no 36 campbell road. This should have a white line to prevent parking.	55.949815	-3.2475723
Resident	You have indicated visitor parking bays commencing close to my drive. There needs to be at least a couple of meters between the drive and start of bays to allow me to exit safely	55.949802	-3.247693
Resident	The space between the drives for no 36 and no 38 is too small for a car so should either have double yellow lines or the white line across the two driveways should be continuous to prevent parking between them as well as across them	55.949835	-3.2477654
Resident	We do not need any more restrictions in this street. We are perfectly happy with no controls. Occasionally someone parks and goes on holiday. However it is a public road, so we work round it. It's just a stealth tax	55.946786	-3.2415883
Resident	Parking on Western Terrace is limited as the majority of the properties are converted flats with no driveways, so Permit Holder Bays are required to prevent use of the limited parking spaces by commuters and non-residents.	55.945198	-3.2467896
Resident	The status quo which already restricts parking and prevents commuters is sufficient. There is no need for and further restrictions which will just inconvenience residents at times when they have visitors, including for childcare and caring purposes.	55.948632	-3.2418012
Resident	We will have massive problems My husband is severely disabled and requires carers four times a day If they change parking I will struggle to get help if they have to pay for parking !!! Please don't make life any more difficult Thankyou Charlotte mitchell	55.947437	-3.2352241
Resident	I strongly support the existing system which works perfectly well for residents and visitors	55.946601	-3.2390938
Resident	There are no issues with the current arrangements on Coltbridge Avenue. We have a simple permit system which ensures no parking in the majority of the street by long term users without permit. This successfully controls commuter/airport bus users	55.947469	-3.2343534
Resident	Unacceptable - significantly reduces parking for residents by increasing double yellow lines. Insufficient parking for residents. We support restrictions for non residents but not discrimination against residents.	55.947458	-3.2354968
Resident	Very strongly against proposed double yellow lines. This will significantly negatively impact on residents and is absolutely unacceptable.	55.94732	-3.2355719
Resident	Coltbridge Terrace MUST be allowed sufficient residents permit bays for the residents. Removing permit parking between 26 and 36 means the remaining spaces between 2 and 25 will not be enough for the street. At the moment residents can easily find a space	55.94676	-3.2355449
Resident	Not sufficient parking for residents based on plans	55.94676	-3.2355449
Resident	I would like to know what the definition of MEWS is. Can't see where to find this information. I want to ensure that I have adequate access to my garage at all times and need free space because of the angle required to access.	57.8712	-38.317626

Resident	Parking on one side and wider pavement please. Road gets blocked easily with parking on both sides. Dangerously vans mount the pavement ALL THE TIME (pavement is so narrow even wheelie bins block it). Have to walk my daughter to school on the road regu.	55.94847	-3.2346475
Resident	Western Terrace in order to ensure parking outside of the properties in this stretch is it feasible to have resident parking? Concern comes from the development and building of flats opposite with limited number of parking bays provided	55.945176	-3.246442
Resident	I have concerns about provision for visitors or second car. Currently only have of road parking for 1 and double yellow lines out side house. Would we be able to park in the Mews down the side of the house?	55.945769	-3.2527786


5. ROSEBURN

5.1.1 30 people dropped 39 pins on the interactive map

5.1.2 Of those, 37 had comments and two were left blank

5.1.3 4 comments are positive

5.1.4 35 comments are negative



5.1.5 The most common theme of comments was regarding land ownership and if there are discrepancies in council records.

5.1.6 The next most common theme is about the general parking availability.

I am a...	Comment	X	Y
Commuter	I commute to the school in this area as a teacher. Perhaps we could get staff permits.	55.944005	-3.2378818
Other	I don't feel parking restrictions are necessary in this area	55.9433	-3.2363
Other	Staff at school need to be able to park unable to use public transport. Commuters abuse this	55.943574	-3.2361123
Other	staff need free parking permits otherwise unfair tax on council staff who cannot access workplace.	55.943641	-3.2364317
Resident	I completely support the parking proposals for Roseburn. As a resident, our small streets are congested with traffic putting the children at the local school, and our elderly residents at risk.	55.944732	-3.2371683
Resident	I dont think half of Roseburn Place should be shared use, this should be in Roseburn Drive where there are more parking spaces and less properties	55.944965	-3.2346399
Resident	There needs to be more permit parking or take away the single yellow line in Russell gardens. The demand in parking for just residents is huge so please don't take away spaces away. We are competing with commuters and airport users as it is. There doesn't	55.943818	-3.2386753
Resident	We have perfectly good mixed parking restrictions on Murrayfield Avenue and CPZ would have major impact for friends and family visiting. Solving a problem that doesn't exist	55.94806	-3.23878

Resident	As with the previous parking consultation the vast majority rejected the proposal as there is not a parking issue in this vicinity. The proposal you are 'considering' will only make parking more restrictive and is actually just another tax	55.944253	-3.2333389
Resident	Double yellow lines within the Maltings will make it more likely for freeloaders to park in the dedicated space for my flat. I don't have a car so it is seldom used, and given the space is right outside my living room window I would rather keep it clear.	55.945154	-3.2328688
Resident	Lived in Roseburn Street for 25 years and my vehicle is registered to my company address in Loanhead so I couldn't get a permit. There must be a way company registered vehicles can be included.	55.944413	-3.2348134
Resident	Not necessary. Parking spaces are always available to be found at very close distance. After covid it is expected to be less commuting as less people will travel to office. Wrong time to be making this time of decisions with so much uncertainty ahead.	55.943951	-3.235264
Resident	31 Roseburn Drive. I share the drive with my downstairs neighbours at No 33. For ease I daily use one of the 2 existing spaces which are now to have double yellow lines. Could this be reconsidered?	55.944203	-3.236113
Resident	Currently there is no problem finding parking	55.944958	-3.2370959
Resident	These spaces are privately owned and cannot be used for shared use parking bays	55.943894	-3.2312727
Resident	Parking bay indicated and bay to right of block 19 are private and cannot be zoned. More single yellow lines would help residents and still stop misuse	55.943945	-3.231305
Resident	Unnecessarily restrictive. Will make getting deliveries and access for tradesmen harder, and drastically reduce parking for visitors, which will spill out to other streets nearby.	55.944243	-3.2317637
Resident	I do not see how this is going to help me personally find a parking space I do not believe double yellow lines outside your front door helps either I do not wish the council to proceed with this plan	55.945713	-3.234582
Resident	You seem to be proposing changes to some privately-owned parking spaces in Roseburn Maltings: will this involve compulsory purchase, or is the map wrong?	55.943944	-3.2312868
Resident	Further consultation required re specific issues such as yellow lines, pay and display and permit holder zones. Local input essential.	55.943981	-3.2320012
Resident	The shared use bays marked in brown on the map are not correct. The brown rectangle in front of block 17, as well as the 2 areas at the sides of blocks 17 and 19 are allocated to individual flats, and are numbered.	55.943692	-3.2310904
Resident	This area in front of the garage block is residents parking as it is all mono blocked like the rest of all the resident parking areas on the development. This belongs to the residents so it can not be used for any form of shared parking.	55.944293	-3.2330646
Resident	This area is residents parking. It is monblocked like all the other parking bays on the development so cant be used. There are not enough spaces as it is on the development for each flat. The area is owned by the residents and is not public road space.	55.944293	-3.2330431
Resident	There is not a need for double yellows the whole length of the block. Why not have it as residents permit parking instead?	55.943975	-3.2309617
Resident	Please check with the map provided by Hacking and Paterson showing the privately owned land- I think this is not adopted and therefore cannot be council parking	55.943894	-3.2306063
Resident	There is not a need for blanket double yellows all along here. How about some residents permit parking here.	55.944273	-3.2317476
Resident	These 3 parking spaces are private & belong to the Russell Gardens development so can't be changed to a shared-use bay	55.94432	-3.2331096
Resident	it looks as if you are planning to put shared-use bays on land which is currently part of our private gardens!!! I don't think so!!!	55.944248	-3.233307
Resident	Again it looks as if you are planning to add shared-use parking on an area of private garden	55.942157	-3.2312428
Resident	This part of road was missed when double yellow lines were added last year. It was on the original proposal & these are required to allow easy access for emergency & utility vehicles	55.944358	-3.2331697
Resident	This is another area of private parking you want to change to a shared-use bay. By adding yellow lines near this you will be reducing the area available to residents therefore we can't afford to lose any of our private resident spaces	55.943527	-3.2337963
Resident	I believe these four sections of parking spaces have been incorrectly marked for shared use. My understanding is that they are private property, the same as the other numbered bays within Roseburn Maltings.	55.943954	-3.231297
Resident	VERY DIFFICULT TO PARK DURING DAYTIME AS CARS BEING LEFT BY COMMUTERS AND LOCAL BUSINESSES.	55.943977	-3.2381119
Resident	Double yellow lines in Roseburn Maltings? Why? The flow of traffic in and out of the Maltings runs well. We already have double yellow lines where needed. Where would visitors park? How would deliveries be made? It is totally a bad idea.	55.945867	-3.2283735

Resident	Certain areas on the digital map marked for change are development owned.	55.943909	-3.2331289
Resident	I am resident in Roseburn Maltings. The proposed parking changes are excessive. Double lines are only required on corners not on every pavement area. This would lead to problems for deliveries and maintenance workers.	55.944181	-3.2314708
Resident	I have sent an email. Yellow lines a poorly thought out solution. Mistakes made with owner spaces. Need elaboration over shared spaces. Please read email.	55.94432	-3.2318749

6. SAUGHTONHALL


6.1.1 189 people dropped 259 pins on the interactive map

6.1.2 Of those, 253 had comments and six were left blank

6.1.3 25 comments are positive

6.1.4 16 comments are negative

6.1.5 18 comments are neutral



6.1.6 The most common theme of the comments is about the loss of parking availability should the proposals be implemented.

6.1.7 The second most common theme is comments stating that the current layout/restrictions work fine as they are.

I am a...	Comment	X	Y
Business owner	There is no problem with parking currently. The proposed changes will be detrimental to the area	55.94086	-3.25134
Commuter	My place of work SystemWise is located in the target area. Part of the reason we are located here was the parking. We have never had an issue finding a space, nor have we had complaints from neighbours. This is unfair.	55.94096	-3.25149
Commuter	I travel by car to the tram every day for work. If there is no free parking how can I do this? This will stop me using the tram service and be forced to use Lothian buses. Why would you do this?	55.93396	-3.25697
Commuter	Stop the implementation of paid parking in Saughtonhall	55.94088	-3.2514
Commuter	To use the tram to get to work I park legally and respectful in this area please help commuters by allocating proper bays and have a peak charging structure	55.93915	-3.24986
Commuter	I disagree with this proposal, I would respectfully suggest you provide a better solution for employees of local businesses in the area.	55.9409	-3.25195
Other	We have disabled visitors, regular hall users, sometimes delivery vehicles and tradesmen who need to park outside the hall. At the very least we would require a disabled parking space.	55.94161	-3.24942

Other	I am totally against the proposed parking permits for saughtonhall. There has never been any problems with parking in the saughtonhall area as a whole. The only group to gain from this is Edinburgh Council in the money raised from unnecessary permits.	55.94306	-3.25563
Other	The community hall requires access for disabled, dropping off and collecting children at After School Club, deliveries for events eg Fete, Coffee mornings and maintenance of the grounds	55.94136	-3.24913
Other	Access to community hall would be easier if Double yellow lines were on other side of the road. Perhaps a disabled bay outside the hall or Loading only would be useful	55.94131	-3.24909
Other	THE INTRODUCTION OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS IS NOT NECESSARY OR WANTED . THEY WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE THE AMENITY OF THE AREA FOR RESIDENTS AND MAKE THINGS VERY DIFFICULT FOR VISITING FRIENDS, CARERS AND TRADESMEN.	55.94117	-3.25741
Resident	I approve of permit parking	55.9435	-3.25145
Resident	Why Double yellow lines here!?	55.94339	-3.25307
Resident	Driveway ignored	55.94362	-3.25294
Resident	My driveway seems to have been missed allowing cars to block the entrance, will this be corrected before work starts ? 15/1 glendevon PK.	55.9395	-3.25507
Resident	I am all in favour of this proposal as presently we have people who park there car for the airport bus, a two week holiday then return. Some return in the middle of the night and exchange loud farewells and door slamming. Also we have the commuters who park	55.94371	-3.25137
Resident	The extension to the double yellow line is not required, it will cause problems with door opening due to the trees , the existing double yellow line is satisfactory	55.94373	-3.2514
Resident	There is no problem in my street with a lack of parking spaces, or with any of the neighbouring streets.	55.94039	-3.25716
Resident	I am strongly against having permit parking outside my own house. Vehicle levels do not warrant this at all in our location	55.94255	-3.25327
Resident	We live in a private residents only parking area which is a cul de sac and need no parking permits or yellow lines!	55.94266	-3.25982
Resident	Totally against this - there's no need for permit parking here, plenty of available space. I don't see why I would have to pay for parking at my house. There's a lot of elderly people who wouldn't be able to have visitors if this comes in.	55.94336	-3.25301
Resident	Riversdale Road here is a wide street with rarely more than a few cars parked, other than on rugby international days.	55.94263	-3.24757
Resident	How is council going to stop non residents parking in residents parking spaces	55.94275	-3.26103
Resident	I would have no parking outside my house with single yellow lines & no residents bay nearby. I am 80 & my nearest parking would be some distance away. I'd have to compete with visitors to find a space in a shared bay & parking pressures would be increased	55.93954	-3.25113
Resident	I object to the shared bays located outside my house, I'd prefer residents only as it appears to be only my end of the street that has shared bays. This will result in me finding it difficult to park outside my property.	55.94351	-3.2514
Resident	Parking controls are not required in this area. The street is only used by residents and the introduction of 'shared parking' bays would make parking in the area worse.	55.94268	-3.25538
Resident	Neighbour with limited mobility at 20 Balgreen Rd will no longer be able to park outside her house.	55.94266	-3.25781
Resident	This will have a negative impact on the community with regards to parking. This is shocking from the council and another money making scheme against the public.	55.94309	-3.25042
Resident	We have no parking problems in this area and we don't have any problems for our visitors or tradesmen when they come as there is plenty space to park. I am always able to park at or near my home. There will be NO benefits to residents with a new system.	55.94219	-3.25941
Resident	There is no issue with parking, you would be creating an issue where there are none	55.94284	-3.24759
Resident	Double yellows placed in an area where parking bays are required and there are no obvious reasons for this	55.94191	-3.25844
Resident	Loading or short term stay should be considered here to support local shop	55.9393	-3.25184
Resident	An attempt by the council to push through a solution to a problem that does not exist. A proper consultation with the residents is not possible due to the covid situation, which is being used by the council to push through a scheme that is not required	55.94008	-3.24874

Resident	This is just a money making exercise from CEC to fill their depleting coffers. There is absolutely no need for controlled parking in Saughtonhall. You haven't even set out how much it will cost.	55.93984	-3.24681
Resident	Proposed parking restrictions on Balgreen Park will half current parking capacity, creating a parking problem where one does not currently exist.	55.94162	-3.25793
Resident	Lack of visitor parking or shared spaces on Balgreen Park. This would impede family and friends from visiting. This pressure would only be made worse by reduced parking spaces on the street.	55.94174	-3.25811
Resident	We don't have an issue with parking currently. The proposed structure appears to reduce parking directly outside the house to 1 or 2 spaces. This may make it more difficult for us to park in front of the house and will cost at the same time.	55.94151	-3.25172
Resident	There is no need for this as parking is not an issue and never has been in my 3 years here. All this will do is disrupt a quiet street and cause the destruction of trees, hedges and gardens to make way for drive ways.	55.94377	-3.25284
Resident	There is no need for controlled parking in this area & we totally are opposed to this proposal.	55.94169	-3.24843
Resident	Great...we need permits as when Murrayfield stadium is in use I can't park!	55.9435	-3.25145
Resident	1) I am currently building a double garage to replace my existing single wooden garage which is falling apart. 2) The vehicle I drive is a long wheelbase (6.5 metre) Mercedes Sprinter Coach. I need a longer parking bay.	55.94275	-3.25794
Resident	Having consulted personally with neighbours we are firmly of the view that there is no need or desire for controlled parking in Saughtonhall Crescent. We don't have any issues with non residents parking so there is no need to impose a CPZ in our area.	55.94415	-3.25236
Resident	No need whatsoever for any restrictions in Saughtonhall Circus all households have driveways for one or more cars.No existing parking problems in this area even when rugby is on This will will have a negative impact on visitors	55.94305	-3.24965
Resident	No need for any restrictions in the Saughtonhall area no existing parking issues large number of residents have driveways or ample on street parking there is no problem to be solved here	55.943	-3.25002
Resident	in Glendevon Place we have no parking issues except on rugby days at Murrarfield. We would only need control on those days, if it is pay and display they would just pay, it needs to stop these visitors. Not fair to pay for permit for 2-3 days' benefit	55.9408	-3.25612
Resident	i do not see a problem with the current arrangement, i have lived here for 30 years,have 2 cars at our home and have not had a problem parking in the street. This will definitely cause problems and financial worries.	55.94387	-3.24346
Resident	Either way it's the residents that suffer therefore I prefer not to have the added financial burden of having to purchase parking tickets or permits.	55.94246	-3.25356
Resident	It's infrequent that there's too many vehicles trying to park, and that's mostly to do with rugby so the rest of the year is fairly uninteresting. I am concerned because I have a van which won't fit in my driveway and lives on the .street.	55.94476	-3.24951
Resident	Parking should only be allowed on one side of Western Place to allow access for delivery, refuse and emergency vehicles. This is currently a big problem.	55.9447	-3.24955
Resident	I would like to know how many requests you have received from residents in the Saughtonhall area requesting parking controls in the area. There is no parking problem here. The housing stock is low level, either terraced, bungalows or at most 4 in a block	55.94329	-3.25674
Resident	Cars park on pavement on east restalrig terrace to avoid damage but this is quite recent. Road is passable with on street parking both sides. When one car goes on the pavement others follow suit.	55.96861	-3.15897
Resident	We are an upper villa with 1 narrow driveway to be used for access for 2 properties and therefore there is no possibility for off street parking within our property boundary. We would like accessible on-street parking. We hope plans include cycle lanes.	55.93943	-3.25126
Resident	For three decades resident and visitor parking in this quiet cul-de-sac has been self regulated allowing for one side parking and free flow of traffic. Imposition of statutory regulation and parking charge is unnecessary, would be detrimental to exist	55.94245	-3.26051
Resident	For decades on road parking in South Beechwood has been self-regulated, vehicles being parked on one side or the other along the road, allowing uninterrupted traffic flow, The arrangement works well for everyone. Inclusion in a CPZ is unnecessary.	55.94264	-3.25982
Resident	This is a ridiculous idea. We have a care home in our culdesac. There has never been a problem parking for people. I don't drive or have a car but think family, friends or workman need to come to my house then they will need to pay. I totally object to	55.94264	-3.25982
Resident	We have no problem with parking except when the stadium is in use Then it is a nightmare. our street is too narrow and those attending matches etc llne the street as a result traffic cannot flow.	55.94369	-3.24742
Resident	I have had permission passed to put a driveway into my private garden to the side of 5 Glendevon Park. This is currently in the centre of where you are proposing to put a permit holder bay. This will leave even less space for parking.	55.93954	-3.25431

Resident	Seems unnecessary. Residents and visitors manage to find suitable parking space within reasonable distance	55.94051	-3.25562
Resident	I'm outraged with proposed double yellow lines outside 61 Sth Beechwood, already have long path to walk with heavy bags & you're expecting elderlies to walk even further? Nonresidents will park in private bays. This is not fair and total inconvenience!	55.94276	-3.25916
Resident	No difficulty finding parking to date; annual permit adds to costs, living will become unaffordable	55.94065	-3.25617
Resident	Sledge hammer to crack a nut. Not necessary given there isn't a problem.	55.94315	-3.24897
Resident	At the location marked below, there is no necessity of any road markings. It will disrupt the agreed parking within the street.	55.94314	-3.24901
Resident	There are no permit places outside numbers 53 or 55 Balgreen Rd. If all of Glendevon Ave is mixed use spaces then all visitor traffic will park here and prevent residents from finding a space. Different space types need to be more evenly distributed	55.94181	-3.25544
Resident	There is no requirement to bring in controlled parking in South Beechwood or for that matter Saughtonhall. The survey identified is out of date. It has identified the medical centre as being high use. It is a small centre and does not impact parking.	55.94225	-3.26199
Resident	Double yellow lines and single yellow lines are not required. Currently no issue as parking but restrictions would reduce available spaces.	55.94222	-3.26198
Resident	Dual use parking bays would be extremely restrictive for visitors. 90 mins max stay is ridiculously short period of time. Getting a permit does not mean getting a space. Waste of money and if no parking in area then could impact personal safety in dark.	55.94218	-3.26172
Resident	For whole South Beechwood the changes severely restrict parking unnecessarily and create pressure on private bays which will create problems for residents. There is no external pressure on private bays currently.	55.94281	-3.25895
Resident	Please do not introduce permit/pay and display parking	55.94007	-3.25755
Resident	Previously no significant issues In Saughtonhall Circus apart from inconsiderate parking on corners which despite contacting council and police nothing was done! Think you are wrong to impose parking restrictions in this quiet residential area.	55.94296	-3.24964
Resident	Business vans always parking on corners blocking access/view but otherwise no issues in Circus	55.94289	-3.24991
Resident	I strongly object to the proposals particularly for South Beechwood where no resident permits have been proposed in addition to large amount double yellow lines causing severe parking restrictions to residents who don't have allocated parking. See email.	55.9427	-3.25916
Resident	Balgreen park- no need for double yellow running full length of street. Strongly advise against this, has anyone actually visited the street to look at this or has it all been based off of an OS map? Ample space for two cars to pass currently	55.94145	-3.2577
Resident	As mentioned in the consultation. Balgreen Park stands out as an "anomaly" in having a double yellow line the full length. I am opposed to permits and proposed double yellow. If permits are introduced both sides of the street will be needed for parking	55.94151	-3.25783
Resident	I'm concerned for the future viability of our Saughtonhall Co-op, with no convenient stopping-off place for passing motorists to shop - and with no loading bay provision at the rear. The same may apply at Western Corner.	55.93932	-3.25167
Resident	I am strongly against having a shared bay on this side of the road. It should simply be double yellow lines. By putting this shared bay in you are in effect turning it into a single track road. Which would make it impossible for emergency vehicles.	55.94383	-3.24484
Resident	I would advise that one side of this Riversdale Road should be double yellow. To ensure that emergency vehicles can travel along it. If not you will find cars will park on the pavement.	55.94394	-3.24861
Resident	Where there are driveways, I would suggest that Access Protection Markings are added instead of single yellow lines. By having it as a yellow line it is saying it is ok to park across the driveway. (Especially when rugby events are on).	55.94362	-3.24597
Resident	I am strongly against this permit bay. It would make much more sense to have it on the other side. It is all about ensuring the road is not dangerous.	55.94432	-3.24418
Resident	In a previous comment this shared bay should be removed. The double line should remain in place all the way to 12B. where it meets the single yellow.	55.94366	-3.24545
Resident	I am strongly against having a shared bay on this side of the road. It should just be double yellow.	55.94388	-3.24472
Resident	I am against having single yellow lines across driveways. Access Protection Markings should be there instead.	55.94363	-3.24597
Resident	Please do not introduce parking charges or permits	55.94007	-3.25758

Resident	If this goes ahead. This should be a permit holder bay for 1 ballgreen park and others upto start of corner. I dont want to fight with none residents to park out side my house.	55.94208	-3.25858
Resident	Double yellow lines should not be installed in this road. The road is wide and this should have permit holder bays for the residents on both side of road. Curenly there is enough space for all residents to park using both curbs. cu	55.94214	-3.25879
Resident	The elderly couple in this house will need this bay to park their car.	55.94248	-3.25851
Resident	Double yellow lines have no business in a residential area unless for corners, junctions, or other safety issues. These areas in residential areas where the road width allows should be set up for parking.	55.94203	-3.25864
Resident	This area should be set up for permit holders for these 2 houses.	55.94269	-3.25793
Resident	Road junction is very large and double yello lines are not needed for this area, additional shared or permit holder parking can be easily utilised in this area for both sides.	55.94229	-3.25873
Resident	There is a dropped kerb NOT marked on your map. There is a double gate, obscured by a hedge, giving access to parking on my property. I reserve the right to reinstate this access. Please amend your map to show dropped kerb.	55.94313	-3.24905
Resident	I am very strongly opposed to these plans as I am positive that the proposed plans will cause chaos and a severe lack of residential parking. I question if anyone has actually been out to look at this in person as there is ample space for cars to pass	55.94156	-3.25793
Resident	This is not needed and given changes in commuting habits etc in the last 12 months doesn't have research to support it	55.94148	-3.2578
Resident	We have never had a problem with parking in our street and I only see the proposal to charge our guests and visitors to park here as an alienation. Council looking to fill their coffers in this manner is diabolical	55.94017	-3.24904
Resident	Parking problems in the southern part of the proposed area have been caused by tram parking. You cannot seriously consider that the fair option is to now charge residents to park outside their properties. You desperately need to re-think this.	55.93908	-3.25013
Resident	The provision for non residents is not acceptable. Those with space to create front drive will do so which will further restrict on street parking.	55.94387	-3.25272
Resident	There are currently no issues with parking in saughtonhall. There are no signs of commuters driving to this area to park before taking public transport into town. This is completely unnecessary in this area.	55.94115	-3.26118
Resident	Opposed to paying for a permit, live in a cul de sac and don't find our street particularly busy even on rugby days	55.93934	-3.25414
Resident	So as a home owner you are expecting me to purchase a parking permit? Will I receive a discount to council tax. As other home owners can park in other areas outside their house. Where is the equality in this !	55.93963	-3.24801
Resident	I object to these new proposals, There is no need for double yellow at this part of Riversdale Road, residents who need to use on street parking for any reason will be severely inconvenienced. Things are fine as they are.	55.94294	-3.24746
Resident	Why as a resident can I not park, at all times, in front of my own driveway? My car will be registered to my home address. If a yellow line is put across my driveway then will the "warden" check the vehicles registered address?	55.94255	-3.2488
Resident	There are no issues whatsoever in 90% of the area you have indicated for Soughtonhall. I don't see any benefits even if flowover from neighbouring CPZ zones.	55.94228	-3.25885
Resident	Oppose this scheme as unworkable in our area. Don't thinks this proposal is properly thought through. The Terrace has many private drivewayso don't see a permit improving parking any better than it currently is. You will just cause congestion elsewhere.	55.94287	-3.24909
Resident	I have a shared driveway this will arise to parking problems as the road outside will become a parking lot due to supermarket in th area	55.94008	-3.25162
Resident	All of these proposals (i.e. the whole scheme proposals are very good - well done! This will help to prevent massive disruption when events are taking place at the Stadium.The proposals adjoining my property are fine, thanks.	55.94203	-3.24756
Resident	This would ruin the lovely community feel of the area. PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS	55.94079	-3.25126
Resident	As a resident of c40 years I am unaware of non residential parking being an issue. As a pensioner, visitors, in particular family members with young children, be need to pay to park. This just seems to be an opportunity for the Council to make money.	55.94117	-3.2547
Resident	There is no need for proposed restrictions on my street and surrounding area.	55.94054	-3.25707

Resident	Totally not needed in this area, even though I have off street parking it's just a money making project for the council and will put pressure on other areas totally discussed with this idea	55.94068	-3.2493
Resident	Restricting parking so much is going to have A massive impact on me personally I'm registered disabled and rely on care from family friends Home helps and other agencies with out parking this will be difficult surely yellow lines on corners is enough	55.93964	-3.24776
Resident	This is not acceptable as it will affect our life here.	38.744	-76.0636
Resident	I don't like this as it is an unnecessary tax on resident drivers. The parking in the area is not excessive and this is a stealth tax by the council who are hell bent on banning cars, we don't see commuters park here.	55.9398	-3.25595
Resident	I've lived here for 20yrs and never had a problem parking. My car is always within a few metres of my house even when there's a rugby match at Murrayfield. There's absolutely no need for permit zones	55.94051	-3.25562
Resident	I have lived here for 15 years or so and have never had any problems with parking. I have also spoken with neighbours and they have never had any issues so I'm surprised to see these proposals and the rationale for change.	55.94021	-3.25669
Resident	Looking at the proposals I feel there is no need for parking restrictions in South Beechwood. I would like to see the survey results for this street as looking at it for the year there have been no recorded parking issues. Not enough comment space in box	55.94249	-3.26009
Resident	The lack of residential parking bays, at the south end of Saughtonhall drive, will cause myself great difficulties, as I live next door to the Scot MID store my driveway is constantly being blocked by customers, who are nipping into the Scot mid store	55.93911	-3.25137
Resident	I am against parking restrictions in Saughtonhall area. I have never had a problem with parking. This is just a money making scheme without any consideration for the residents	55.9392	-3.25139
Resident	I do not think parking restrictions are needed in Saughtonhall and on the contrary, it will create problems for residents.	55.94201	-3.25335
Resident	I do not think introduction of parking restriction in Saughtonhall are needed. On the contrary, they will cause problem for residents.	55.93969	-3.2515
Resident	I do not think that there is a need for controlled parking in this area, & there should not be double yellow lines outside our house	55.94264	-3.24756
Resident	Parking should be permitted on both sides of Balgreen Park as the width is adequate.	55.94177	-3.25828
Resident	42 properties on Glendevon Terrace, how many parking spaces, it looks around 50%? Parking spaces should be increased by trimming double yellow lines and allowing parking opposite driveways.	55.94042	-3.25688
Resident	Residents park here, the number of shared parking bays in Saughtonhall drive, Saughton Crescent and Riversdale is disproportionately favouring incoming traffic rather than residents whom very few of have driveways.	55.94294	-3.25175
Resident	Why is ours the only driveway with a single yellow line on our street? We don't need a single yellow line at our driveway. We have a dropped curb which indicates driveway in use.	55.94317	-3.24915
Resident	In general we have few parking issues in the Saughtonhall area, with congestion only near the tram stop at Balgreen/Baird Drive and bus stop at Western Corner/west end of Riversdale Road. Double yellow lines and parking bays would help in these areas.	55.94382	-3.25086
Resident	I have never had any problems parking outside of my flat, there are always plenty of space outside the door. I do not see any need for pay and display here either as there are not businesses nearby that would require that type of parking.	55.9425	-3.25444
Resident	I strongly object to double yellow lines on both sides of South Beechwood especially at No.61. It's not necessary as not affected by commuters. Just sheer inconvenience to residents having to walk far too far with heavy food shop & those disabled. Parkin	55.9428	-3.25905
Resident	There is a double yellow line outside my property- in the middle of the street- where our building parks their cars	55.9434	-3.25315
Resident	This wheelchair space was created for the previous resident, now deceased.	55.94204	-3.25851
Resident	Parking in Glendevon is NOT excessive & residents park thoughtfully. These proposals will create problems for residents who are being punished by an anti car agenda at ECC. What would happen if people add driveways & reduce spaces? ECC are creating issues	55.93987	-3.2559
Resident	This lay by used for Co Op deliveries. Will the new restrictions move them to shared bays?	55.93925	-3.25176
Resident	I will find it harder to park as there are shared bays at my house as double the amount of people will be able to use them	55.9395	-3.25223
Resident	Parking isn't a problem here as there is still enough space to get round when cars etc are parked there	55.94015	-3.25358

Resident	Drivers going to Co Op park across bus stop making it difficult to see buses coming then to get on. Yellow lines are ignored. Needs more monitoring by parking attendants	55.93937	-3.25144
Resident	Drivers going to Co Op/ cashline leave vehicles on zigzag lines. Needs more monitoring by parking attendants	55.93926	-3.25145
Resident	Drivers going to store/ cashline leave vehicles on zigzags. More monitoring by parking attendants needed	55.93927	-3.25126
Resident	Drivers going to Co Op/ cashline leave vehicles in bus stop markings. Need more monitoring by parking attendants	55.93943	-3.25128
Resident	unnecessary as it isn't a busy street unless for sport games and even then its restricted parking. A lot of elderly residents who require care during the day and this is going to negatively affect the care that they receive.	55.94155	-3.24892
Resident	Never had a problem parking nearby. Restrictions on rugby days are also adequate. Our overnight visitors would struggle with proposed plans. Don't believe any neighbours support the proposals - suggest Saughtonhall be excluded from plans.	55.9443	-3.25031
Resident	Since the tram line was built the top half of Baird drive does seem to have a few more cars parked there during the day but there is still ample parking in the area. Any complaint of lack of spaces I'd argue is unfounded.	55.93949	-3.24922
Resident	I don't think parking restrictions are necessary across any of the Saughtonhall area.	55.94013	-3.25712
Resident	I disagree strongly with this proposal and the report submitted to committee in 2019. There is no evidence of serious issues with parking (commuter or otherwise) in our area over the last 10 years.	55.94274	-3.2499
Resident	There are no parking issues in this street and don't understand why residents and visitors of the residents should be penalised financially for having a car. Also I do not understand why there is a proposed double yellow line right outside my building.	55.9434	-3.25325
Resident	No requirement for parking restrictions to be imposed. Will cause significant difficulties for residents being able to park when there is currently no problem. Golf club at the end of Glendevon Park will suffer the consequences of restrictions.	55.93937	-3.25509
Resident	House prices-will be effected Drive ways-lack of trees and hedges People struggling financially-jobless,can't afford permits. The return of people going back to offices in town will be lower-no demand for parking ever here.	55.94369	-3.2526
Resident	Hi.in the next few months, I plan to install a driveway on my property. at the moment you propose to have it as a permit holders bay rather than this in a few months could it be changed to allow for this to happen and save any future alternation .	55.94034	-3.25665
Resident	The southern part of Saughtonhall Drive has only shared use parking places, where the middle part has only permit holders spaces. This seems very unfair as all the visitors to will have to park in our area. Surely a mixture of spaces type would be fairer	55.94044	-3.25141
Resident	It seems to me that the answer to everything these days is to make the people pay more, I think a good idea would be to make the parking permits free and anybody parking here without a permit should be the ones who are fined.	55.94311	-3.25168
Resident	Huge reduction in available parking on Balgreen Park with the double yellow line. Can't work out why this is here - narrower streets don't have this?	55.94155	-3.2578
Resident	This is a bay and a parking space here would not interfere with traffic crossing the bridge	55.94003	-3.24643
Resident	At the point pinpointed there is a kerbside tree. The car parked at the end of the resident's parking stretch will be parked such that they will not be able to open their offside doors.Why does the double yellow line have to come so far round the corner?	55.9437	-3.2514
Resident	I don't think there is much of a problem with parking only a slight problem with access for large vehicles. I don't think its a good time for a survey since circumstances are different due to Covid.	55.9397	-3.25557
Resident	I am in favour of the parking proposals for the Saughtonhall area.	55.94344	-3.24946
Resident	I support the proposals for Saughtonhall	55.94344	-3.24946
Resident	I have council approval for a dropped kerb from the council (to allow me to create a garden drive for e-charging) but I have not converted my drive yet so how can I get this annotated to negate a bay being created in front of my house ?	55.9435	-3.25145
Resident	This is a nursery and scout hall which should have double yellows the entire length past 52 and 54 saughton crescent.	55.94359	-3.25465
Resident	There should only be 1 bay per property (not necessarily outside the property)with remainder of street double yellowed allowing safer cycling	55.94166	-3.25578
Resident	We welcome the general principle BUT we have reservations about 'shared use' parking either side of our gate. It will not alleviate our issues - parking across our gate, park and ride , large vans either side of the gate blocking view to drive out.	55.94376	-3.25112

Resident	Important that double yellow lines go to top of this street to protect entry to recreation ground which is often blocked. Entry required for grass cutting, grounds deliveries etc.	55.94054	-3.24841
Resident	Helpful to have these double yellow lines here. Inconsiderate parking often makes this very narrow.	55.94382	-3.25045
Resident	Double yellow lines on the four corners of this junction are unnecessary. Rare that anyone parks this close to the junction.	55.94304	-3.2492
Resident	My view is that introduction of a CPZ in Saughtonhall is unnecessary. However, if it is to be introduced nonetheless pleased that this area designated as Mews as will provide an appropriate degree of flexibility for residents.	55.94284	-3.24896
Resident	No one ever parks in this area currently and would be likely to make left turn from Saughtonhall Terrace dangerous given oncoming traffic coming around sharp bend from Riversdale Crescent.	55.94201	-3.24796
Resident	This severely restricts parking for locals. We don't have issues with people from outside Edinburgh using this area for park and ride. This proposal is purely an exercise to increase revenue for the council. Costs to install will not be recouped.	55.94048	-3.24837
Resident	Proposal drawing shows double yellow line in front of existing driveway at this address.	55.94173	-3.24948
Resident	I disagree strongly with this proposal and the report submitted to committee in 2019. There is no evidence of serious issues with parking (commuter or otherwise) in our area over the last 10 years.	55.94275	-3.24987
Resident	I see no need for this, it is a money making council scheme. I think it will put unnecessary pressure on residents. Very little evidence of people parking outwith in the area.	55.9421	-3.25176
Resident	We don't have a parking problem in our area and will lose a lot of resident parking with all the double yellow lines. It is a very bad idea.	55.94104	-3.26283
Resident	There are and never have been any issues requiring a controlled parking zone in Riversdale Road. This is simply a money grabbing issue by the Council and not acceptable. If it is implemented will council ensure drop kerbs for residents to allow access t	55.94293	-3.24782
Resident	I would like to suggest you use a system adopted by the area at Mark Erskine School. You are not allowed to park between the hours of 11.00 am and 15.00 pm and works well. The parking around Saughtonhall has increased but is not that bad.	55.94543	-3.26648
Resident	We will lose all on street parking due to single yellow lines and there are to be no designated residents parking bays.	55.93955	-3.25119
Resident	The issue of non-residential parking does not exist here. As a result I can see no need to extend the CPZ this far out from the City Centre. There are many locations in this area for parking that does not impact residential parking.	55.9413	-3.25559
Resident	We live in a courtyard in Balgreen Avenue and do not have any parking issues and these proposals would cause significant disruption where we presently have none - both in our courtyard and on the street.	55.94143	-3.25981
Resident	I have studied the proposed map. If I am correct the drop kerb position to the left hand side of my house is out by 3 meters. This apparent error would mean the purple parking zone would be in front of my left hand driveway	55.94006	-3.2493
Resident	I think double yellow lines on the entrance of Baird Gardens is essential.	55.93996	-3.24938
Resident	The only other area in saughtonhall that badly needs addressing is Baird Drive as for the rest no need to do anything the Council is just waisting money	55.93896	-3.2506
Resident	we do not have any problems with people from outside the area parking	55.94255	-3.25825
Resident	Extending the CPZ into the Saughtonhall area is totally unnecessary as 99.9% of vehicles belong to residents and not commuters.	55.94235	-3.25032
Resident	How will the council provide electric charging points on Saughtonhall Drive	55.9435	-3.25145
Resident	The proposed MEWS areas are currently essential for residents to park from between 23 and 43 Saughtonhall Drive as parking is restricted at junctions. Loosing ~8 parking spaces as a result of the MEWS would create a massive parking problem for residents	55.94307	-3.25092
Resident	Restrictions unnecessary - no issues as a household with two cars getting parked on street. Restrictions likely to lead to greater disruption as grandparents helping with childcare unable to get parked.	55.94067	-3.25121
Resident	Where will payment meters be positioned? We have issues with homeowners on Saughtonhall Avenue using our street as it is. How can we be assured we will be able to park outside our properties when bays are introduced?	55.94147	-3.24787
Resident	Making Glendevon Ave shared use, unlike all surrounding areas on BGR, will cause displacement of any non-residential parking to this area, creating parking pressure outside our house where none existed before. 250 characters is insufficient.	55.94185	-3.25543
Resident	The reduction in parking with double yellow lines around this area is unnecessary and will not improve road safety - and will create parking problems where none previously existed.	55.94217	-3.25493

Resident	Why are there double yellows over my driveway? That means I can't access the driveway	55.94164	-3.24951
Resident	Would you please advise where we can access the evidence that there is a parking issue that warrants the scale of the restrictions proposed. Would you also advise exact what the red colouring implies for Beechmount Park	55.94365	-3.25624
Resident	I would have no parking outside my house with single yellow lines & no residents bay nearby. I am 80 & my nearest parking would be some distance away. I'd have to compete with visitors to find a space in a shared bay & parking pressures would be increased	55.93953	-3.25114
Resident	Unacceptable for double yellow line outside house. There should be no parking changes in our street	55.9403	-3.24834
Resident	Excessive double yellow lines along this road	55.94307	-3.25664
Resident	Exit from the bridge is dangerous, particularly as a cyclist as the visibility is obscured by walls and gatepost. Not strictly a parking issue but something to be aware of.	55.94451	-3.244
Resident	Residents and business owners out on Saughtonhall already are struggling to find a space to park and use this street to ease the parking out there this will just be chaotic for them and us as residents trying to find a space THIS IS A LUDICROUS IDEA	55.94332	-3.2494
Resident	There is no issue with ability to park on Balgreen Road. Even when the restriction are in place for rugby, you can always find a space. This will have a negative impact on the environment, There is no need for permit parking.	55.94108	-3.25453
Resident	I object to parking restrictions on Balgreen Avenue and Park. There is no parking pressure in this area and restrictions are unnecessary. The lines and signage reduce the visual amenity and will make my home less accessible to friends and family.	55.9422	-3.25864
Resident	Will you be installing EV Charge points as part of these changes? Seems like the obvious time to do that if you are installing meters and rezoning parking.	55.94344	-3.2511
Resident	We don't have a parking problem in our area. Permits will encourage private driveways, residents parking off street and allowing the road to free up for increased vehicular speeds, not safe. This will cause more issue that it will be solving.	55.94153	-3.25543
Resident	Our garage is at dropped pin. We plan to have a PHEV or an electric car soon. we would always need access to this, but a single yellow line would let people park when they can. we normally park on criss/cross area that is paved or in front of door.	55.94144	-3.25961
Resident	I fear there will many more issues for residents here. The single yellow from 43 to 25 balgreen avenue should be a white no parking line i.e. leading on to a driveway/garage. The double yellow in front of 35 and 37 should also white line.	55.94146	-3.25963
Resident	The pinned location is my garage. if i park my car in front of my garage one of the tyres will be on the yellow line. I want to continue parking either in front of my main door/garage (no. 35) w/o falling foul of any regulation. Please change plan.	55.94144	-3.25961
Resident	There is no need for this. Also - any zones that are not permit only will, as a result, become unnecessarily congested which means that even with a permit we will not have any place to park on our own street at this refers to our street.	55.94265	-3.25555
Resident	This one should be shared use so people can access the park and WOL walkway by car we should be encouraging outdoor recreation not limiting it. Maximum stay time on pay and display of 5 hours or so will prevent miss use by office workers in the city.	55.94432	-3.24416
Resident	Moving bays across the road from drive ways is a good idea. Double yellow on driveways might be wise.	55.94381	-3.24481
Resident	Parking in Saughtonhall Drive is never a problem for residents, visitors or tradesmen. Unreasonable to impose permit system to boost council funding.	55.94127	-3.25151
Resident	Fortunate to own house with a driveway – But deeply opposed to any notion of residents having to pay to park near their own property. We feel this is a deterrent for multiple households visiting .e.g. both sets of our parents from Dundee	55.93942	-3.24845
Resident	Extremely unhappy with double yellow line outside my house - look at the number of cars parked on the street on a normal day as there is nowhere near enough parked cars to warrant parking restrictions, only concern is money.	55.94267	-3.24754
Resident	There is absolutely no parking pressure in my street and we don't expect any even if parking in corstorphine is restricted. No need for any change. in fact with yellow lines going in that in itself will cause less parking space than is available now.	55.94405	-3.25359
Resident	There is no parking problem in Saughtonhall, with the exception of a few times a year when Murrayfield is in use. A problem will be created if the proposed restrictions go ahead.	55.94016	-3.25361
Resident	My property is to have single yellow lines outside and no allocated parking, I do not have a driveway. There are no parking issues in this street. Costly pointless exercise.	55.93924	-3.25127

Resident	South Beechwood is a nice quiet residential area that isn't affected by commuters. Putting double yellow lines both sides on the road this area may be full from commuters who won't be able to park on Balgreen Road.	55.94264	-3.25982
Resident	The parking charges that you are suggesting appear ridiculous and money grabbing to me. We generally do not have significant numbers of cars on the street around my flat and it is only the residents and their visitors that use the street for parking.	55.94146	-3.25294
Resident	I concerned about elderly visitors not being able to park. There are no issues with safety and parking so this seems unnecessary.	55.94359	-3.24656
Resident	the only problem with parking is with cars parked on BGR too close to SH Ave W, double yellow line needs to be extended to reduce near misses. I do not support permits as this will decrease green space and increase pollution as residents convert gardens	55.94019	-3.25337
Resident	parking is not a problem commuters do not park here	55.94014	-3.2515
Resident	There are no current parking issues within my area. I never have any trouble parking outside my property. The proposal of a shared bay directly outside my property will no doubt increase the issue rather than reduce it.	55.94268	-3.25541
Resident	Strongly object. Not in any way necessary. Always available spaces for parking. Councils will make money at local residence and businesses expense. Suggest applying efforts to enforcing 20mph speed limit to make road safer.	55.9418	-3.25173
Resident	I support the idea but there is still too much space lost to private parking. Cut all parking on one side of B'green Road, S'HDrive, S'H Ave, Glend' Pk and provide segregated cycle routes. Enable kids to cycle to school,library,park!	55.94025	-3.25372
Resident	Please remove parking from outside the length of the nursery.(52) and replace with double yellows and even school yellow zig zags. It is thoroughly unpleasant and dangerous for toddlers on narrow pavement and cars swinging in to park.	55.94359	-3.2547
Resident	Could the double yellows be extended here please to allow direct access to my side gate for cargo bikes carrying children.	55.94154	-3.25602
Resident	Could this section of road be closed? Dangerous to cross. Poor visibility and high speed cornering encouraged.	55.94002	-3.25335
Resident	I use this side gate to enter/exit my house with kids/shopping strapped to a bike. Access is difficult when cars are parked directly outside the gate. Is it possible to request this area is kept clear of parked cars? Or only dropped kerb?	55.94153	-3.25603
Resident	This IS required and will hopefully eliminate parking on junctions and pavements. Can this be done without the pavement poll clutter though?	55.94039	-3.25376
Resident	Will this be on streets which are not main roads? Existing residents shouldn't have to pay parking	55.94292	-3.25454
Resident	I dont think it is necessary as we do not have a problem with non residents parking. I think it will encourage more people to convert front gardens to driveways which goes against keeping the street visually appealing.	55.94215	-3.25647
Resident	You are trying to solve a problem that is neither perceived nor real. This is clearly a revenue generating exercise.	55.94215	-3.25647
Resident	Map is out of date. Double yellow lines would make parking worse as care home staff will use more of resident's spaces as care home has insufficient. Parking currently not an issue but proposals would mean non-residents would use private spaces.	55.94266	-3.25968
Resident	I agree to double yellows by the island outside my house but as per the island at the top of the Drive, there is no reason for the double lines to extend as far as the disabled parking bay outside 114.	55.94079	-3.25163
Resident	This was originally a disabled space assigned to the resident at No 26 Baird Drive who died in 2009, and so is no longer required. The location of the space also precludes our being able to provide a driveway to our property at No 28.	55.93913	-3.24963
Resident	I can count a handful of times during the entire year where parking is an issue!!	55.9424	-3.25711
Resident	This will severely restrict parking in an area that does not have any parking issues. There is no need for these measures.	55.94017	-3.24847
Resident	Very limited opportunity for visitors to park here (especially given the reduction in spaces for residents due to the double yellow line).	55.9417	-3.25801
Resident	Absolutely zero problems with parking on the area. Only problems recently have come due to the fact half the roads have been dug up and half of the street is unavailable for parking! Just a money making scheme nothing more!	55.94233	-3.25332
Resident	Pay and display right next to a convenience store? Who is going to pay for parking just to pick up milk? No one. You will force it out of business and the community will lose this much valued service.	55.93926	-3.25179

Resident	You must think nobody comes to visit - where are non-residents meant to park?	55.94104	-3.25471
Resident	This area would be better suited as a mews.	55.94166	-3.26013
Visitor	Post Covid we want to be able park. Not have to pay unnecessarily and also be limited in time and numbers visiting. No restrictions required at all.	55.94349	-3.2529
Visitor	No need for parking restrictions on a quiet residential street. Parking availability is not an issue for residents and guests here.	55.94255	-3.25825
Visitor	There is no parking issues whatsoever in this area, this is a scheme to tax the residents. I object to this in the strongest terms.	55.94276	-3.25536
Visitor	My elderly parents have no driveway to use, would have no parking outside their house due to single yellow lines, would have no dedicated residents bays in the street & parking pressures would be greater due to the volume of shared bays in this area	55.93952	-3.25109
Visitor	Consider this a poorly researched and unnecessary use of funds.	55.94156	-3.25793
Visitor	Rediculous proposal, there is no parking issues in this area. This is obviously a revenue generation tactic which will effect house prices etc..	55.94141	-3.25768
Visitor	I don't feel I should have to pay for parking if I'm going to visit my parents who live here.	55.94019	-3.24816
Visitor	This road is wide enough for a single lane of traffic and parking on both sides, as demonstrated by this proposal allowing it at certain times, and therefore this single yellow line is unnecessarily restrictive on parking.	55.94018	-3.24832
Visitor	The length of this proposed double yellow line is excessive and therefore unnecessarily restricts parking opportunities on this road. The Highway Code says do not park within 10 metres of a junction, so is all the length that is required here.	55.94024	-3.24833
Visitor	The length of this proposed double yellow line is excessive and therefore unnecessarily restricts parking opportunities on this road. The Highway Code says do not park within 10 metres of a junction, so is all the length that is required here.	55.94029	-3.24814
Visitor	The length of this proposed double yellow line is excessive and therefore unnecessarily restricts parking opportunities on this road. The Highway Code says do not park within 10 metres of a junction, so is all the length that is required here.	55.94042	-3.24737
Visitor	The length of this proposed double yellow line is excessive and therefore unnecessarily restricts parking opportunities on this road. The Highway Code says do not park within 10 metres of a junction, so is all the length that is required here.	55.94	-3.24903
Visitor	Seems no reason why parking spaces could not be provided here at all times (except at vehicle accesses) rather than just outwith the CPZ operating times.	55.94093	-3.25002
Visitor	Seems no reason why parking spaces could not be provided here at all times (except at vehicle accesses) rather than just outwith the CPZ operating times.	55.94122	-3.25024
Visitor	Seems no reason why parking spaces could not be provided here at all times (except at vehicle accesses) as for the rest of this length of road.	55.94106	-3.24747
Visitor	Seems no reason why parking spaces could not be provided here at all times (except at accesses) as this road is wide enough to allow parking opposite a jct. Compare with the Carrick Knowe Ave/Traquair Park jct where there are no proposed restrict	55.94046	-3.24698
Visitor	Seems no reason why parking spaces could not be provided here at all times (except at accesses) as this road is wide enough to allow parking opposite a jct. Compare with the Carrick Knowe Ave/Traquair Park jct where there are no proposed restrictions.	55.94057	-3.24709
Visitor	There is no need for these restrictions, parking is fine in this area.	55.94434	-3.25106
Visitor	Not required, these streets are not at all busy when parking controls operate.	55.93892	-3.25142
Visitor	Unnecessary way to try and get money out of residents in a quite area where parking is not problematic	55.94245	-3.25834
Visitor	I visit regularly to help look after my brother who has motor neuron disease. There's plenty parking so unfair to charge for this.	55.93902	-3.24958
	You've taken away half the parking in a wide street used solely by residents and then charge them to park on the other side. You're creating problems, not solving them.	55.9415	-3.25783

7. WEST LEITH


7.1.1 279 people dropped 389 pins on the interactive map

7.1.2 Of those, 363 had comments and 26 were left blank

7.1.3 50 comments are positive

7.1.4 323 comments are negative

7.1.5 16 comments are neutral



7.1.6 The most common theme of the comments is about the loss of parking availability should the proposals be implemented.

7.1.7 The second most common theme is comments stating that the current layout/restrictions work fine as they are.

I am a...	Comment	X	Y
Business owner	My business Clown Around on Restalrig Road has now been closed a year due to government covid regulations. Now the council wants to make it make it impossible for any of my customers to park in the surrounding area. Think about local independentbusiness!	55.96655	-3.15532
Business owner	The parking restrictions are going to damage local businesses which have already suffered dramatically with lockdown	55.96696	-3.15679
Business owner	This is a massive over reaction to parking. The problem of parking isn't as big as this seems to make out. I would be looking at closing my business and making 5 people redundant big this comes into place.	55.96557	-3.16305
Commuter	I am a teacher at Hermitage park primary and rely on my car to get to work as I live a 35-40 minute drive away. If this goes ahead it will take me even longer to get to work as I'll have to find a free space or park quite a distance away and walk.	55.96556	-3.16116
Commuter	I am working for The City Edinburgh Council. I choose this location so I don't need to face difficulties with parking spaces and fees for that. I am expecting that Council will pay for my parking time.	55.9659	-3.16193
Commuter	I come in from East Lothian and work in Hermitage park. There is very little parking as it is, I don't know what I would do if this goes ahead.	55.96604	-3.16133
Commuter	I am an NHS worker, this parking changed would effect all of our staff members along with our patients. We aim to serve the local area and I know if this was put in place many of our staff members would look for work elsewhere.	55.96918	-3.16479

Other	Where on earth are teachers and other staff going to park to get to their work at Hermitage Park Primary School. I am currently shielding so am not keen to use public transport and even if I was there no direct route from my home to my place of work.	55.96586	-3.16187
Other	AS AN OWNER, AND VISITOR. I THINK THIS IS BAD FOR THE WHOLE AREA. THERE'S NOT MANY PARKING SPACES AS IT IS. GOING TO CAUSE TROUBLE AMONGST NEIGHBOURS. RIDICULOUS.	55.96437	-3.16186
Other	Family and friends stay in area and never had any issue.	55.96723	-3.16057
Other	The proposed parking bay is within a private development	55.96718	-3.16473
Other	Permit spaces have been allocated within private land	55.96718	-3.16471
Other	Permit spaces have been allocated within private property	55.96719	-3.16465
Other	Permit spaces have been allocated within private property	55.96721	-3.16455
Other	Permit spaces have been allocated within private property	55.96722	-3.16449
Other	Permit space have been proposed within private land	55.96724	-3.16441
Other	Permit space has been proposed within private land	55.96727	-3.16435
Other	Permit space been proposed within private land	55.96726	-3.16435
Other	Permit space been proposed within private land	55.96728	-3.16425
Other	Permit space been proposed within private land	55.9673	-3.16419
Other	Permit space been proposed within private land	55.96731	-3.16413
Other	The parking bay is within a private development	55.96719	-3.16466
Resident	Opposed	55.9648	-3.1613
Resident	I have never experienced a problem parking local to my home. Also, if a CPZ is introduced, how will visitors be able to stay with me overnight with only 1 hour parking vouchers available?	55.96725	-3.15875
Resident	Totally unnecessary to implement parking permits in this area. I've lived here for 22 years and have never had any trouble parking. A punitive money grab by the council.	55.96672	-3.16103
Resident	Would like to see double yellow lines on street corners but I am totally against any other parking restrictions. We have no issues at all but restrictions would cause numerous problems	55.96732	-3.16039
Resident	Parking not a significant problem at the moment. Leave as it is rather than add a further expense to motorists for parking outside their own home	55.96737	-3.16042
Resident	There should be double yellow lines - left side Lochend Road on way down opposite Upper Hermitage. This would prevent cars parked up on pavements. Road is used by emergency services and bus route. No parking on road would improve flow. Put up 20mph sign.	55.96678	-3.16459
Resident	We live at 66 Lochend Road and have a drive. The map indicates plan for yellow line outside 66 & 68, which also has drive. 64 LR has drive but map indicates parking zone. Map / plan is not an accurate reflection of this part of Lochend Road.	55.9656	-3.16366
Resident	Don't want to pay for permit, or visitors to be restricted to pay and display. No issues with commuters parking on our streets currently. Currently ample space for resident parking. Restalrig Terr. with double yellows would make our parking a nightmare.	55.96771	-3.1614
Resident	Easter Hermitage shared use bays. Wrong as residents have servitude in title deeds and pay property owners liability insurance to cover. Factor maintains and paid for residents only parking signs and mono block paving.	55.9663	-3.15753
Resident	This is a really tight community, and we work out parking without difficulty so please do not interfere. Also you will issue more permits that there are parking spaces and we can't park on the main road, which we need to do.	55.96649	-3.16157
Resident	What is happening in the area marked news?	55.96645	-3.16203
Resident	I wish to state my objection to the proposed changes to the parking in Cornhill Terrace and advise I strongly object to these plans, there is no need for this in this street having lived here for 20 years, it is only residents who park in this street.	55.96766	-3.16062
Resident	The proposal does absolutely nothing to help the residents on our street and would in fact be detrimental! There is no need for "shared use" or permit parking on this street at all! Just another excuse for you to make money of the residents. Daylight rob	55.96512	-3.16046
Resident	Hawthill is a residential estate and currently only has issues when football is on apart from then proposed restrictions would be negative for a few residents leaving them no parking in the estate	55.96371	-3.15803
Resident	Not suitable in our street.	55.96481	-3.16112

Resident	Commuters are not taking up parking spaces in my area, there are simply too many residents with cars so introducing permit parking would be a waste of time. Double yellow lines on street corners would help traffic / deliveries though.	55.9665	-3.16011
Resident	The proposed parking permit bays in upper hermitage off lochend road are part of a private development. How can these be included as proposed permit bays for others outside of the development to use?	55.96719	-3.16425
Resident	one thing, remove the pay and display bays from blackie road to the junction with East Hermitage place and make it double yellows all the way down - with cars parked on both sides the road is width is reduced to one lane and is often congested.	55.96922	-3.15927
Resident	I object strongly to this proposal, we are 71 year old pensioners and cannot afford the cost of such a scheme, we have no problems with parking in our area and see no reason to impose such disgraceful parking restrictions	55.96634	-3.15937
Resident	There is currently a bus stop here, but you've put no provision in for a bus cage. I'm fairly sure a single yellow line through a bus stop is not going to help local services. Can you confirm that the bus stop is being kept in place?	55.96847	-3.16647
Resident	The South side of Burns Street is all garages. Are you sure that placing a single yellow line accross the garage entrances is safe and in any way good for the garage owners?	55.96864	-3.16468
Resident	Having purchased my property party on the basis that there is a residents only car park, these proposals are ridiculous. The car park at Barleyhill Terrace is already outlined as being for residents use only and should not be included in these proposals.	55.96664	-3.15903
Resident	First time buyer, purchased a property in Barleyhill Terrace. A major factor in our decision was the PRIVATE car park. ECC have since "adopted" the car park to implement these charges. Current parking allocation is fine among residents. Why should we pay	55.96744	-3.15618
Resident	With the Covid situation resulting in a drastic change in behaviours (commuting and retail) which will carry on into post -covid, the plans are inappropriate and unnecessary in this area.	55.96771	-3.16897
Resident	At present these are parking spaces. They should remain as the parking problem will be made worse by the council removing spaces.	55.96588	-3.1618
Resident	At present this is a parking space. It should remain as the parking problem will be made worse by the council removing spaces.	55.96596	-3.16148
Resident	Once this goes back to normal and parking is allowed at weekends and evening and nights it will help alleviate parking issues. If this remains then it is the council trying to create a problem.	55.96582	-3.16208
Resident	I do not agree with the proposals as more permits for parking in this street will be sold than there are parking spaces (due to the mews) and so, despite paying for parking I will not be able to park in my street if these proposals go ahead.	55.96564	-3.16308
Resident	If this goes ahead (I do not approve of it) then I would expect to still find a space in my street, even on event days at Meadowbank and the Hibs Stadium. I would expect cars to be removed from this area if they have no permit to park.	55.96581	-3.16229
Resident	There is hardly enough parking for residents that need the use of a car and that will just make everyone take the residents places	55.96742	-3.16759
Resident	This proposal is surely very underhand and sleekit exactly how have you let the residents know about this we have not received any communication about this. and the mmajority of residents will not be able to afford the cost	55.96634	-3.15937
Resident	This proposal is surely very underhand and sleekit exactly how have you let the residents know about this we have not received any communication about this. and the mmajority of residents will not be able to afford the cost	55.96634	-3.15937
Resident	Insufficient parking for even 1 car per household. Is this a council money making scheme? What is the reason behind it? Unworkable!	55.96839	-3.1597
Resident	There are no issues with parking - please do not introduce parking restrictions, this will only have a negative effect on residents& visitors. This isn't Leith, this is not an overly busy area.	55.96349	-3.15573
Resident	This proposal is completely untenable. There is already barely enough parking for residents in this area, and you are planning to take away at least half of what we have! Where are residents going to park??? Completely unacceptable!	55.96739	-3.16223
Resident	Vehemently opposed. This will leave residents with nowhere to park!!! 50% of parking removed from our road for no reason, and it is mainly residents who park here.	55.96746	-3.1621
Resident	Don't believe this will reduce carbon emissions or commuter traffic but will reduce parking space available to residents. There is not a problem with commuter traffic parking in this area and seems to be a money making scheme for the council.	55.96629	-3.16308

Resident	I don't think the proposal has been researched properly and does not suit the area for a number of reasons.	55.96802	-3.16235
Resident	Double yellow lines on Restalrig Terr and East Restalrig Terr will potentially turn the street into a fast short cut between Lochend Rd & Restalrig Rd. This will make it more dangerous for pedestrians. There is no problem with non residents parking here.	55.96803	-3.16218
Resident	I don't think there will be enough spaces for residents to park if the proposal goes ahead. This means the proposal will be causing the problem that it claims to be aiming to solve. I don't think a problem of non residents parking here exists.	55.96781	-3.1636
Resident	The proposal is likely to make people resort to paving their front gardens to use for parking as there is unlikely to be enough parking space provided for residents. Taking away vital green space in the city is surely not to be encouraged.	55.96846	-3.15963
Resident	Terrible proposal. Have spoken to several people in the area, all have been against it & most are saying they won't pay for permit, will just park in nearby streets. Can't see how this benefits anyone except to line the council's pockets.	55.96334	-3.15629
Resident	Completely opposed. 25 years resident. Where is bus stop? Proposals represent reduction in parking for residents and visitors and discriminate against those with mobility issues.	55.96791	-3.1581
Resident	The additional cost of a parking permit may price us out of the area and we'll have to move. It may seem like a small cost but Covid restrictions have had a massive financial impact.	55.96895	-3.16132
Resident	I am strongly opposed to this proposal. Parking is difficult enough as it is and this is additional and unforeseen costs for residents.	55.96812	-3.15865
Resident	This is awful, extremely dangerous. This leaves nowhere to park for residents, devalues our house prices, and will encourage dangerous driving. There are absolutely no problems with the way it currently is. Don't change it.	55.96813	-3.16122
Resident	There is no problem of commuters parking in this area and so permits are not the appropriate solution to this. I can understand putting double yellows on corners to allow traffic flow and to meet the highway code but that is the only measure I agree with	55.96683	-3.15938
Resident	This will make life more difficult for residents. The parking works as it is we cannot lose any of our residents parking. My car is parked in the day outside my house as I work at night. A single yellow will mean I can't park my car. Think of shift work	55.96756	-3.16112
Resident	It would be even better if there was a way to stop it becoming a fast "rat run" to allow our children to continue playing out on the streets. A barrier between East and Restalrig terrace would help stop this.	55.96789	-3.16323
Resident	Having more City Car club spaces in the Restalrig/Ryehill areas would also help more people get rid of their cars and use the car sharing more readily.	55.96775	-3.16389
Resident	Really like the plan for the school street this will make it much safer for school kids and residents alike.	55.96591	-3.16164
Resident	My only concern would be the single yellow lines on Lochend Road would increase the amount of speeding which is already a problem. Are there plans to look at this?	55.96733	-3.16481
Resident	This is solely a residential and school drop off with very limited parking as it stands. It does not get used as a drop off point for commuters therefore I reject the proposal on this basis and believe the sole motivation is to obtain further revenue.	55.96637	-3.15982
Resident	Making my street a mews when there is hardly any parking in the street at present. I have older residents in the street who find it difficult to park at present. Making them find on street parking elsewhere is counter productive.	55.96684	-3.15617
Resident	Making my street a mews when there is hardly any parking in the street at present. I have older residents in the street who find it difficult to park at present. Making them find on street parking elsewhere is counter productive.	55.96684	-3.15617
Resident	I don't live in a through road, parking is difficult for all but we manage, making it a mews would be more difficult and force us to park in the other streets, not helping anyone. This change about money for the council not better parking.	55.96684	-3.15617
Resident	Worried about the overspill from Cornhill Terrace and East Restalrig into Ryehill Gardens. We are thinking about buying an electric car, this would impact our chances of being parked outside our house to charge our car.	55.96721	-3.15968
Resident	The proposals for a parking zone in this area are completely unworkable. Introducing so many yellow lines in a relatively small area will greatly reduce the number of parking spaces in the neighborhood. Parking near home will become impossible for many.	55.96784	-3.15594
Resident	I am completely against this - no parking restrictions are required, there are no parking issues here. PLEASE DO NOT MAKE RESIDENTS PAY TO PARK OUTSIDE THEIR OWN HOME!!!	55.96337	-3.15411

Resident	in favour of restrictions to make the streets safer such as double yellow lines at corners. However it is only residents parking permits unnecessarily and problematic	55.96722	-3.15862
Resident	No provision for visitors	55.96743	-3.1588
Resident	The traffic/parking which is being moved out of this area will be pushed towards my own area and creating problems elsewhere. I have children who attend Hermitage Park primary and both parents work full time so we have no option but to drive to school.	55.96586	-3.16187
Resident	Not appropriate for our street.	55.96481	-3.16133
Resident	If the aim is to encourage commuter use of cars. Please can the locations of cycle safe cycle storage be shared, or if there provision to actually provide any? And when will the awful potholes that make cycling risky for any commuter be fixed?	55.96739	-3.16869
Resident	I don't agree with this at all. I'm strongly against it.	55.96464	-3.16198
Resident	The reduction on parking in the Restalrigs will impact residents in the Ryehills more than the pressures from the zoning on leith walk. It will make it impossible to find parking on the weekends and evenings because of the overall reduction in parking.	55.96837	-3.16017
Resident	Hi, I live in the colonies on Leith Links that are are marked as 'mews', however there's no explanation about what this means in relation to parking. Will this be free parking or will we need to apply for permits?	55.9691	-3.16097
Resident	Does not solve the main issue of football traffic blocking access for emergency services	55.9641	-3.15847
Resident	I don't understand why permits are required for Ryehill streets - we don't have a parking problem. You are able to get a space even when e.g. the Hibs games are on. I'd resent having to pay for a permit to address a problem that doesn't exist	55.9667	-3.16023
Resident	I support efforts to reduce car use and while this will impact upon me to some extent, I do think it is probably a good idea.	55.96906	-3.16099
Resident	So my parents use the private car park but I would need to buy a permit . I work from home and need my car to go out at night . I can't afford permit.	55.96581	-3.15914
Resident	I don't like the fact that there are yellow lines going across my driveway	55.96464	-3.15729
Resident	I have wanted permit bays for a long time due to the number of people that park all day / evenings / match days and no parking to access property easily. My concern is that the permit bays are insufficient to meet the demand and will make no difference	55.96527	-3.16313
Resident	I fail to see how this will improve the area. There are just enough spaces for residents as it is, reducing the space they can use is just going to force people to park elsewhere rather than reduce the amount of cars in the area. NOT ENOUGH SPACE	55.96745	-3.1629
Resident	Parking is already pushed to the limits in this street. If you impose a double yellow line along Restalrig Terrace and elsewhere this will force cars into other areas. This is unworkable. Rethink required.	55.96752	-3.1652
Resident	This is a terrible plan for Restalrig Terrace/East Restalrig Terrace. It will leave us with much less parking than we have now and will result in most residents parking further away from their houses, potentially in other streets thus counterproductive.	55.96819	-3.16194
Resident	No required as parking as ample	55.96487	-3.16154
Resident	Been living at this location for 20 years and not had any problems with parking close to my home regardless of day or time.	55.96789	-3.1581
Resident	We will send a separate email with comments. Thank you.	55.96824	-3.15701
Resident	Some of the changes are good. It not happy with a lot	55.96577	-3.15349
Resident	Some of the changes are good. It not happy with a lot	55.96577	-3.15349
Resident	Can't understand why there is to be half the provision of space on East Restalrig Terrace. There is NO problem with non residential use here. Where can all these vehicles go under this proposal? Permits can be purchased but there is no chance of parking!	55.96806	-3.16194
Resident	There isn't enough space for all cars to park at the moment, so where do we park when you're displacing over 50% of the spaces?	55.96827	-3.1604
Resident	THIS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH HELPING FOLK PARK OUTSIDE THEIR HOMES, ITS ALL ABOUT FILLING CEC COFFERS. IF THIS WAS GENUINE(WHICH IT ISN'T) CEC WOULD GIVE FOLK FREE PERMITS. WE HAVE NO PROBS WITH PARKING HERE!!	55.96493	-3.16142
Resident	These restrictions are will be detrimental to residents. Is this a CEC money making exercise? I cannot see any benefits to residents relating to the proposals	55.96771	-3.16043
Resident	There is no real reason to implement the proposed parking restrictions. Who is expected to benefit? The Incompetent CEC money making exercise.	55.9676	-3.15886

Resident	This is a residential area with no problem of non residents parking in this street. The street is busy in the evenings with residents cars. Putting in pay meters and permit zones is a money making racket and is of absolutely no benefit to locals	39.43506	44.76923
Resident	Money would be better spent sorting out a process for putting electric charging points in place for local residents for environmental strategy 2030	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	Have you considered making a one way system up Cornhill and Down Ryehill to Restalrig road. Preventing traffic going round onto Restalrig terrace from Cornhill or Ryehill terrace. This would alleviate traffic on East Restalrig terr	55.96809	-3.15864
Resident	Where do you propose to place parking meters on such narrow pavement	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	Have you considered marking boxes for cars to park in.?	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	Money making racket by CoC say you are consulting. Has the decision been made already and we the residents are wasting our time?	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	What is the purpose of double yellow lines in the middle of the street? Residents know the etiquette of waiting at top or bottom of street no passing place required. Make one way system to avoid having to pass. Take away dble yellow from mid terrace	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	I strongly oppose these proposals that impact on residents who have taxis or vans to make a living. It will make it difficult for elderly residents and for us to have work completed on our houses and to have family visiting	55.96567	-3.1588
Resident	I live within alemoor crescent and while I agree with the double yellows in certain area to make the area directly in front of my house a single yellow line I totally disagree with and was not something discussed with us in the original meetings.	55.96353	-3.1606
Resident	Remove parking space to create bus lane	55.96809	-3.16599
Resident	Thank you for double yellows	55.96781	-3.16328
Resident	Thank you for double yellows!!	55.96793	-3.16566
Resident	Keep clear for visibility / safety	55.96763	-3.16537
Resident	Why no double yellows??	55.96581	-3.16212
Resident	Double yellow required	55.96625	-3.16016
Resident	Remove parking to create bus lane	55.9682	-3.16841
Resident	The bays indicated here appear to be on private land and if this is the case they should not be included in the scheme.	55.96717	-3.16472
Resident	Hermitage Place and East Hermitage Place were included within the 2019 consultation for Leith & North Leith CPZ area. How can they now be included within the West Leith CPZ area?	55.96911	-3.16588
Resident	Removal of parking altogether down one side of Restalrig Terrace/East Restalrig Terrace and Cornhill Terrace will result in the loss of 100+ parking spaces. Where do you envisage these displaced vehicles will now park?	55.96756	-3.16508
Resident	Removal of parking altogether down one side of Restalrig Terrace/East Restalrig Terrace and Cornhill Terrace will result in the loss of 100+ parking spaces. Where do you envisage these displaced vehicles will now park?	55.96744	-3.1626
Resident	Currently we have high parking pressure in the evenings and endemic pavement parking which often blocks access, Moving to single side of the road only parking will solve this problem	55.96792	-3.16274
Resident	pavement parking is a problem here	55.96692	-3.16474
Resident	Risk of ERT becoming a rat run due to no right turn at bottom of Lochend Rd. Current parking acts as a deterrent	55.96845	-3.15984
Resident	Need space for 2 busses to pass here as frequently causes a blockage and people need to reverse. Also on street bins at this location	55.96911	-3.15921
Resident	Why double yellow lines on East Restalrig Terrace and yellow lines on Cornhill, which is narrower? Yellow lines should be sufficient	55.96844	-3.15987
Resident	No 16 ERT has a dropped curb but garden is not a driveway. Swapping permit spaces to this side would mean more spaces as fewer driveways	55.96837	-3.1601
Resident	Could add additional permit parking on Links Place	55.96996	-3.16023
Resident	Halving the amount of parking on Cornhill Terrace is going to create a parking problem when there wasn't one to start with. This will displace half of the cars into neighbouring streets, some of which will also have less parking space.	55.96796	-3.15965
Resident	No need for parking restrictions - there are always spaces. Introducing parking restrictions will only reduce spaces. Extremely against this.	55.96287	-3.1536

Resident	Fed up getting cars from every where parking over my drive in if we don't have this street will be even more cars from Restalrig road	55.9685	-3.1602
Resident	There is adequate parking for cars here and you can find a space, if not outside your house. With already restricted parking in the colonies and no parking on Rosevale Terrace, this leaves a high proportion of residents to number of cars.	55.96852	-3.16294
Resident	This will simply force rogue parkers into the private parking at the rear of 374 Easter Road. We'll be inundated with cars that don't belong to the owners parked up in PRIVATE parking spaces and no legal power to remove them.	55.97091	-3.15527
Resident	Permit parking is not necessary in Ryehill Grove. All residents who live in Ryehill Grove are opposed to this parking tax. The Council are strapped for cash, but should be raising cash from the City Fibre Companies, not from people already struggling to	55.96633	-3.15951
Resident	This area is called the Colonies not Mews which are totally different. This will make parking worse for people who have restricted mobility or who have to have a car to travel as they have caring responsibilities.	55.96643	-3.16334
Resident	Why is this being proposed in the first place? Parking is right here, yes, but bringing in zoning will do nothing to improve that. All I see is a council looking to increase their income. Our address is one street and we have a back door in another.	55.96726	-3.16097
Resident	Whilst it may be an advantage to have access to the colonies restricted to those who live in them, I do have concerns about the access to parking for trades and deliveries. Given age of properties there is almost constant maintenance required.	55.9693	-3.16098
Resident	Delivery drivers already hate these streets, if they needed to pay to park they may start refusing to deliver large appliances which require time to install.	55.96894	-3.16051
Resident	If making changes at all could you also consider marking bays, and installing eV charge points.	55.96938	-3.16103
Resident	Supportive. Aims should be to reduce traffic speed and volume and create more space for wider pavements, cycling and wheeling infrastructure off carriageway and urban greening to create green networks and tackle the Climate Emergency.	55.96779	-3.16554
Resident	Parking restrictions should allow for electric car charging spaces on street, car club spaces and bike parking.	55.96624	-3.1637
Resident	This is not going to deter drivers. It will cause congestion, yet more issues for businesses in the area, add extra costs for households who may already be struggling financially, and inconvenience disabled people.	55.96751	-3.16891
Resident	Restrictions will reduce spaces, this will leave the residents without enough spaces. Where are residents going to park?	55.96735	-3.16296
Resident	The street on which I live does not have parking problems.	55.96737	-3.16041
Resident	Only residents park on restalrig road anyway. The proposed double yellows will reduce space for residents parking not improve it !!!	55.96945	-3.15956
Resident	There is ample parking in this area, and it's not a place with lots of commuter parking either. Offices have also become much more flexible with working location since the pandemic we do foresee commuter parking becoming an issue in the future either.	55.96624	-3.1596
Resident	I'm concerned. I have space for two cars in my drive. I have a white line painted on the road. Drivers still park over my drive. Please reassure e that road markings will make it crystal clear, that my exit should not be blocked. I	55.96553	-3.16367
Resident	I would prefer to see marked bays in all mews areas. Car ownership in the colonies is higher than elsewhere in Leith, and marked parking maximises space by reducing selfish parking (i.e. straddling large spaces).	55.96884	-3.16312
Resident	I own a business that requires me to have a car. It is important that I park outside my house so I can load and unload equipment. Having double yellow lines outside my house would seriously impact me. I also have two small children and being able to	55.96843	-3.15946
Resident	I would like encourage a balanced approach to parking provision however it should not take priority over space for people. Leith was not built with cars in mind which residents must take in to consideration as many feel they have the "right" to parking	55.97097	-3.17248
Resident	No justification for this project. A blatant money grab from the council	55.96671	-3.16275
Resident	All residential parking at the moment, no commuter traffic to control. There is currently no problem - if this is implemented there will be.	55.96777	-3.16101
Resident	Parking in this area is mainly by residents and a few teachers at Hermiage Park Primary during week days. It's not commuter parking, so charging for permits won't make parking problems go away. It will put extra financial pressure on a deprived community	55.96635	-3.16373
Resident	The parking in the colonies are only used by residents . No need to change this .	55.96405	-3.16401

Resident	West Leith is a residential area where presently there is adequate car parking. Creation of permit zones and associated non permit spaces is unneeded and will erode the overall total of parking available to residents. This is un needed, un wanted	55.96762	-3.16177
Resident	Things are working as they are so why change it	55.96595	-3.1584
Resident	Family visiting would have to pay to park to see their relatives which could isolate some families	55.96437	-3.16186
Resident	I live at No 72 Lochend Road, the pink line for a parking permit runs over my drive but all my other neighbours drives are blockedout, giving them access. Can someone confirm this is a mistake?	55.96542	-3.16366
Resident	There is a Parking permit pink line over my drive. Can someone get back to me with an explanation? This is the second time I have raised this query but nobody has got back to me.	55.96542	-3.16366
Resident	This is not required in our street	55.96496	-3.16126
Resident	I park right outside my house which is on a corner and is wide enough for a car to get round safely! This is private residence parking and we have no issue other than football match days. We don't have enough parking for ppl who live here.	55.96637	-3.15446
Resident	This will prevent pavement parking on this street.	55.96761	-3.16296
Resident	This will prevent pavement parking on this street.	55.96776	-3.16369
Resident	This should be a double yellow line as there is not enough room on this street for vehicles to park on both sides.	55.96742	-3.16242
Resident	This should be a double yellow line vehicles are always parked on the pavement blocking it entirely, suggesting the road isn't wide enough.	55.96626	-3.16014
Resident	This will prevent pavement parking on this street.	55.96799	-3.16237
Resident	I would prefer the parking to be on one side of the street only, the full length of the street – rather than swapping sides.	55.96821	-3.1612
Resident	This should be double yellow lines. This stretch of street constantly has cars parked on the pavement indicating there's not enough room for parking on both sides at any time. I think this also limits emergency service access, e.g. fire engines.	55.96825	-3.16124
Resident	This will prevent pavement parking on this street.	55.96841	-3.15999
Resident	This will prevent pavement parking on this street.	55.96722	-3.16257
Resident	There is not enough room at this point on Restalrig Road for parking on both sides of the street. At the moment, there is only space for one vehicle at a time to pass, creating congestion, dangerous manouvers by drivers and awful pedestrian conditions.	55.96924	-3.15934
Resident	I would like to see the introduction of a modal filter here to prevent an increase in through-traffic, reduce parking pressure and encourage people to walk or cycle.	55.96795	-3.16272
Resident	I would like to see the introduction of a modal filter here to prevent an increase in through-traffic, reduce parking pressure and encourage people to walk or cycle.	55.96748	-3.16228
Resident	I would like to see the introduction of a modal filter here to prevent an increase in through-traffic, reduce parking pressure and encourage people to walk or cycle.	55.96615	-3.16008
Resident	It's great to see the parking being removed here as it currently creates a really difficult junction to make a safe exit from Restalrig Terrace.	55.96764	-3.16537
Resident	Removing parking here will make the junction of Lochend Road and Restalrig Terrace safer.	55.96759	-3.16545
Resident	I believe this is a horrendous suggestion. I see no sign of people who do not live in my street parking in it. I cannot believe i have to pay to park outside my own house. I also cannot believe you will double yellow line half the street.	55.96785	-3.16038
Resident	This a totally ill thought out scheme as I see it as all that will happen is no residents will buy your permits and park in there allocated bays leaving a totally empty street.	55.96533	-3.16001
Resident	This is absolutely ridiculous! The only people that park in these areas are residents. The council doesn't care about its residents at all - all they care about is f***ing us over to get more money	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	I live on a purely residential street. There is no need to reduce parking here. You are halving the number of parking spaces Ona street that is already full when every resident parks. Where am I supposed to keep my car?	55.968	-3.16193
Resident	I always park on my street and almost never experience any issues. I will no longer be able to park on my street as there will be single yellow lines. I am strongly against the parking restrictions proposed for Burns Street.	55.96867	-3.16456

Resident	I am fine with permit parking but please do not single yellow line Burns Street. There are at least 15 parking spaces which do not obstruct garages and so there is no need to restrict parking in this way on my street.	55.96868	-3.16471
Resident	There is currently no problem finding a space to park. Double yellow lines on corners to stop inconsiderate parking would benefit the residents more than permit bays.	55.96759	-3.16119
Resident	Non-residents do not park here. I would prefer to wait and see if any issues occur from parking changes in other parts of Leith rather than future proofing.	55.96765	-3.1612
Resident	Perhaps parking bays could be painted on to the road to help drivers park respectfully and not waste parking spaces.	55.96766	-3.16119
Resident	Double yellow lines on one side of Cornhill Terrace where it becomes narrow. Would stop parking on the pavement.	55.96741	-3.16251
Resident	Only residents use this area. This is purely a way to make money out of us.	55.96604	-3.16109
Resident	Dislike - halving the number of parking spaces; residents will be unable to park; double yellow lines making this a through route for traffic; deliveries, loading, tradespeople all negatively affected; intolerable worsening of daily living convenience.	55.96768	-3.16397
Resident	Additional resident parking in Upper Hermitage is welcome but currently notice at entrance states this is private parking.	55.96723	-3.16438
Resident	Good for allowing emergency vehicles along street, good for environment. I worry that there won't always be enough permit holder bays though, which would be stressful for my neighbours (I don't have a car).	55.96837	-3.161
Resident	I agree with the changes as it will stop people parking on the pavements. WHY does each household get 2 parking permits? We are trying to reduce car use so this is your opportunity to make changes, ONE PARKING PERMIT PER HOUSEHOLD IS SUFFICIENT.	55.96788	-3.16333
Resident	1.For Restalrig Road buses struggle in the pinchpoint between Leith links and Ryehill Terrace (yellow lines may help here) but buses have no such issues south of Ryehill Terrace. 2.Will garages/driveways on side streets get white lines or yellow lines?	55.9677	-3.15804
Resident	I am not aware of any issue with non-resident parking. The proposed use of double yellows along the whole length of one side of the street will effectively reduce resident (and total available) parking by 50% , 24 hrs a day, 7 days a week.	55.96803	-3.16225
Resident	There is a lack of information as to how this will work, including what will happen if residents in mews areas cannot find parking within them. In general, the entire proposal is unnecessary in such a residential area.	55.96666	-3.16121
Resident	We are a tight community that manage our limited parking well ... there is absolutely no reason other than greed, to adding parking charges. My partner is disabled and has a blue badge and I am really worried we will not get parking near our door.	55.96545	-3.15895
Resident	I don't understand why it is necessary to create any restrictions in this area. These are quiet residential streets a long way from the town centre.	55.96781	-3.16382
Resident	Restalrig terrace This is a quiet residential area - absolutely no need to impose parking restrictions - yellow lines & permits in this street and area.	55.96789	-3.16361
Resident	I don't really see the need for this I live in this area and there are no problems. Where do you expect people to park their cars. Funny how permits are on roads with expensive housing this is just Money making. I work for nhs and need my car for home vis	55.96666	-3.15802
Resident	I think the planning to restrict parkin in this residential area where the majority of houses are 3 bed plus is absolutely ridiculous, most households have more than one car and not everyone has a drive.	55.96518	-3.15736
Resident	Ridiculous people trying to make money from people in residential areas. Some areas are nowhere near town, shopping centres etc and are fully residential, there is no need for charging people to park outside their own home.	55.96917	-3.16238
Resident	Completely unnecessary. The vast majority of people that park here are residents, not visitors. You'll be taking away spaces & asking residents to pay to park when there is no need.	55.963	-3.15723
Resident	Whatever the budget is for CPZ, I believe in the region of £7M, then this money would be better spent on resurfacing the roads which are in an appalling state of dis-repair...rather than putting fancy coloured lines around the edges!	55.96452	-3.16155
Resident	It seems to me that one effect of imposing further restrictions on parking in any area is to displace vehicles into areas where no such restrictions exist, thus simply moving rather than solving the problem.	55.96865	-3.15865
Resident	Barleyhill Terrace was a private road that was adopted. The road is in a separate development and in effect has operated as de facto residents parking for the last 11 years. Furthermore - current area proposed as single yellow is vital parking for us!	55.96676	-3.15874

Resident	Controlled parking is not required in this street. Always enough parking for residents.	55.96487	-3.15832
Resident	Please visit the colonies/mews I live in. It's very difficult to get a parking spot there and you want us to pay for it - shocking.	55.96655	-3.16148
Resident	I am concerned that the introduction of permit parking and double-yellow lines on East Restalrig Terrace will mean only half the houses on the street will have places for parking. When most residents are car owners this seems unhelpful.	55.96846	-3.16015
Resident	I am worried that under the proposed parking restrictions this would make Restalrig Terrace and East Restalrig Terrace much more likely to become a rat run, especially as cars can no longer turn right at the bottom of Lochend Road.	55.96795	-3.16268
Resident	Permit parking on both sides of this stretch of Restalrig Road will not assist with bus congestion that regularly occurs here.	55.96836	-3.15864
Resident	If part of the Council's objectives with this proposal is to discourage car use, then why is there no provision for additional cycle lanes and/or cycle storage?	55.9692	-3.15495
Resident	This proposal is outrageous. There is not enough space for local residents cars. This area is full of working families who need to be able to access their own homes with shopping and kids. This proposal is not taking into consideration us residents.	55.96752	-3.1652
Resident	Reducing parking to one side of the street leaves greatly inadequate parking availability already under stress thus displacing parking to other side streets and main roads. Currently no problem with non residential parking in Cornhill.	55.96768	-3.16048
Resident	Zones do not work, always too many cars for the zone so its impossible to find spaces late in the evening.	55.9668	-3.16188
Resident	There is already extremely limited parking in the Lochend colonies. We would like assurance that we will be eligible for permits covering the surrounding area if we live within the mews area.	55.9664	-3.16383
Resident	There is no need for parking Bays in this location, the parking is adequate, the non permit parking would never be policed making it redundant and a scheme to make money.	55.965	-3.15964
Resident	I need my car as I often work late at night and travel long distances after public transport has finished. There is no need for this. Not one positive reason for having pay and display.	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	Non resident parking is not a problem. If necessary permit parking or one way system? Most vehicles can access and restricted parking would only mean cars park on nearby. CPZs seem to be a solution in this street for a problem that doesn't exist ..	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	Concerned parking restrictions on Restalrig and East Hermitage will move cars looking for free parking to the Mews designated areas which are already extremely tight for residents parking. Has consideration been given to issuing permits mews residents?	55.96921	-3.16002
Resident	We do not have issues with parking locally and do not want parking permits. People do not park here to go to the airport / town. CoEC does not state the price of a permit, the time restrictions or why 2nd vehicle permits are charged at an additional 25%	55.96906	-3.16174
Resident	No issues with parking - against these proposals all the way!	55.96341	-3.15602
Resident	What's the purpose of this parking zone apart from taxing the local residents to park outside their homes	55.96799	-3.15996
Resident	I'll elaborate further as above but will say this, how about fixing the potholes rather than unnecessary and wasteful spending on what pleases the Council rather than us who live here.	55.9654	-3.15553
Resident	There is not a problem parking in my street so why create one ?	55.96772	-3.1647
Resident	This proposal is only going to create a problem to neighbouring streets as Cornhill Terrace does not require or need these restrictions.	55.96729	-3.16018
Resident	The proposal to put double yellow lines along Restalrig Terrace/East Restalrig Terrace is an extremely bad one. It will reduce the available of on street parking drastically for residents.	55.96768	-3.16397
Resident	Parking is not really an issue here.	55.96892	-3.1614
Resident	No need for this	55.96487	-3.16151
Resident	I'm completely rejecting this proposal. It doesn't to any of us residents.	55.96665	-3.16243
Resident	As a resident of Lochend Road I think it would help the flow of traffic if parking was limited. But I have off street parking so I recognise that the financial implications for those who don't is a consideration.	55.96732	-3.1648
Resident		55.96886	-3.16301

Resident	We strongly object to this proposal which will create problems for residents as it will cut the parking by half in Restalrig terrace, creates a rat run for speeding traffic that cannot turn right at the foot of Lochend Rd, 90mins for visitors is unfair.	55.96784	-3.16403
Resident	Absolutely ridiculous proposal. This will only mean residents will not be able to park in their own street and will only move the problem to another street outwith the area in question. Yet another indirect money making tax from the council.	55.96847	-3.15975
Resident	Absolutely no need for this plan to be put in force, lived here for over 30 years and it is beyond comprehension that this has even been thought about for such a narrow street like this, I strongly object to this.	55.96785	-3.16065
Resident	I object to this, I am a car owner and don't have parking issues. This also feels like a stealth tax in what are difficult times financially and finally the council could reopen links gardens which has parking spaces.	55.96884	-3.16312
Resident	More of this please! But what's happening to the bus stop at 70ish Restalrig Road?	55.96796	-3.15838
Resident	More of this please! But will restrictions be enforced? There are already double yellow lines at the junction of Cornhill Terrace and Restalrig Road, but that doesn't stop drivers parking there to 'just pop over' to McColls.	55.96808	-3.15853
Resident	Can we please consider not having parking here? Traffic frequently comes to a standstill here, making it incredibly unsafe to cross since pedestrians are at the mercy of drivers impatient to get moving again.	55.96921	-3.1593
Resident	Whilst there is plenty of spaces for parking in the area, you say you have had many complaints yet highlight none. If no one could park cars would be in the middle of the street, but they are not! EDC money grabbing again!!!	55.96466	-3.16239
Resident	250 characters is not enough - I will use the email option	55.96794	-3.15907
Resident	Upper Hermitage is private grounds and should not be part of this proposal. The parking bays suggested for permit parking are only in use by the residents and guests of the development.	55.96719	-3.16467
Resident	At our property development there is a shared car park which is often used by non-residents, particularly when there are football games on. I am worried that non-residents will use our car park to avoid parking controls.	55.96406	-3.16079
Resident	Everyone around this area gets parked no problem, if this was to go ahead it would be chaos. Stop parents using cars for the school run, that's the problem	55.96115	-3.15558
Resident	Absolutely ridiculous, parking is very scarce now.	55.96669	-3.16129
Resident	Absolute disgrace and unnecessary in this area.	55.96314	-3.1522
Resident	Support the introduction of permits	55.96683	-3.16043
Resident	This will reduce the already busy parking options, there is not enough permit spaces here and it will leave residents paying to park outside their house. There is not a lot of visitors parking here anyway it is majority residential parking	55.96655	-3.16415
Resident	This is absolutely unnecessary to implement parking restrictions here. There is mainly a low council tax neighbourhood, people won't pay for the permits & will instead park further up the road impacting people outside the bracket.	55.96336	-3.15621
Resident	Please do not implement parking restrictions on this area - this area does not need it, there are no issues parking. To do so would be of no benefits to residents & would be for council gain only!	55.96336	-3.15414
Resident	Parking on Cornhill Terr is NOT currently problematic; halving available parking space would be highly problematic. I strongly object to this proposal: unnecessary, unwanted, costly for residents, & potentially divisive if we have to compete for parking.	55.96789	-3.15934
Resident	I feel that the suggested restrictions will only add to, rather than improve, the current parking situation. Currently, from working at home, I'm familiar with all the cars on our street - there are no transient cars here but residents!	55.96672	-3.16027
Resident	This proposal is very bad for local residents. This would cause a huge parking issue as there just wouldn't be anywhere near enough spaces left for local families and residents. I very much object to this. Local people's opinions haven't been heard!	55.96752	-3.1652
Resident	Have you considered making the parking restriction between 11 and 1.30 each day as is done in Ravelston to stop non-residents parking in that area?	55.96708	-3.16269
Resident	I am furious and disgusted by this proposal. It is only about making more money for the council & will cause chaos.	55.96532	-3.16038
Resident	There are not nearly enough spaces available for the residents' own cars in this area. There are very few visitors to this area and this appears to be solely to generate extra revenue for Edinburgh Council.	55.96584	-3.15921

Resident	From the map it appears the shared visitor spaces in this area are to be permits, can you explain why they cant be kept as shared bays as in other surrounding areas such as hawkhill??	55.96584	-3.15897
Resident	The proposal will make what is already difficult parking for front line workers on shifts impossible. There is no evidence that parking fees are beneficial to services	55.96659	-3.16222
Resident	I need more information on this proposal. There is no legend to understand the map, or a writeup.	55.96906	-3.16099
Resident	I am disabled and a blue badge holder. I park outside my home and the new proposals will not allow me to do this. This will have an impact on the quality of my life	55.96708	-3.15946
Resident	There are never issues with parking in our streets. Everyone is courteous and we all get a parking space. It is disappointing that there was no notification of these proposed changes. I strongly oppose these changes, they are not necessary.	55.96072	-3.13819
Resident	I have very specific concerns about this proposal. I am a full-time wheelchair user. There is a dropped kerb outside my flat. I need the dropped kerb to be clear at all times, or I cannot leave my house. I need access to the road. (comment box too short)	55.96792	-3.16012
Resident	No need for parking restrictions in Alernoor Park. The street is never too busy on weekdays, even with a busy doctors surgery. It is not used for park and ride. The only busy period is when Hibs are at home, which is out with your permit times.	55.96518	-3.15818
Resident	How can you justify charging me for parking near my home? I have lived here all my life & there has never been any problem with people parking where they shouldn't. Why are some areas exempt? You are punishing me for owning a car. It's discrimination.	55.96658	-3.16167
Resident	Non-residents & a car repair business constantly park on the exit/entrance to Easter Hermitage. The road there is narrow & any cars parked there cause a problem with oncoming traffic to/from Restalrig Rd.	55.96666	-3.15703
Resident	I am in favour of aspects of this - such as permitted parking for residents (depending on the charge, of course) but I think it's awful for the staff at Hermitage Park primary school who will have nowhere near the school to park freely.	55.96574	-3.16274
Resident	You have purple permit holder spaces at the rear of 178. These spaces are on the title deeds of each flat - private property. You cannot make these permit holder spaces	55.96261	-3.15337
Resident	It's going to make things a lot worse for residents	55.96286	-3.15769
Resident	I object to a double yellow line outside my house, if this project goes ahead there will not be enough parking bays available for residents by who are polite and considerate but this will cause animosity!	55.96792	-3.16213
Resident	I DON'T AGREE WITH THIS SITUATION WHATSOEVER. HAVE LIVED HERE FOR 40YRS, THERE HAS NEVER BEEN AN ISSUE WITH PARKING, THEN & MORE SO NOW. MY DEEDS STATE THIS IS A PRIVATE ESTATE	55.96493	-3.16142
Resident	There is a dropped kerb here	55.96781	-3.1634
Resident	Unnecessary passing place, reducing the amount of parking spaces. Only residents park in this area and plenty of space for trades parking during the working week. In the last 20 plus years I haven't had a problem with giving time for another car.	55.96692	-3.15938
Resident	The 50% reduction on parking fo restilrig East, terrace and Cornhill will put a strain on evening parking after permit hrs. This is of no benefit to the residents and would cause a problem for our older residents.	55.96771	-3.16064
Resident	There is not an issue getting a parking spot near our home, either in Lochend Colonies or on Lochend Road. These proposals will make the issue worse by removing spaces, whilst demand will remain the same as non residents do park in this area.	55.96639	-3.16379
Resident	Overall, this is a positive move. However, this is a chance to make Restalrig Road safer by allowing parking on only one side of the road at certain points. At present, vehicles - buses especially - cannot pass each other which leads to potential danger	55.96889	-3.15907
Resident	This is not required as everyone who parks their car in this area are residents. There are no commuters parking their car here and going into the city centre. This is a money making exercise and totally uncalled for as there is no justification for this.	55.96695	-3.16036
Resident	Given the scale of the changes and the extent to which the entire local area is covered, there will be no space for parking near by and this will push others into dangerous parking or the like in local areas. Some areas, like restrig Road would benefi	55.96778	-3.16019
Resident	As a resident I have not had any issues parking in my area. Ever. I would like to wait until after the tram works are complete to see if the council's perception of a problem actually IS a reality. Postpone this proposal	55.96746	-3.16213

Resident	I cannot understand how the seemingly arbitrary number of 90 minutes for visitors was arrived at? Who at CEC thinks they get to dictate the length of time my friends and family can visit for?	55.96741	-3.1613
Resident	I'd like to see some bike hangars installed in this area. Restalrig Terrace could do with some. Why only on street car parking?	55.96788	-3.16337
Resident	I'm dissatisfied with there being proposed single yellow lines across my drive. The Hawkhill/Ale Moor double yellow line areas need patrolling during football matches - late evenings & weekends otherwise this proposal is pointless.	55.96419	-3.15929
Resident	The permanent restrictions are only required at the entry road and corners within Hawkhill to stop dangerous football parking. These permanent measures around Hawkhill, a quiet family estate are not needed.	55.96365	-3.15864
Resident	The parking is bad enough without these proposals on restricted parking in the area. Also where are visitors meant to park, when they come to visit you? They can't park over your drive when there's a yellow line there. What happens when parents come in t	55.96593	-3.16172
Resident	This appears to effectively half the available space for parking without providing an alternative. I am not aware of any issues with non residents parking here so I don't see any benefit in this proposal	55.96805	-3.1622
Resident	We don't have a problem with parking at present. If your suggestions are introduced they will cause a problem with parking. We would require the parking bays to be for permit holders only.	55.96403	-3.15838
Resident	Double yellow lines on the corners of streets would be beneficial but the remainder of the proposals particularly in East Restalrig Terrace reduce parking capacity by around 50% thus just displacing vehicles to other nearby areas	55.96715	-3.16067
Resident	Limiting parking to one side of the street will encourage the use of the street as a convenient route between Restalrig and Lochend roads, leading to higher traffic volumes on this residential street.	55.96802	-3.16219
Resident	The proposal removes half of the currently available parking places. We do not currently face any parking pressure on this street so the proposal will effectively create the very issue it claims to be addressing.	55.96804	-3.16201
Resident	Why can't we park in front of our own homes without having to pay for the privilege, Another tax for the good residents of Leith to then be spent in the glorious New Town of Edinburgh.	55.96666	-3.16121
Resident	This is insane and completely unnecessary for Cornhill Terrace. We have no parking problems at the moment. This would create huge problems by halving the number of spaces during the day - why? You are trying to fix a non-existent problem.	55.96746	-3.16198
Resident	Why are we having to pay for permits when we are not guaranteed a space or can you guarantee a space for everyone? Why the pay and display at the doctors?	55.96265	-3.1584
Resident	Currently in Cornhill Terrace every space is used up. If you halve the amount of parking I genuinely don't know where we'd all park. There's no spare parking around our street either so we could be traveling miles away. I strongly object to this proposal	55.96799	-3.15981
Resident	paid permit no guarantee of space, no access for trades people, no access for electric car charging, potential loss of garden space, see separate email for further comment	55.96743	-3.16296
Resident	I live in one of the few houses in the street where there is no option of turning my garden into a drive way and so rely on being able to park in the street. If the street were to become a mews with no parking I would have no where to leave my car.	55.96692	-3.15532
Resident	Absolutely no point of this in hawkhill, all the vehicles parked here are residents vehicles or visitors, the only time we have problems with outsiders parking is when theres football on, this would have serious implications for residents and our visitors	55.96355	-3.15771
Resident	This should be a DOUBLE yellow line, not a single. People often bump up on the kerb and park here, especially on football days and it's hard to get passed, and ambulances etc have no room. Please make it a double	55.96494	-3.16086
Resident	This should be a DOUBLE line all the way down here. This part of the road is a nightmare as it narrows and people park	55.96672	-3.16452
Resident	There is and has never been a parking issue on Summerfield Place.	55.96885	-3.15967
Resident	I reject the need for permit holder bays and any alterations to existing parking in this area. This is a difficult time for many people financially and an additional cost annually will be detrimental to so many. Another tax?	55.96647	-3.16267
Resident	Are the council not causing parking problems in the Links area, with the road closure of Links Gardens? This is an additional tax. There is sufficient parking in this area and the traffic lights at the foot of Easter Road, created pollution	55.9648	-3.16276
Resident	Insufficient parking spaces and road is not used as a rat run so should not be necessary	55.96768	-3.16397

Resident	I have lived in Ryehill Terrace for 16 years and have never had any issues with parking and I am certain that commuters do not use our street to park in and then travel into town. Parking restrictions are to be welcomed on Restalrig Road.	55.9677	-3.15804
Resident	You are proposing to turn our residents only car park into a permit holders bay. We bought this property last year and one of the largest swaying factors was the parking. Your proposal will take this away and devalue our property massively.	55.96688	-3.15862
Resident	where is WEST LEITH stayed in Leith all my life and never heard links/Restalrig called west Leith	55.96563	-3.16298
Resident	double yellows restrict delivery/tradesmen, street not used 9-5 by commuters nor as cut through, risk residents will turn front gardens into parking spaces - bad 4 environment, stress/environmental impact from people circling for half an hour to get parked	55.96781	-3.16382
Resident	I'm currently working from home due to COVID and won't be back in office for a while. I normally drive to office therefore wouldn't need a space during the day. Sadly due to covid my car is parked there. I'm not paying a permit.	55.96573	-3.15918
Resident	No parking issues on Cornhill Terrace for residents or visitors. Resent having to pay for permit when no problems. Would hate visitors having to pay. Proposed restrictions on other streets would mean shared bays would be taken by resident permit holders.	55.96772	-3.16145
Resident	We purchased our home knowing that there was free on street parking outside, to introduce permits and single yellow lines would be detrimental to the way we chose to live. I will be forced to park far away from my home which makes me feel unsafe.	55.96631	-3.16414
Resident	This is a blatant move by the council to profit from car owning residents. The Hawkhill parking issues only occur on Hibs football match days so only require temporary parking restriction on these days. Why are you making residents suffer permanently.	55.9641	-3.15847
Resident	I cannot see any point in introducing parking permits for this area. Some residents like to park close to their property, others prefer to park on the main road. We all need tradesmen to come pretty regularly to maintain these period properties.	55.9691	-3.16097
Resident	These proposals are completely unnecessary and will majorly impact our lives. My husband uses lots of equipment that he needs to load and unload. I have small kids that need to get in and out of the car. We have no complaints with the current set up!	55.96843	-3.15946
Resident	This removes half the available parking which will cause great pressure on the area and surrounding streets. If the aim is to widen the space it would be better to use existing powers to prevent people parking on pavement.	55.96851	-3.15949
Resident	This is long overdue. The whole area is dominated by cars. It is difficult to walk down many of the streets due to cars parked on both sides. Get these proposals implemented ASAP!	55.96806	-3.16275
Resident	This is good, but what category will the permits be?	55.96839	-3.15866
Resident	Adding pay and display bays here will reduce residents' parking by a lot, and it's already tricky. I'd prefer permit bays.	55.9692	-3.1593
Resident	It is bad enough trying to get a parking space when you live on the street never mind letting random people park here nearly all people now have at least two cars on which road tax is paid.	55.94316	-3.12
Resident	The scheme in practice won't leave any car spaces for visitors. Residents with more than one car or unwilling to use their own spaces due to concerns over poor lighting and safety will undoubtedly take over the shared bay spaces.	55.96512	-3.16037
Resident	I think it should be all resident. Otherwise people will have to pay to park in their own street and we will be overwhelmed with football traffic on match days.	55.96775	-3.16066
Resident	Whilst the economy is in melt down Edinburgh Council has taken it upon themselves to introduce parking permits for most of Leith. Slow hand clap.	55.96661	-3.16097
Resident	I would like to question why the 4 parking bays opposite our house are being proposed as Permit holders and not shared use bays? This does not make sense.	55.96469	-3.15875
Resident	No need for parking restrictions! The majority of people who park here are residents & there are plenty of spaces for residents & visitors! Ridiculous proposal!	55.96291	-3.15364
Resident	Reduced parking already due to increased double yellow lines, dropped kerbs for people changing gardens to driveways, communal bins in the street. Painted parking bays will result in further reduction in spaces. These are residential streets.	55.96594	-3.16347
Resident	This will significantly reduce parking spaces for residents causing parking issues where there are currently are none.	55.96806	-3.16158
Resident	The plans for East Restalrig Terrace seem completely unnecessary. They will create far more problems than they might solve. People will pave over their front gardens to get a space to park, to the detriment of the environment and carbon footprint.	55.96802	-3.16226

Resident	Completely opposed to proposals 1) Current arrangements are fine - can still park car outside house 2) proposals represent a reduction in available parking by increasing yellow lines and introducing bays 3) have lost busstop outside 72 Restalrig rd.	55.96791	-3.1581
Resident	Wait until Phase 1 goes in. No issues with parking on Cornhill Terr. This reduces parking by half. Ryehill gets Permit Parking we get halved!	55.96797	-3.15895
Resident	Parking in Cornhill Terrace currently insufficient for residents. Currently no commuter parking issues in this screen while one side only parking would increase speed and volume of through traffic in street making it more dangerous.	55.96626	-3.16481
Resident	The proposed CPZ is complete overkill. The only significant problem with non resident parking on Lochend Road occurs on match days at Easter Road which could be easily regulated by Traffic Wardens and Police. Will a CPZ even operate on a Saturday?	55.96379	-3.16148
Resident	This plan is unworkable and will not benefit the residents in any shape or form. EH council need to get their act together and concentrate on restoring the city to pre pandemic levels. Not taxing the residents and motorists.	55.96689	-3.15922
Resident	There is absolutely no need to make Lochend Road and Colonies a controlled parking zone. I have lived in the colonies for 9 years and have never had a problem finding a space either in the colonies or on Lochend Road. This is just a money-making scam.	55.96679	-3.16158
Resident	I do not see any need for controlled parking in this area. There can be issues around school drop off and pick up times, but there are other ways to manage this.	55.9662	-3.16097
Resident	There are currently plenty of parking spaces for residents on either sides of road, and space for visitors too. I don't think there are any issues with parking on the street which need solved. These proposals seem to reduce	55.96812	-3.15865
Resident	Our block of flats only provide one parking space per flat and i am often forced to park on the road often because my space is being used by other people visitors have to park on the road as there are no visitor spaces in the block.	55.96627	-3.15176
Resident	!) We do not have a non-resident parking problem. Our current system is satisfactory 2) one side parking is NOT acceptable for deliveries and service.	55.96756	-3.16112
Resident	There is no need for these changes. There is not an issue with parking at the moment. This is just an excuse for the council to charge us for permit spaces.-	55.96257	-3.1595
Resident	I object to this proposal as this will leave an unsustainably small availability of parking spaces in Cornhill Terrace. There is no increase in unsolicited parking since the Tram works. Predominantly families who need cars and parking spaces live here.	55.96774	-3.16094
Resident	In principle very much in favour of this plan, but it does leave several questions.	55.96924	-3.15999
Resident	With parking restrictions coming into place on the surrounding streets what is going to stop these residents from parking in the mews which are already jam packed with parked cars	55.96923	-3.16003
Resident	We have our own private parking as shown on map as private road. This proposal now shows that anyone who visits me will need to pay and display or I need to purchase a permit ? !!!!	55.96583	-3.15898
Resident	Object to creation of permits . Especially with many people wfh and not using or moving their car during the pandemic. Penalised fir using car or not using car is the Edinburgh way now is it ?	55.9658	-3.15905
Resident	Lived here 20yrs absolutely no issue with non residents parking here	55.96675	-3.16015
Resident	There is already limited parking in this street. Taking away parking bays that already exist in this street and streets in the surrounding area means that residents will have nowhere near their homes to park.	55.96778	-3.15991
Resident	CEC WON'T CLEAR OUR STREET OF SNOW,WON'T FILL OUR GRIT BIN,WON'T CUT OUR GRASS BUT THINK YOU CAN BRING IN THIS DISASTER.WE ARE A PRIVATE STREET, CEC HAVE NO RIGHT TO DO THIS. TYPICAL CEC USING MOTORIST AS CASH COW. WE'VE NEVER HAD ANY PARKING ISSUES!!	55.96496	-3.16138
Resident	THIS PROJECT IS GOING TO CAUSE THE SO CALLED PROBLEMS IT IS MEANT TO ADDRESS, THIS NEED TO BE SCRAPPED!!!!!!	55.96496	-3.16137
Resident	SCRAP THIS PROJECT!!	55.96497	-3.16138
Resident	The proposed permit zone in this area needs scrapped! This 3 bay area is used by residents & visitors to park outside/near their homes. Also there's an elderly resident who needs carers multiple times a day every day, why should we have to pay to park!!!	55.9648	-3.16134
Resident	Brilliant idea. Especially if it will stop people parking illegally on pavements obstructing pedestrian access for those of us with disabilities and / or pushing a pram. Also dissuade against those who use the area as a free park and ride.	55.9649	-3.16319

Resident	Bringing in these Parking restrictions in to the street will not work. Are we being asked to pay to park in our own street & once the games start back at Easter Road, it will be horrendous & much worse than usual.	55.96569	-3.15946
Resident	If this helps us become carbon neutral by 2030 I'm a fan.	55.9661	-3.16396
Resident	only problem is when there is a football match on and this idea doesn't solve this as it is only 9 to 5. Leave as is unless you do something about the football parking	55.96358	-3.15875
Resident	This is a private housing estate and the only on match days is there a problem so why are you taking spaces away when we don't have a problem just now. Is this just another one of the council's money making ideas like the garden tax	55.96354	-3.15877
Resident	Another money making ploy for the council. Not enough space here for all the comments. Reduce car ownership to one per household unless key workers.	55.96891	-3.16218
Visitor	V. much in support of controls on parking generally, but this road is too narrow for parking on both sides! Buses can't get through, cars can't get through and it creates a dangerous area for cyclists.	55.96848	-3.15879
Visitor	V. much in support of controls on parking generally, but this road is too narrow for parking on both sides! Buses can't get through, cars can't get through and it creates a dangerous area for cyclists.	55.96514	-3.16317
Visitor	More car club bays please! The whole area generally needs them because it is so densely populated and it might encourage people to give up cars.	55.96613	-3.156
Visitor	My son & daughter-in-law live at 41/3 Easter Hermitage and I regularly help with child care for my 2 yr old granddaughter	55.96628	-3.15774
Visitor	More parking allocations for disabled and car clubs/ co-operatives. Fewer shared use/permit holders. Encourage people to share cars so fewer cars on the road and space for bike lockers, cycle lanes & pedestrians	55.96536	-3.16135
Visitor	Resident spaces reduced to intolerable level with struggles for young families trying to get safely with kids, shopping etc to their front door. Likewise for Tradesmen to park near enough to unload/work. Elderly will find it so hard. Think again please.	55.96773	-3.16135
Visitor	This means when I stay over at boyfriend's house I need to make sure I get up and feed the meter in the morning when I'm on late shift. Also only allowed 90 mins on shared bays ! So I can't see him longer than that during day !!!	55.9657	-3.15907

8. WILLOWBRAE NORTH


8.1.1 196 people dropped 298 pins on the interactive map

8.1.2 Of those, 296 had comments and two were left blank

8.1.3 19 comments are positive

8.1.4 269 comments are negative

8.1.5 10 comments are neutral



8.1.6 The most common theme from the comments was regarding the potential loss of parking availability.

8.1.7 Secondly were comments that were too varied to be counted under one main theme.

8.1.8 The next highest theme of comment was stating that the current layout and/or restrictions work fine as they are.

I am a...	Comment	X	Y
Business owner	Hi. Double yellow lines are proposed on the bowling club private road. We feel these lines should be approx 6m less in length stopping at our current gatepost.	55.95366	-3.15404
Business owner	Self employed Artist, teaching students from all over Edinburgh and Lothians in Studio, Early Onset Alzheimer's Sufferers and carers attend workshops, Exhibitions & charity fundraising events held in studio. All would be adversely affected by these plans	55.95428	-3.14855
Other	This is a bad idea	55.9532	-3.15368
Other	Double yellow lines will provide greater capacity for road users. Providing grater capacity always for more eat running and higher speeds. I would be surprised if anyone is in favour of this. Furthermore it will only displace parking up towards the school	55.95279	-3.14748
Other	By introducing double yellows on Glenlee Ave & Gardens it will allow cars to travel at higher speeds and create a more dangerous street. It will create a rate in through the neighbourhood pushing more traffic up through Paisley Crescent.	55.95268	-3.14943
Other	No need for permits or yellow lines. People have cars so places to put them is needed. If you block more safe parking then cars will be parked in other areas thus causing more issues. People also can't afford permits given how unstable jobs are	55.94998	-3.14051

Other	As there have been no Parking concerns raised in this Ward, the process for stating that there is a problem is flawed. This is a political solution to a problem that does not exist and should be scrapped.	55.95212	-3.14961
Other	Proposals will reduce the number of parking spaces for residents forcing those who can't find a space, or those who do want to pay for residents parking into streets like Piershill Terrace and Abercorn Crescent/avenue.	55.95313	-3.14663
Resident	Strongly in favour of the area becoming a CPZ. However, top of Lilyhill Terrace alongside Park wall should be double-yellow, as too narrow to support any sort of parking even outside controlled hours.	55.95284	-3.15168
Resident	Most of the people who park in this area are not shown on the map. There are a number of student flats, residential and sport centre also being built with no parking. How has this been taken into consideration?	55.95561	-3.15176
Resident	I like the idea of the CPZ, but this should be a double yellow line, as there is no space for cars to park on this side of the street (even temporarily) as they would block the road. No one parks here and a single yellow line would encourage parking.	55.95277	-3.15185
Resident	I like the Residents parking proposed on this side of the street	55.95281	-3.15173
Resident	50% of the parking to be removed from Glenlee Avenue and Gardens. Where is everyone going to park? I am going to have to pay to not be able to park in my own street which is currently not an issue. They currently work fine. How is this an improvement?	55.95284	-3.14859
Resident	I have stayed at 34 Glenlee Avenue for 23 years and never had an issue with parking, you now tell us that due to residents not being able to park you will do away with half the spaces in my street and ask us to pay for the privilege of half the spaces	55.95278	-3.14852
Resident	Hi I fully agree with the introduction of parking measures in my street as we find it virtually impossible to get parked anytime. It's particularly bad during the working week as commuters and local businesses use my street as a work car park.	55.95462	-3.1544
Resident	For this whole area, no difficulty parking during the day, as there are no businesses/visitors "stealing" spaces. Parking is difficult at night - there's simply too many residents with cars for the amount of spaces. This solves nothing!	55.9545	-3.15
Resident	have lived in this street for 25 years and have parked at no cost. Now you want me to pay for a permit but probably not get to park when i get home. The cars parked in this street are residents cars.	55.95261	-3.14837
Resident	My car is a long lease so is not registered at my address, therefore don't qualify for permit? Where am I supposed to put my car? What about Company cars?	55.95356	-3.14956
Resident	Both my partner and I are in favour of these plans. However my big concern remains about the narrowness of Scone Gardens, its use as a "rat run" to avoid London Rd traffic lights. Could it be made one way - PLEASE!!!	55.95457	-3.15137
Resident	I like the plan but am concerned about the overspill from Glenlee Garden and Glenlee Avenue impacting on the surrounding streets, particularly Willowbrae Avenue, and Abercorn Road. Scone Terrace, a very narrow Street, has parking on both sides???	55.95316	-3.15039
Resident	As the owner of 75 Willowbrae Avenue, I would like assurances that my driveway entrance. Shown with double yellow lines on the proposal, will have adequate space, and sight lines, for safe entry and exit.	55.95207	-3.14984
Resident	We don't have a parking problem now but will if you remove the 50% of parking on our street that this purposes.	55.95252	-3.14941
Resident	As a resident of "willowbrae north" area in consultation, I utterly oppose these proposed measures! After viewing the colour coded map the idea that parking in the street will be halved is preposterous. As a family of 4 parking at our property is essenti	55.95316	-3.15039
Resident	We don't understand why it is necessary to implement this new project as parking or too many cars are not a problem in Glenlee Gardens (in my opinion)	55.95316	-3.15039
Resident	Would it be possible to see the survey that has created this decision during the worlds largest crisis in modern history.	55.95171	-3.15019
Resident	No problems parking in Glenlee Gardens. No you are proposing we pay for it and are reducing spaces by 59%. Then there will be serious problem parking in this area. Ridiculous idea and nobody in this area will benefit from it	55.95262	-3.14978

Resident	For over 40yrs have NEVER had a problem with parking! Now you propose cutting space by over half and also charging money! This is just a money making joke and helping nobody!	55.95263	-3.14979
Resident	I think this is an awful idea for the area, we have never had any problems parking here, you are just going to cause problems with the parking.	55.95323	-3.15035
Resident	Our daughter has had many health issues and getting to the hospital with a vomiting child with a high fever on a bus is not viable. Half of the street parking in our area is lost in this proposal. You should focus on-street ev charging if we are to pay.	55.95276	-3.14951
Resident	Family can't visit. Difficult to park with a small child - will have to park further away. Clearly a money making scheme or residents would be able to apply for 1 free permit. Will push parking out further east.	55.95313	-3.14907
Resident	Strongly opposed to Glenlee double yellow. Contradictory to easing pressure. No evidence of non-residents parking. Residents will be forced to other streets where pressure will increase in & after CPZ hours. Creates problems, solves none. Utter madness.	55.95298	-3.14896
Resident	Currently people park here. By removing the parking here a lot of spaces will be lost - compounding issues with lack of parking	55.95307	-3.15026
Resident	Currently people park here. By removing the parking here a lot of spaces will be lost - compounding issues with lack of parking	55.95264	-3.14953
Resident	Currently people park here. By removing the parking here a lot of spaces will be lost - compounding issues with lack of parking	55.95302	-3.14904
Resident	Currently people park here. By removing the parking here a lot of spaces will be lost - compounding issues with lack of parking	55.95341	-3.14959
Resident	Could we have an explanation for reducing parking space by half on Glenlee Avenue and Glenlee Gardens? I am in favour of controlled parking but do not think this provides enough space for these two streets	55.95313	-3.14907
Resident	There is currently no problem with the parking on Glenlee Gardens but putting in double yellow lines in half the spaces will create a problem and not be of any benefit to the residents. It is not clear why it is proposed to put in double yellow lines.	55.95268	-3.14979
Resident	I strongly object to the introduction of double yellow lines as this reduces the available parking by 50%. The people who park in our street are all residents. We do not have off road parking, so where would be park.	55.95278	-3.14948
Resident	I strongly object to the proposed double yellow lines, this will reduce residential parking leaving us no where to park.	55.95278	-3.14948
Resident	We are owners of the lock up garages on Kenmure Avenue we we access on a daily basis. If a single yellow line is put in place across the two garages this will restrict our access. Parking out-with restrictions could block access.	55.95307	-3.14769
Resident	At present there is not an issue with parking in my street during day hours the issues are in the evenings when there appears ti be lots of work vans. The proposed parking controls will mean due to double yellow lines there will be less available spaces	55.95345	-3.14949
Resident	No issues with parking at present proposed will make issues due to less spaces and the proposed is a council income generator	55.95309	-3.14946
Resident	no issues with parking at present proposed is an income generator as there will be less spaces available due to double yellow lines	55.95307	-3.14943
Resident	No improvement for me whatsoever as my street is already an overflow from neighbouring streets. Even less chance of getting my one small car parkedna	55.95387	-3.1518
Resident	I have never had problems parking on my street, which is a big attraction for living here. The proposals will mean that more people will park on my street due to restricted parking in the area caused by the increase in double yellow lines.	55.95151	-3.14882

Resident	My street gets the worst of two options by being one side residents parking and opposite mixed which taking in account that the whole surrounding area is mainly residents only is going to lead to visitors parking there as only option available and reside	55.95459	-3.15565
Resident	We'll get even less parking for residents since halving the available space by putting mixed parking in one side of the road. You need to share the burden among the whole area and not just one street	55.95459	-3.15565
Resident	The main times when there are parking pressures is outside the regulated time. Evenings and weekends are when there are the greatest pressure. These bays should also be linked to proposing electric charging bays.	55.95333	-3.15213
Resident	In this location there is an inset in the road and parking bays could be created facing the pavement (perpendicular to the curb). This could maximise parking and slow through traffic.	55.95334	-3.15229
Resident	Vehemently against the proposals. Introducing these paid permit zones is purely a money-making scheme for the council. The only people that use these streets to park are the people who actually live here, as there is no local industry or work places.	55.95451	-3.15513
Resident	Vehemently against the proposals. Introducing these paid permit zones is purely a money-making scheme for the council. The only people that use these streets to park are the people who actually live here, as there is no local industry or work places.	55.95451	-3.15513
Resident	Vehemently against the proposals. Introducing these paid permit zones is purely a money-making scheme for the council. The only people that use these streets to park are the people who actually live here, as there is no local industry or work places; c	55.95451	-3.15513
Resident	I can usually get parked outside my house. How on earth is this improving parking? Double yellow lines will reduce the number of spaces dramatically. I will struggle to be anywhere near my home!!	55.95342	-3.14947
Resident	I am completely against the painting of unnecessary double yellow lines in Glenlee Gardens and proposed parking restrictions. We do not have parking problems in our street. People do not park here then go to town. Lack of parking will lead to conflicts.	55.95285	-3.14975
Resident	If parking is causing such an issue, why on earth have the council given planning permission to allow residencies to be built without additional parking. These are family areas, many of whom have more than one vehicle by necessity.	55.95313	-3.14907
Resident	Unnecessary double yellow line	55.95487	-3.14544
Resident	Massive loss of spaces to residents, loss of spaces for visitors, tradesmen and businesses, and money being charged for worse amenities than before.	55.9529	-3.15002
Resident	Massive loss of spaces to residents, loss of spaces for visitors, tradesmen and businesses, and money being charged for worse amenities than before.	55.95312	-3.14926
Resident	Obsolete disabled bay - do they ever get removed? (some others have, according to the map)	55.95395	-3.15099
Resident	Obsolete disabled bay - do they ever get removed? (some others have, according to the map)	55.9543	-3.15108
Resident	Forgot to add in previous comments on Glenlee Gardens and Avenue - I am aware these roads are narrow and people park on the pavement, which is presumably why yellow lines are proposed. But, the remaining pavement is still wider than others in the area!	55.95286	-3.14995
Resident	Stupid idea. Completely pointless and a waste of money. This is just another parking scheme for Edinburgh Council to make money after Covid. Please explain to me exactly how this benefits me as a resident?	55.95366	-3.14895
Resident	Why is there a gap in controlled parking outside number 3 Wilfrid Terrace? Why are there double yellows on the corner of Wilfrid terrace and Woseley crescent? I'm concerned that removing space here will mean i won't be able to park near my house.	55.954	-3.1495
Resident	The council have said that this is because of parking and lack of spaces. So they want to shorten the parking spaces with yellow lines, city cab spaces and parking control bays. Just be honest and say its all final. Not because of residents complaining	55.95467	-3.14888

Resident	I do not believe paid permit parking should be introduced to Willowbrae. There is not a problem with parking in this area. I have a bicycle and previously commuted when working in town. I am now pregnant and so cannot safely cycle or take the bus	55.95266	-3.15143
Resident	The prosal of the double yellow line on both Glenlee Gardens and 1Avenue is detrimental to the councils plans to allow better parking for residents. By implementing DYL, cars will be pushed on to adjacent streets to park creating more problems.	55.95316	-3.15039
Resident	I strongly oppose all your proposals. Absolutely no need for restrictions. This is Edinburgh Council screwing residents yet again for more money. There is no need for permits or meters. There is no problem as only residents and there visitors park	55.95335	-3.14798
Resident	There are spaces on this and the surrounding streets during the day, but not at night. These cars in the evening are for residents on the street. I cannot see his permit parking will benefit us. Simply put money into the council pocket.	55.95345	-3.14855
Resident	Disappointed that this scheme is not extending south, particularly to Ulster crescent that is so badly impacted by people using it to park for access to Arthur's seat.	55.95212	-3.14556
Resident	I do not think your proposal will help the situation. You are removing parking in my Street and I fear I will struggle to park nearby. I live in glenlee avenue. The street is usually full of parked cars as most residents do have a car. Where will I park	55.95305	-3.14884
Resident	I work in social care and feel that the parking proposals are unlikely to reduce congestion and will negatively increase the cost of living in the area. I would be far more in favour of traffic calming measures that reduce the flow of vehicles.	55.9547	-3.15319
Resident	The proposal would half the current number of available spaces for parking. As a resident without the luxury of a private driveway I am extremelly concerned about where I would park when I finish my job as a teacher at the end of day	55.95346	-3.14963
Resident	Double yellow lines in Glenlea Avenue and Gardens seem excessive overall the reduction in space available to residents can only exasperated the situation and increase parking pressure on streets close by which are outwith the proposed zone	55.95285	-3.14988
Resident	I have concerns that surrounding streets that loose 50% of parking will park in Willowbrae Avenue causing parking issues for residents that are currently not a problem.	55.9523	-3.15069
Resident	I'm colourblind and these colours make it impossible for me to see what is outside my house.	55.95273	-3.1486
Resident	The double yellow lines along the whole of Glenlee Ave & Glenlee Gardens, lead to 7% loss of residents parking space in the CPZ. This will mean 41-42 cars displaced out of the CPZ to Paisley Cres, & the main walking route for local children to School.	55.95286	-3.14978
Resident	The design of the CPZ, reduces residents parking space by 8% to pay&display. Whlst some pay&display may help the CPZ work, 8% is far higher than is needed, when the majority of parking pressure in the CPZ area is need for residents parking.	55.95373	-3.14882
Resident	The design of the CPZ, reduces residents parking space by 8% to pay&display. Whlst some pay&display may help the CPZ work, 8% is far higher than is needed, when the majority of parking pressure in the CPZ area is need for residents parking.	55.95307	-3.15062
Resident	The design of the CPZ, reduces residents parking space by 8% to pay&display. Whlst some pay&display may help the CPZ work, 8% is far higher than is needed, when the majority of parking pressure in the CPZ area is need for residents parking.	55.95423	-3.15257
Resident	The design of the CPZ, reduces residents parking space by 8% to pay&display. Whlst some pay&display may help the CPZ work, 8% is far higher than is needed, when the majority of parking pressure in the CPZ area is need for residents parking.	55.95423	-3.15257
Resident	Asking residents to pay for parking that has hitherto been free is bad enough, but your proposal will drastically reduce the available parking space.	55.9529	-3.15004

Resident	I live on Willowbrae Road, Willowbrae Road already has parking controls ie I cannot park there during the day so I have no option but to park in adjoining streets usually Willowbrae Avenue. This proposal is detrimental not beneficial to local residents.	55.95325	-3.14626
Resident	Work & mobility issues need car parking outside house. No issues before this proposal !!!	55.95306	-3.14923
Resident	Work and mobility issues need parking at house. No issues parking in 36 years before this proposal!!!!	55.95309	-3.14919
Resident	Reduction of parking here is going to push c12-14 cars onto already full streets without yellow lines like Lismore Crescent.	55.95293	-3.15
Resident	The issue on Lilyhill Terrace is the volume and speed of passing traffic, not the volume of cars parking. The road is used as a short cut to avoid the build up of traffic at Jocks Lodge and cars don't adhere to the speed limit.	55.95412	-3.15264
Resident	As a resident I see no need for change this to controlled parking zone. Glenlee Avenue/Gardens are proposed double yellow lines across whole street. Not only will this mean I can't park outside my own house, you're removing spaces so making problem worse	55.9534	-3.1497
Resident	As a resident I see no need for change this to controlled parking zone. Glenlee Avenue/Gardens are proposed double yellow lines across whole street. Not only will this mean I can't park outside my own house, you're removing spaces so making problem worse	55.9534	-3.1497
Resident	Please remove double yellow lines from along Glenlee Gardens only retaining them at the corners. Currently space to legally park on both sides of the street but adding double yellows will create a parking issue that currently doesn't exist.	55.95297	-3.15003
Resident	the proposed means that there will be less parking spaces than at present which will make parking harder and put resident safety at risk as they will have to park outwith home area	55.95344	-3.14946
Resident	I do not see the need at all to make this are in to a Controlled Parking Zone. Why not instead if the Council are determined to do what is already in place in other parts of the city whereby there is restricted parking at certain hours of the day.	55.95354	-3.15113
Resident	It has become apparent during lockdown that the volume of cars in the area is as a result of residents not commuters or visitors which given the volume of tenements is unsurprising. CPZ does not provide more physical space to adds no value.	55.95455	-3.15565
Resident	The CPZ options do not provide any service for the cost, it does not guarantee any closer parking to your home than the current situation. it also is discriminates against those with work cars which are not registered to their home	55.95435	-3.15618
Resident	With the change to home working, which is projected to remain after lockdown for many; this is a very unjust proposal to charge resident during the day to park their car while they work form home.	55.95431	-3.15628
Resident		55.95425	-3.15059
Resident	Willowbrae North-Negative impact for residents with far less spaces than already exist for number of houses with cars meaning locating a space will become unbearable, displacing issue to adjoining streets without restrictions	55.95313	-3.14663
Resident	Only residents park in this area, I am very against being charged to park outside my own home. This is not within reasonable walking distance of the city. There is no need for parking permits in this area.	55.95452	-3.15177
Resident	Counterintuitive - moving/relocating issue instead of solving - cannot solve lack of available parking by reducing it still further	55.95325	-3.14967
Resident	Glenlee Avenue Double yellow lines will remove half available parking - ridiculous - permit holder bays both sides most other streets	55.95325	-3.14966
Resident	I am very concerned that the proposals have not allowed enough parking for all the residents. I understand the need for parking restrictions introduced, but with so many double yellow lines, there won't be enough parking bays for each house-hold.	55.95313	-3.14907
Resident	I'm very happy to see the proposed changes to parking but have some serious concerns about the movement of the bins on Meadowbank Crescent. The suggested position is adjacent to Meadowbank Avenue which acts as a wind tunnel.	55.9546	-3.15484

Resident	If congestion, you are forcing it into neighbouring areas by these parking restrictions. This is mainly a cash grab by the car hating council.	55.95298	-3.14948
Resident	I object. There is sufficient parking in the area at present and these measures will create parking problems where currently non exist. Specifically, the proposal to introduce double yellow lines on Glenlee Avenue and Gardens	55.95333	-3.14946
Resident	This proposal reduces the parking options by 50% on my street. I am expected to pay for a parking permit with drastically reduced parking opportunities. I object.	55.95334	-3.14944
Resident	I'll have to pay to park in my road. However I won't be able to park there since visitors will take most of the spaces.	55.9545	-3.15563
Resident	Less parking and having to pay for it	55.95421	-3.14556
Resident	I don't see a problem during daytime. I'm concerned about visitor parking, e.g my 85 year old father can't walk up the hill, and only resident parking on my block.	55.95334	-3.15212
Resident	The proposed double yellow line on Glenlee Avenue would reduce the available parking spaces by half, thus making it more difficult to find parking for residents.	55.95327	-3.14931
Resident	The double yellow lines on Glenlee Gardens will reduce the available parking by half, making it more difficult for residents to find parking.	55.95286	-3.14988
Resident	Slightly concerned that this area is currently planned to be single yellow line - I think this will actually encourage parking along this tight area of road alongside the wall of the Park outside controlled hours. I believe this should be a double yellow	55.95276	-3.15188
Resident	Please do NOT take away parking on Glenlee Ave. I am a resident and I park in our street. I do not agree with you removing half our residents spaces. I do not mind paying for a permit.	55.95305	-3.14884
Resident	Key crossing point for pedestrians coming from Abercorn Rd to access Park through Lilyhill Gate. Cars often park up against railing & make access to Park difficult for pedestrians. Extending double yellow here would be good	55.95287	-3.15201
Resident	DOUBLE YELLOWS NOT NECESSARY ON THIS CORNER	55.95431	-3.15024
Resident	This used to be a disabled space but the gentleman the bay was for died a long time ago but the markings have not been burned off	55.95398	-3.1495
Resident	This is where lots of children cross on way to/from school. Parking of large vehicles on this corner limits visibility, and is dangerous even with Irene the lollipop lady helping them. Would be good to see more use of double yellows here.	55.95222	-3.14944
Resident	Why bins here-there are options not by flats' doors? Locals use cars mainly to go out of town, not into town. A sustainable solution (multi-organisational) is to improve public transport options e.g. for E.Loithian commuters. What about bike lock ups?	55.95461	-3.1548
Resident	The proposals of double yellow lines in Glenlee Gardens and Avenue is ridiculous. These streets are used for residential parking. We live up a steep hill. Elderly need to park at their door. It will encourage rat race speedy traffic!	55.95285	-3.14975
Resident	I live at 14 Meadowbank Ave. The bins at the moment aren't outside any properties. I propose the bins outside my house (14) be moved up the street where is there is a hedge. Other side (No11) to be moved down where they are just now. Not outside a door.	55.95497	-3.15499
Resident	Both Glenlee Gardens and Avenue will have a 50% plus reduction in parking spaces due to double yellow lines. Resulting in displacement of other residents, issues for families with children, elderly residents. No clear rationale for the proposal of DYLs	55.95314	-3.14915
Resident	The proposal seems likely to achieve the opposite of it's stated purpose; to reduce parking pressure. Comparing the current parking options and those proposed, there appears to be a c17% reduction in available kerbside; increasing in parking pressure	55.95393	-3.15178
Resident	GOOD GOD! VAN'T YOU I****S GIVE US SOME SPACE TO TYPE SOMETHING SUBSTANTIVE! THIS PALTRY ONE LINE SPACE ISN'T EVEN ENOUGH TEXT SPACE FOR ME TO COMPLAIN PROPERLY! COME ON. CONSULT PROPERLY!	55.9536	-3.15092

Resident	Moving the bins here, so that they are in front of someone's house is crazy. Noise + rubbish. There are plenty of other locations in the street that are not directly in front of someone's house or stair.	55.95461	-3.1548
Resident	Substantially reduces parking provision for Kenmure Av, Glenlee Av, Glenlee G. Times of greatest difficulty parking are evenings when most cars are residents. Therefore for many changes will mean paying for a permit, but having to park in another zone	55.95343	-3.1483
Resident	Bins moved in front of the entrance to my flat (building 6 & 8 Meadowbank Crescent)	55.95456	-3.15487
Resident	There is (mathematically) a significant reduction in parking spaces being suggested here. This would have the opposite effect to the proposed, which is to ease congestion. We run a real risk of those who need cars not having a space.	55.9536	-3.15092
Resident	Parking is fine here, keep out of it. The shambles you have made of parking in the rest of the city is trouble enough for everyone.	55.95316	-3.14646
Resident	I would like to know how the proposals will meet the needs of residents with cars in the area who will need to pay for something which is currently free when there is already insufficient space overnight for the cars in the area.	55.9542	-3.14992
Resident	At the location I have marked today is a metal rail beside the road leading into the park. It looks like you will make this permit parking. It would be better to have 1m of double yellow lines as this is where people cross to get to the park.	55.9529	-3.152
Resident	It looks like the parking pressures will be moved onto nearby streets which are already congested. Some of the problem's created by poorly planned accommodations for cyclists	55.94998	-3.14051
Resident	Both Glenlee Av and Gdns will have parking space reduced by 50% which will mean parking a distance from house putting residents at risk having to park a distance away as well as effecting property values. Paying for a space on chance of parking	55.95347	-3.1495
Resident	Having lived here for 31 years and had free on street parking see no advantage of the parking restrictions being imposed on us.	55.95441	-3.15715
Resident	Second attempt! Resident for over 31 years and had free on street parking, no advantage to me to start paying for this. If the resident permits were free would seem less patronizing. Council money spinner.	55.95437	-3.15674
Resident	There are 4 tenement blocks here, which have 34 plus households, you don't appear to have included street bins, currently this stretch would take approx 11 cars. Suggest permits on park side also.	55.95435	-3.15695
Resident	Questioning that you have the right to paint double yellow lines on a corner that is privately owned, not a public roadway?	55.95374	-3.15414
Resident	There is not currently a problem; this will create one, will displace any difficulty and will impose unnecessary expense on residents who have no driveways so have no way of avoiding charges.	55.95226	-3.15038
Resident	I cannot see the logic in an attempt to alleviate parking pressures by literally removing parking places. The roads in this area are 100% residential and are virtually untouched by commuters. Removing spaces is only going to exacerbate existing issues.	55.95286	-3.14977
Resident	The proposed double yellow line will remove half the parking in our street. Parking is most busy in the evenings as residents return from work. This proposal will make the parking situation worse and will push parking congestion to surrounding streets.	55.95299	-3.14981
Resident	I am a pensioner with health problems. I've lived here for almost 40 years. If I cannot park near my house I will need to sell up, as you are proposing double yellow lines outside my door and no permits on my side of the street I will be housebound.	55.95408	-3.1525
Resident	Location of Communal Bins are not placed with residents of Meadowbank Crescent as a priority. They are very unsightly attract vermin a health hazard and devalue the properties affected. They should be placed to cause minimum dissatisfaction to the resid	55.95543	-3.15794
Resident	Strongly object to the double yellow lines. Completely contradicts the goal of increasing residents ability to park near their own homes	55.95335	-3.14926

Resident	Parking demand & availability varies from day to day, and depending on the time of day. I don't think the proposed restrictions will help. I fear it will make it harder to get a space near my house. I also worry that my family won't get a nearby space	55.95356	-3.15115
Resident	I happy to pay for zone parking if it increases parking space for residents however reducing parking by 50% in some streets will reduce parking and impact on parking in surrounding streets.	55.95234	-3.15064
Resident	Parking proposal means that in my street Glenlee Avenue and in neighbouring Glenlee Gardens, we are losing 50% of our parking spaces. Double yellows will create a dangerous rat run and lower property values.	55.95214	-3.14695
Resident	Not happy about double yellows on 50% of my street. This will create a rat run and lower property values in Glenlee Avenue and Gardens as we will not have any readily available parking, even if we paid for a permit. This will just push parking further out.	55.95275	-3.14829
Resident	This makes no sense, why would we reduce the number of parking spaces. I have lived here over 30 years and never had an issue with parking, we, like our neighbors are not precious about parking outside our doors so we make it work between us.	55.95281	-3.15011
Resident	Parking spaces are not an issue for residents or visitors at the top of Willowbrae. We currently park safely directly outside our house. The proposed double yellow lines means we will not be able to park outside our house and will pay for the privilege	55.95225	-3.14976
Resident	Planned scheme is focused on revenue making, rather than neighbourhood concerns. As a neighbouring resident I'm concerned that parking will be pushed into surrounding streets and therefore put pressure on the availability of parking elsewhere.	55.95135	-3.14714
Resident	I am strongly opposed to the double yellow lines proposed for Glenlee avenue and Glenlee gardens. I will be unable to park near my home. This will cause a safety issue transporting my young child.	55.95327	-3.14936
Resident	The proposed restrictions will put further pressure on the parking situation in Willowbrae North. In particular, the double yellow lines in Glenlee Gardens and Glenlee Avenue will just force cars into the surrounding streets making them busier..	55.95278	-3.14973
Resident	Double yellow lines in Glenlee Avenue are unnecessary and will only make the parking worse in the surrounding streets.	55.9534	-3.1497
Resident	There is an ample space here away from the corner so I don't know why it is being taken away.	55.95363	-3.15244
Resident	There is no way that parked cars can fit on both sides of this road. One side needs to be double yellow lines.	55.95361	-3.15272
Resident	If Glenlee is to get double yellow lines why not Scone Gardens which is much narrower and more congested?	55.95451	-3.15179
Resident	As an alternative can white spaces be painted on the ground so that people will park more considerately and more spaces will be freed up?	55.9537	-3.1523
Resident	The problem in Lismore Avenue is the number of camper vans which take up multiple spaces. Will they require to apply for a "double" permit?	55.95391	-3.15178
Resident	The main parking issues are at night and in the evenings and the proposed permits will not help this at all.	55.9542	-3.15272
Resident	The proposal is not based on ANY complaints received from the Willowbrae North residents in regards to parking. This scheme will cause a new financial burden to residents in the area and only push out the parking to the next set of residential streets.	55.95278	-3.1479
Resident	The plans for Glenlee Ave make no sense on several counts - demand is high, and having double yellow lines on the street (and neighbouring Glenlee Gardens) will leave residents struggling to park their cars, even if we buy permits	55.95313	-3.14907
Resident	I do not think the suggested changes will solve the problems we are told they are being put in place to fix.	55.95304	-3.15107
Resident	The proposals for Glenlee Avenue and Glenlee Gardens are not suitable and will significantly reduce parking spaces. I have grave concerns incl safety, wellbeing, permit height restriction and property value. Alternative options need to be considered.	55.95264	-3.14847

Resident	I'm in favour. My street (scone gardens) is very congested and has a high flow of traffic during weekdays. Very hard to get parked anywhere near my house	55.95256	-3.14937
Resident	Re: Considine Terrace ...small bit of double yellow in middle of the permit ? Why ? No need abs doesn't make sense?	55.9543	-3.15452
Resident	Reducing the overall number of resident parking spaces will just create a problem rather than try to solve an issue that doesn't really exist. Leave alone. Focus on reducing speeding motorists using our roads as rat runs.	55.9537	-3.14883
Resident	I do not approve	55.95438	-3.20144
Resident	Would like to have joined the online meeting but there was no mention on the leaflet that you had to sign up in advance. This prevented us from participating. Very disappointed.	55.95135	-3.1468
Resident	Glen Lee Gardens and Avenue should have parking on both sides to allow residents to park near their homes.	55.95283	-3.14981
Resident	Not owning a car or being a driver, use a crutch, depend on family members/friends who visit events, meals/they need to be able to park as close to my house as possible. Many other households have two or three cars! Can I have a permit for Family cars?	55.95376	-3.15304
Resident	It's not clear what the impetus is for new parking measures. I'm concerned about the huge reduction in parking on Glenlee Avenue/Gardens for residents there and the increased pressure on Willowbrae Avenue and surrounding streets.	55.95232	-3.14887
Resident	Decreasing parking here will increase pressures on surrounding streets	55.95301	-3.15006
Resident	If permit holders park here as 'overflow' there will be no room for visitors	55.95388	-3.15174
Resident	I do not want any sort of yellow lines across my driveway - single or otherwise. The current set up works perfectly well.	55.95425	-3.14985
Resident	Don't understand the need for these lines here?	55.9543	-3.15023
Resident	Not clear what the driving forces for the proposed changes are. Close to the main road and at the west end of area parking at night is a problem due to the tenements and the large no. of residents but generally overall it is not a problem for most people	55.95227	-3.15047
Resident	Reducing the available parking space is only going to push the space issue to neighbouring areas	55.95403	-3.14881
Resident	I am objecting to the repositioning of the bins to outside No 6/8/10 Meadowbank Crescent it will be outside 24 flats front doors, they smell and attract rats. It is also at the top of Meadowbank Avenue where the wind comes up and blows the rubbish about	55.95462	-3.1548
Resident	The rationale behind this is not clear. Also think the consultation and awareness of this as a project has been poor particularly in a time when residents are distracted by covid and the challenges which it has brought.	55.95238	-3.14882
Resident	I oppose the proposed changes to parking and the relocation of bins to outside 8-12 Meadowbank Crescent	55.95461	-3.15481
Resident	I have sent an email to the above address with some concerns	55.95161	-3.14328
Resident	This CPZ Introduction which has not been requested by residents will impact negatively on Abercorn Crescent, which currently has no parking issues, due to the displacement of vehicles in the CPZ. The pressure survey done 2018 is this valid post covid	55.95161	-3.14328
Resident	Displacement of cars from the CPZ will cause wider issues in surrounding streets - Abercorn Cresc will become a dumping ground for those without permits affecting the people who live there negatively. I don't feel commuter traffic is an issue at all	55.95161	-3.14328
Resident	The 'pressure survey' is out of date. Abbeyhill having restrictions won't impact Willowbrae. Commuters is not a big issue here. This forces parking issues into other areas. Camper vans are a big issue but they will move to outwith CPZ zones creating more i	55.9537	-3.14883
Resident	We do not need this in our area, in fact I think the permits will make it worse. There is no need. I can get parked near my home no problem. I really don't want to pay for a yearly permit when there is no issue here.	55.95489	-3.15135

Resident	Why are preexisting disabled parking bays not included in the plan? My partner was allocated a space outside our home by the Council last year will this concession for disabled residents be lost? Cou	55.95261	-3.15084
Resident	I strongly oppose the proposed CPZ proposals. I also strongly oppose the relocation of the communal bins to outside my property which will increase noise and rubbish pollution outside the entrances to multiple properties.	55.9546	-3.15464
Resident	Having lived in other areas of Edinburgh with resident parking zones I can say they are not beneficial to residents. They simply reduce the places to park for residents and visitors alike. Arriving home mid to late evening often all spaces are taken	55.95467	-3.15539
Resident	I am concerned by the reduced number of spaces overall and the 'shared bays' in Queen's Park Avenue. Already, we have the issue of users of the park parking, but main issue is eve and w/end. Nearby residents who cannot find a space will also park in QPA.	55.95432	-3.15671
Resident	The admission that council (Andrew Mackay) have received 0 complaints re parking in W Brae North is significant. Cllr MacInnes states (on Council website) "This review responds to the concerns of residents across the city". This is not so for W Brae	55.95313	-3.14663
Resident	Introduction of fees for parking is an increased financial burden on households. There is sufficient parking at moment without the imposition of restrictions.	55.95275	-3.14774
Resident	I think this is a terrible idea just a money making scheme from Edinburgh. There is no issues with parking in this area it is public streets and people can park anywhere.	55.95418	-3.15472
Resident	Double yellow lines in Glenlee Avenue and Gdns will displace up to 40 cars. There is nowhere for them to go	55.95283	-3.14975
Resident	The shared parking will mean visitors will park at our location making it more difficult for us to park near our home. Better to have no PCZ so visitors can park more flexibly	55.95266	-3.14795
Resident	Implementation of double yellow lines will displace numerous vehicles into neighbouring streets and knock on will affect adjoining streets not in the CPZ, e.g. Paisley Crescent, creating a problem for residents there.	55.95263	-3.14954
Resident	Relocation of 2 bin clusters not in front of flats to directly in front of Nos.8-12 is ridiculous. CPZ offers no benefit to residents, if anything worse. Concentrate efforts on reducing commuter parking - improve public transport from commuter belt.	55.95455	-3.15473
Resident	The proposals will result in less parking spaces overall. The premise for the proposals is flawed - the residents complaints are not from this area. The vast majority of residents here are against parking controls and in favour of the status quo.	55.95235	-3.15005
Resident	in order to offer an appropriate number of parking spaces it is imperative that cars park both sides of this road - like they do currently. if the proposal is to remove these parking spaces this proposal cannot and must NOT go ahead.	55.95337	-3.14954
Resident	these parking spaces cannot and must not be removed. cars must continue to be allowed to park here both sides of the road in order to maintain current balance. This proposal to reduce resident parking is unworkable and should not proceed	55.95303	-3.14908
Resident	why is parking not permitted in this area? the proposal to reduce resident parking is not a viable solution. This proposal should not proceed and is against residents wishes	55.95354	-3.14853
Resident	why is parking not permitted in this area? the proposal to reduce resident parking is not a viable solution. This proposal should not proceed and is against residents wishes	55.95447	-3.15204
Resident	why is parking not permitted in this area - the road can take cars both side and does. the proposal to reduce resident parking is not a viable solution. This proposal should not proceed and is against residents wishes	55.95294	-3.14998
Resident	This proposal to reduce resident parking is not a viable solution. This proposal should not proceed and is against residents wishes	55.95264	-3.14955
Resident	I think more of Queen's Park Avenue should be permit only, between numbers 1-14. The proposal information provided is very limited and does not provide indicative permit pricing information for residents.	55.95439	-3.15725

Resident	Control of parking is unnecessary in Willowbrae Ave-SW. There is currently no difficulty parking for the residents. Double yellows proposed outside my house inappropriate/unnecessary for such a shallow bend; will create a parking issue where none exists	55.95237	-3.15038
Resident	The proposed introduction of CPZ to resolve apparent congestion actually reduces the extent of practical parking with the loss of over 60 spaces in Glenlee Avenue & Gardens (the key issue). This not only INCREASES congestion in the adjacent streets but f	55.95332	-3.14943
Resident	The proposed introduction of CPZ to resolve apparent congestion actually reduces the extent of practical parking with the loss of over 60 spaces in Glenlee Avenue & Gardens (the key issue). This not only INCREASES congestion in the adjacent streets but f	55.95288	-3.14882
Resident	The proposed introduction of CPZ to resolve apparent congestion actually reduces the extent of practical parking with the loss of over 60 spaces in Glenlee Avenue & Gardens (the key issue). This not only INCREASES congestion in the adjacent streets but f	55.95283	-3.14977
Resident	The proposed introduction of CPZ to resolve apparent congestion actually reduces the extent of practical parking with the loss of over 60 spaces in Glenlee Avenue & Gardens (the key issue). This not only INCREASES congestion in the adjacent streets but f	55.95257	-3.14942
Resident	There is an entrance to a garage/parking area next to 14 Willowbrae Ave that is not shown correctly on the map	55.95279	-3.14787
Resident	It seems daft to have a shared use bay directly in front of a row of houses when just across the road there is an area of parking that is not directly in front of any house	55.9527	-3.14787
Resident	Between 12 and 21 Willowbrae Ave there is currently space to park 4 cars between driveways, the plan is to cover these 4 places with single yellow lines, why? If the proposal to remove over 40 spaces from the Glenlees goes ahead, we will need these.	55.95284	-3.1474
Resident	Currently, the owners of these garages park their car in front of them, the plan is to put yellow lines here, further reducing the number of available spaces.	55.95308	-3.14774
Resident	Your proposal to remove over 40 parking spaces from such a small area is totally unacceptable, you need to come up with a better solution.	55.95282	-3.14977
Resident	Rather than resolve parking issues this proposal will create massive parking problems.	55.95267	-3.1479
Resident	If a survey has been taken of the area why would this area not be allocated as Shared Use Bays rather than outside residents houses ? There are several ares like this available.	55.95276	-3.14792
Resident	Kenmure and the Glenlee's could be made into one-way streets (alternating) which would ease through traffic and remove the need for double yellow lines.	55.95307	-3.14897
Resident	Scone Gardens and Lismore Ave could be one way streets to ease flow of traffic.	55.95449	-3.15149
Resident	This is yet another TAX on residents, no benefit whatsoever to the area. If you reduce parking spaces (for example in the Glenlee's) the traffic will become faster and more frequent creating a hazard for children and the elderly.	55.95314	-3.14911
Resident	Has the impact been assessed on the overspill of parking into surrounding areas ?	55.95219	-3.14935
Resident	The number of available parking spaces will be greatly reduced with the introduction of yellow lines specifically in Willowbrae Avenue, Glenlee Gardens and Glenlee Avenue. We will be paying for parking when a space will not be guaranteed.	55.95289	-3.14718
Resident	Currently the lockups provide two parking spaces for the owners. Yellow lines will mean they will need to use alternative parking which is already scarce	55.95304	-3.14767
Resident	residents parking will move the parking issues on to streets outside the designated zone	55.95292	-3.14966
Resident	This bay is rarely used. Could car club cars park in permit bays instead? This would free a number of unused spaces.	55.95501	-3.15371
Resident	Shared bays will be filled with park visitors which will sop residents parking. This will occur throughout the area unless the restrictions are very long.	55.95431	-3.15682

Resident	This change to current arrangements is completely unnecessary. This proposal introduces problems where none exists at present.	55.95275	-3.14983
Resident	I object to the re-positioning of the waste bins outside numbers 6, 8 and 10 Meadowbank Crescent	55.95461	-3.15481
Resident	Why are we losing 50% of our on street parking spaces whilst scone gardens are keeping all there spaces	55.95313	-3.14907
Resident	Parking is already really bad in this area and getting worse. Some type of controlled parking would be welcomed to help residents and create a more sustainable local environment.	55.95316	-3.14664
Resident	paying for a resident parking permit which is creating less parking places in street and . adjacent streets than have at present which is the opposite of what the plan is expected to do	55.95344	-3.14948
Resident	Relocation of the bins in our street to just outside our building is a great concern. Apart from being immensely unsightly and creating a higher footfall just outside our door, the site is just at the top of Meadowbank Avenue which acts as a wind channel	55.95457	-3.15478
Resident	The proposal to move bins from a section of Meadowbank Crescent which is currently not in front of anyones home to outside 8,10,12 Meadowbank Crescent directly at the top of Meadowbank Avenue is ridiculous.	55.9546	-3.15482
Resident	The proposal to move bins from their current location to outside residential homes with small children and elderly is a health hazard. The bins will also now be located at the top of a wind tunnel and will cause more rubbish to fly all over the street.	55.95459	-3.15482
Resident	Double yellow lines opposite front of house ,reducing parking availability by 50% ,this does not help residents ,pushes us to park further out to Abercorn tennis courts.It also creates a dangerous rat run here and in Gardens.	55.95275	-3.14829
Resident	How are Scone Gardens afforded permit bays with their pavements being a third narrower than ours ? Narrow our pavements.	55.95443	-3.15156
Resident	With the reduction in parking ,the CPZ is meant to help residents,it does not ,we will be forced to park maybe 2 streets away from our home ,affecting our safety when returning at night	55.9521	-3.14939
Resident	If CPZ is enforced on us ,we may have to lose our valued garden full of green shrubs and trees to create off street park at 35 Glenlee Avenue ,our valued oasis to help our mental health in the midst of a pandemic.How is that environmentally friendly ?	55.9529	-3.14822
Resident	Double yellow lines will force my vulnerable wife to park a long distance from our house, with a 3 year old during the dark and with all the potential safety issues which may arise. In addition, her morbidly obese mother simply cannot walk that distance.	55.95318	-3.14909
Resident	I do not approve of the proposed changes to parking. There is no real issue with parking currently. The introduction of yellow lines in the proposed places will cause parking congestion.	55.95308	-3.15028
Resident	I do not approve of the proposed changes to parking. There is no real issue with parking currently. The introduction of yellow lines in the proposed places will cause parking congestion.	55.95257	-3.14942
Resident	I do not approve of the proposed changes to parking. There is no real issue with parking currently. The introduction of yellow lines in the proposed places will cause parking congestion.	55.95334	-3.14948
Resident	I do not approve of the proposed changes to parking. There is no real issue with parking currently. The introduction of yellow lines in the proposed places will cause parking congestion.	55.95284	-3.14871
Resident	I oppose the proposed changes to parking in this area. This will cause MORE issues for residents. I also oppose the repositioning of communal bins to outside 8-12 from opposite 14-16 MC	55.95462	-3.1544
Resident	This shared bay should not be on this side of the road - it will be better placed on other side, where gable-ends of terraced housing are.	55.95279	-3.1476
Resident	You have neglected to inform residents that there is currently planning for a CPZ in Abbeyhill which will directly affect Willowbrae North.	55.95438	-3.15722
Resident	It is true that Abbeyhill residents have been calling for parking controls for some time, and a scheme is to be introduced there later this year. It is also true is that the problem of commuter parking will almost certainly be displaced to Willowbrae whe	55.95433	-3.15677

Resident	The problem is a lack of parking spaces - a plan which severely reduces parking spaces is therefore a retrograde step.	55.953	-3.14681
Resident	Whilst I understand the benefits of restricted parking in principle - the proposed double yellow lines will mean there is less parking available- not more. I disagree with double yellow lines in Glenlee Avenue - and therefore I oppose the proposed plan	55.95337	-3.1497
Resident	Despite the absurd decision to reduce available parking in the street there is not even the option for residents to load/unload in what is a quiet street.	55.95284	-3.14975
Resident	There is no good reason for shared parking here, this should be residential parking only.	55.9527	-3.14784
Resident	This should be residential parking only	55.9539	-3.15151
Resident	DYLs will remove far too many parking spaces in an area which has a high number of residential vehicles. You would know this if your survey was done past 5pm	55.953	-3.14893
Resident	Too much shared parking. This scheme should not be encouraging visitors to Holyrood Park to park in residential streets. There are parking facilities at the park and visitors should be encouraged to use public transport	55.95425	-3.1561
Resident	I am strongly AGAINST double yellow lines being painted in Glenlee Gardens. Parking will be reduced by 50% in the street causing greater parking problems in the area.	55.95285	-3.14975
Resident	Unhappy about the repositioning of the wastebins on Meadowbank Crescs.Undermining the streetscene,ugly, will attract more litter as wind comes up Meadowbank Avenue, more rats and remarkable uncaring of the residents who have to look, hear, smell them	55.95459	-3.15483
Resident	Upset about the waste bins being positioned outside homes this will undermine the aesthetic of Meadowbank Crescent, the value of the flats and area. more rubbish in the gardens/kerbs, due to wind coming up Meadowbank Avenue	55.95455	-3.15483
Resident	No need - plenty space in streets and will cause problems for surrounding areas and make it more unsafe for residents and children	55.95486	-3.14903
Resident	Survey carried out 2018 does not relate to the current climate which will be here for a few years yet- wher more people will be working from home-hence the cars will be parked at owners own door. Not people travelling into town leaving cars parked.	55.95199	-3.14762
Resident	Unnecessary, very costly,poorly considered, bad timing with Pandemic. Spend money on improving road surfaces first. I suggest councillors try cycling in this area, before asking residents for more money!	55.95432	-3.15097
Resident	I think the controlled parking is a great idea. There are far too many cars in my area and Edinburgh. Better integrated public transport is required.	55.95464	-3.14958
Resident	As a resident of (redacted postcode) I object to these proposals. I do not believe there is currently need for parking restrictions in the area as parking is not an issue for residents. There is very little through traffic and parking from non residents.	55.95334	-3.15224
Resident	This will make parking harder for residents and care providers, and more challenging to do any business in the area.	55.95334	-3.15224
Resident	This is not a solution to a problem - it's a tax, and an imposition on residents. Any visitors, carers, trades coming to bring services will be penalised. Local businesses too. It's an outrageous imposition and cannot be justified as there's no problem.	55.95387	-3.14913
Resident	This is going to exacerbate rather than relieve parking problems - problems that will result from previous council decisions allowing the construction of more housing and student accommodation without adequate parking provision.	55.95462	-3.13467
Resident	Please do not relocate the bins!!The new placement is an unsheltered spot outside 24 residents homes (including1with special needs).This will reduce property value, be a health risk (rodents), eyesore and create bigger rubbish problem for entire street!	55.95454	-3.15493

Resident	Please do not relocate the bins!!The new placement is an unsheltered spot outside 24 residents homes (including1with special needs).This will reduce property value, be a health risk (rodents), eyesore and create bigger rubbish problem for entire street!	55.95455	-3.15473
Resident	Please do not relocate the bins!!The new placement is an unsheltered spot outside 24 residents homes (including1with special needs).This will reduce property value, be a health risk (rodents), eyesore and create bigger rubbish problem for entire street!	55.95455	-3.15473
Resident	Please do not relocate the bins!!The new placement is an unsheltered spot outside 24 residents homes (including1with special needs).This will reduce property value, be a health risk (rodents), eyesore and create bigger rubbish problem for entire street!	55.95455	-3.15473
Resident	Please do not relocate the bins!!The new placement is an unsheltered spot outside 24 residents homes (including1with special needs).This will reduce property value, be a health risk (rodents), eyesore and create bigger rubbish problem for entire street!	55.95454	-3.15493
Resident	Please do not relocate the bins!!The new placement is an unsheltered spot outside 24 residents homes (including1with special needs).This will reduce property value, be a health risk (rodents), eyesore and create bigger rubbish problem for entire street!	55.95455	-3.15473
Resident	I do not agree with this proposal as it will result in a net loss of parking spaces and unnecessary costs for residents.	55.95466	-3.15555
Resident	Our street will lose 50% of its parking spaces by only having parking on one side of the street. This will make the road wider and more open to speeding / short cut use than currently. I'd like to see a chicane/ other safety measures to help prevent this	55.95276	-3.14965
Resident	Residents on our street (Glenlee Gardens) are all in favour of having smaller than standard parking bays (eg 1.8m width) so that there can continue to be parking on both sides of the street. Making street one-way would also make it safer.	55.95282	-3.14995
Resident	I'm concerned that CPZ will increase volume of parking and traffic on Paisly Cresc (first street outside zone to south), especially during morning rush hour. This is the main walking route to school for all kids in the area.	55.95214	-3.14934
Resident	This area could do with a crossing or yellow boxed area to help pedestrians cross into Holyrood Park. It's currently often difficult to cross here, especially with a pram.	55.95291	-3.15198
Resident	There should be no shared use spaces on Meadowbank avenue - bottom spaces are currently used by employees of local businesses, not 'shoppers' - Spaces on wolseley crescent ample and much more convenient for shops. MA is one way st, and easily congested!	55.95511	-3.15503
Resident	Unsuitable cluster of bins - convenient for lorry, not for users! Will also limit recycling bins (wheels on steep road?!).these are MOST in demand, need more GREEN bins! Remove 1 side bins M. Ave, place between 37-39 Meadowbank Cresc (as present)	55.95498	-3.15496
Residentbetter than current (v poor bin placement - tickets for overhanging lines but should be more space!). Ensure spaces for at least 6 'normal' cars in this residents bay, and shorten double yellow lines to min possible (less than Asda van!!)	55.95477	-3.15484
Resident	I want to object to the repositioning of the waste bins outside the front doors, for health and safety and aesthetic reasons. Please leave bins where they are.	55.9546	-3.15481
Resident	Unnecessary shared use space	55.9545	-3.15573
Resident	This is ample shared use for the entire road in my opinion	55.95419	-3.15559
Resident	This is a perfect place for the Asda van :) Also need sight of cyclists here Excellent.....BUT consider limiting lines on Meadowbank Ave and corner opposite so that you can only have one at a time, or this will persist!	55.95466	-3.15504
Resident	I do like res bays on Considine terrace, but again too much yellow lines!yes give more space for pedestrians/drop curbs but big yellows will just get vans, and unnecessary fine revenues!	55.95408	-3.15495
Resident	Agree to limit a little here - very tight. BUT why not place bins here?! - more recycling as well please, Not JUST more fines!	55.95427	-3.15582

Resident	Far too many shared use spaces! half or even third ample - people visting hollyrood caneasily park in the park, not here too please!.....this will become very congested and no turning up QPA, congestes whole area	55.95432	-3.1567
Resident	This implies there is a pavement here - there is not, and presume there is not plan to make one....there's plenty of pavement on opposite side of road. Grey bit, all the way up wall should be tarmacked specifically to park cars, 80% residents 'overflow'	55.95424	-3.15595
Resident	Good	55.95463	-3.15528
Resident	This will not benefit the residents as most of the parking is due to high resident numbers in the tenements. In areas withiut Tenements the parking problem is much reduced or no exisident.	55.95466	-3.15555
Resident	Double yellow lines on my street taking about 50 percent of parking does not meet you objective of allowing residents to park near their homes!	55.95298	-3.15002
Resident	More residential parking is certainly needed. Despite having residential zone parking, people park badly and there isn't physical capacity to park within zone 6 past abiut 7pm. More residential parking is needed!	55.95881	-3.19372
Resident	More nonsensical regulations wasting public money just to get more for themselves with all the alledged corruption	55.94962	-3.14083
Resident	My main concern is that even if we pay for a resident parking permit, there still won't be room to park on our own street, Meadowbank Terrace.	55.95485	-3.15714
Visitor	Unacceptable that I will need to visit my mother by car and require to pay for a visitors permit with a limited time of 90 minutes. People will risk loading and blocking willowbrae road lanes due to this or park in surrounding streets not requiring permi	55.95375	-3.14981
Visitor	My daughters house has a proposal of double yellow lines directly outside her house which is a residential Street, my husband and I are elderly and unable to walk a distance due to health problems, therefore parking is essential outside her house.	55.95258	-3.14946
Visitor	I am the main childcare for my daughters children and come and park when watching her kids at the moment there is no issues ever parking near to her home, if we park further away for a price i feel due to health and finances I could no longer help her, t	55.95161	-3.14328
Visitor	Permits will not change the parking in the area. I do not want my daughter to have to pay for a permit when she will see no improvements. She gets parked as well as can expect. The improvement that would better this is a driveway! Not permits.	55.95495	-3.15134
Visitor	The bins should be positioned between 37 and 39 on the other side of the road, where they will be both shielded from the wind tunnel at M'bank Ave and not adjacent to any tenements or houses.	55.95462	-3.15479
Visitor	I am objecting to the repositioning of the bins on Meadowbank Crescent. They ought not to be in front of anyone's doorway!	55.95459	-3.15482
Visitor	I object to the entire proposal as it will create even more traffic in an area that is already difficult to navigate by bicycle or by car. It will disadvantage my neighbouring community by giving them less spaces to park in an already congested area.	55.95417	-3.1517
Visitor	I live just outside of this area and walk with my kids around there regularly & support the plans as a whole. Parking is v. bad here and pavements often blocked. More car club bays please!	55.97905	-3.72178

Appendix C – Emails

<u>Area</u>	<u>Bonnington</u>	<u>Corstorphine</u>	<u>Easter Road</u>	<u>Murrayfield (B9)</u>	<u>Roseburn</u>	<u>Saughtonhall</u>	<u>West Leith</u>	<u>Willowbrae North</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total comments	58	120	6	64	8	67	58	98	479
Consultation remarks - survey, evidence, data etc	33	53		27	6	43	34	49	245
No space to park	2	5		3	1		3	5	19
Parking not an issue/Enough spaces available	33	48	4	31		43	27	37	223
Negative impact on areas i.e. displacement onto other roads, reduction in businesses etc	24	61	3	26	2	33	38	66	253
Monetary concern - Expensive, moneymaking, etc	16	31	5	27		23	20	38	160
Supportive comments	5	3		5	2	3	2	3	23
Capacity for new housing developments concern	7	2	1	1			1	7	19
Football/Rugby games (weekend)			2	1		5	2		10
Other/unclassified	6			1		1	3	8	19
General objection	3	3		1		1	2	5	15
Multiple cars per household/unused garages	2				1	1			4
Concerns with emergency vehicles access		1		3		2	1	1	8


Other priorities for funding – road maintenance, traffic calming measures and cycling	13	7	2	14		4	8	11	59
Disabled/ carer parking concerns		18		5	1	6	7	11	48
Enforcement - better of existing and concerns with proposed		1	1				1		3
Encourages creation of private driveways	2	4		4		6	2	1	19
Would affect property value/prices				2		1		4	7
Issues with abandoned vehicles	1			3	2		2		8
EV Infrastructure comments	1	2		3		2	3	2	13
Park and Ride/public transport improvements needed	3	4		2	2	2	4	3	20
Alternative suggestions	13	14		9	3	8	11	8	66
Safety concerns	7	5		1		2	7	16	38
Trades/ HGV/ SUV access issues	3	3	1	12	1	8	5	10	43
Commuter/ business/ school parking issues	1	2		5	4	2		1	15
Encourages active travel	1	1		2			2	5	11
Visitor parking concerns	6	25	2	23	1	19	12	16	104

Some email responses were for multiple areas and have been logged for each area they refer to. Some responses also fell into multiple categories.

Appendix D – Online Survey Responder Location Maps and Analysis

1. BONNINGTON

There were 288 responses for the Bonnington area, the majority of which came from within the proposal area.




Are you responding as a...?




- Of the responses received, 89% were from people who stated they were a resident of the area.

- 9% of the responses came from those who stated that they were visitors to the area.
- The remaining 2% comprised of local workers, business owners, groups or organisations and commuters.



- 285 responders of the 288 respondents answered the question regarding if they face issues parking in this area.
- Of the 256 people who indicated that they were a resident, 81% replied No, while 19% replied Yes.
- Two people did not answer this question.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.




- 242 responses for parking issues came from residents within the consultation area

- Detail of when these issues are experienced can be viewed, by area, in Appendix E.

2. CORSTORPHINE

There were 712 responses for the Corstorphine area. Responses came from a wide area both within and outside the proposal area




Are you responding as a...?




- 619 (87%) of the 712 respondents identified themselves as residents of the area.

- Only 6% were visitors and 3% local workers in the area.
- 2% responses came from groups or organisations within the area.
- The remaining 2% were business owners and commuters.




- 700 of the 712 responders answered the question of if they experience parking issues in their area.
- Of the 614 who indicated that they were residents, 76% responded that they did not experience any parking issues, whilst 24% said that they did experience issues.
- The 12 people who did not respond account for the final 2% of the total number of respondents.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.




- 424 responses were received from residents who reside within the consultation area.

3. EASTER ROAD


There were 144 responses for the Easter Road area, with the majority of which coming from within the proposal area.




Are you responding as a...?



- Of the 144 responses, 88% of these came from people who identified as residents of the area.
- The remaining 12% of responses came from commuters, visitors, local workers and one group/organisation within the area.




- All 144 responders answered the question regarding parking issues within the Easter Road area.
- Of the 126 who indicated that they were residents, 61% of people expressed that they did not experience any issues, whilst 39% answered Yes, they did have problems with parking.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.




- 82 responses came from residents within the consultation area.

4. MURRAYFIELD (B9)


There were 296 responses for the Murrayfield (B9) area, with the majority coming from within the proposal area.




Are you responding as a...?



- 95% of the responses came from people who said that they were residents within the area.
- 4% of responses can from visitors to the area.
- The remaining responses were from local workers and a group/organisation.




- Only 6 (2%) people chose not to answer the question about parking issues in the area.
- Of the 276 who indicated that they were residents, 23% answered Yes, they did experience parking issues and 77% of responders answered No, they did not.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.




- 272 responses were received for this question from residents within the consultation area.

5. ROSEBURN

104 responses were received for Roseburn with most of these coming from people within the area.




Are you responding as a...?



- 87% of responders stated that they were a resident of the area.
- 7% were from people who work in the area.
- The remaining 5% were visitors, a commuter and a business owner.




- Of the 90 who indicated that they were residents, 52% of people in the area answered Yes to experiencing parking issues in the Roseburn area
- 46% of responders answered No.
- Three people (3%) left this question blank.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.



- There were 81 responses came from residents from within the consultation area.

6. SAUGHTONHALL

Saughtonhall received 401 responses with the majority of these coming from within the proposal area.




Are you responding as a...?



- Of the 401 responses, 90% of these came from people who stated that they were a resident of the area.
- 6% of responses were from visitors to the area.
- The remaining 4% is made up of responses from local workers, groups and organisations, business owners and a commuter.




- Of the 357 who indicated that they were residents, 90% of responders answered No, they do not experience issues with parking in the area.
- Only 10% stated that Yes, they have issues parking.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.




- 346 responses came from residents from within the consultation area.

7. WEST LEITH

366 responses were received for West Leith. The majority of these came from within the proposal area but there were a number of responses from further afield.




Are you responding as a...?



- 95% of the responses came from people who stated that they were a resident of the area.
- The remaining 5% of responders is made up of visitors, business owners, commuters and local workers.




- Of the 90 who indicated that they were residents, 77% of responders said that they did not experience issues with parking in the area.
- 23% advised that they did have issues.
- One person did not answer this question.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.



- 303 responses came from residents residing in the consultation area.

8. WILLOWBRAE NORTH


317 responses were received for Willowbrae North. Most of these came from within the proposal area, though there were a number of responses from further afield.




Are you responding as a...?



- Of the 317 responses, 93% identified as a resident of the area.
- 2% of the responses came from visitors to the area.
- The remaining 5% is made up of responses from commuters, groups or organisations, local workers and a business owner.



- Of the 292 who indicated that they were residents, 66% of responders stated that they did not experience issues with parking in the area.
- 34% said they did have issues with parking.
- One person did not answer the question.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.





9. 'OTHER'

66 responders either did not specify to which area they were concerned with or said they were concerned by all areas. Some people chose to use the 'other' space to type in specific roads that their answers related to. Those who did not specify but left their postcode or specified individual roads, have been tagged with a related area based on this information.


Area response	Total
All Areas	11
Willowbrae North	7
Bonnington	5
North Leith	5
City Centre	3
Corstorphine	3
West Leith	3
Bugtlin	2
Clermiston South	2
East Craigs	2
Gorgie	2
Leith	2
Leith Walk	2
Saughtonhall	2

Abbeyhill	1
B6	1
Cammo	1
Clermiston North	1
Corstorphine North	1
Corstorphine South	1
Craigentinny	1
Duddingston North	1
Glimerton Dykes	1
Longstone	1
Merchiaton	1
Newhaven South	1
Northfield	1
West Craigs	1
Unknown (partial postcode)	1





- 73% of the 'other' categorised responders stated that they were residents.
- 15% said they were visitors.
- The remaining 6% were made up of groups and organisations, a commuter and a business owner.
- Four people did not answer this question.
- Without clarity on which area people are responding to, it is difficult to assess the answers provided.
- The graph below shows the type of issues faced in within the area to the people who answered 'yes'. Multiple options were able to be selected.



Appendix E – Online Survey Analysis


1. SURVEY FINDINGS

1.1 A total of 2,694 responses were received for the online survey.

1.2 Q1-4 Name, Address, Postcode and Email address.

1.3 Response location analysis can be found in Appendix D.

1.4 Q5. Which of the following areas does your response refer to? Please choose one



1.4.1 The table below shows the figures as percentages of all responses to the survey.


Corstorphine	26%
Saughtonhall	15%
West Leith	14%
Willowbrae North	12%
Murrayfield (B9)	11%

Bonnington	11%
Easter Road	5%
Roseburn	4%
Other	2%

1.4.2 As can be seen from the above, over a quarter of all responses came from the Corstorphine area.

1.5 Q6. Are you responding as...?

1.5.1 2,679 people responded to this question whilst 15 chose not to answer.



1.5.2 The table below shows the responses broken down by area:

Are you responding as a...?	Bonnington	Corstorphine	Easter Road	Murrayfield (B9)	Roseburn	Saughtonhall	West Leith	Willowbrae North	Other
A resident within the area	89%	87%	88%	95%	87%	90%	95%	93%	73%
A visitor to the area	9%	6%	3%	4%	3%	6%	2%	2%	15%
Someone who works within the area	1%	3%	3%	1%	7%	1%	1%	1%	
The owner of a local business within the area	1%	1%			1%	1%	2%	0*	2%
A group or organisation within the area	0*	2%	1%	0*		1%		1%	3%
Commuter through the area	0*	0*	4%			0*		2%	2%

*0 denotes <1% which is due to only receiving one or two responses to that answer

1.5.3 Vast majority of respondents identified as residents of the area they were responding to.

1.5.4 In total 2,376 people (98%) identified as residents within the area. 48 responses (2%) stated that they were residents but used 'other (please specify)' to advise which area they were responding to.

1.5.5 Some areas were not part of the Phase 2 areas. Answers received for this category are listed in Appendix D.


1.5.6 Murrayfield (B9) and West Leith had the highest proportion of resident responses at 95%, followed closely by Saughtonhall at 90%.

1.5.7 Bonnington had the second highest responses from visitors with 9%. 15% of these responses came from those who chose 'other' and stated areas that weren't part of the Phase 2 consultation.

1.5.8 Roseburn had the highest proportion of respondents who work within the area or own a local business with 8% collectively.

1.6 Q7. How many motor vehicles does your household own or have use of?

1.6.1 2,662 people responded to this question, whilst 32 left it blank




1.6.2 2,511 of the responders indicate they have use of a car or cars.

1.6.3 Of those who own vehicles, 61% own or have use of only one vehicle. This equals 57% of all 2,662 responses.

1.6.4 Almost a third of all responses (34%) own or have use of two cars. While 6% do not own a vehicle.

How many motor vehicles does your household own or have use of?




1.6.5 Vehicle ownership in Murrayfield is the highest amongst respondents, with 96% owning or having use of a vehicle. Interestingly, almost 40% of respondents (280 out of the 679 people who own or use cars) own/use 2 vehicles.

1.6.6 Meanwhile, 19% of those from Easter Road do not own a vehicle, which is the highest in relation to number of responses.

1.7 Q8. Do you have access to off-street parking or a garage?

1.7.1 2,644 people responded to this question whilst 50 left this answer blank.




1.7.2 In total 56% of respondents stated that they do not have any access to off-street parking or a garage.

1.7.3 44% said they do have access to off-street parking or a garage.

1.7.4 50 responses (2%) were left blank.

1.7.5 This information is broken down by area below:



1.7.6 The two main areas where respondents said they do not have access to off-street or garage parking are the Willowbrae North and West Leith areas with 80% and 75% respectively.

1.7.7 Meanwhile, just under half of residents responding from Murrayfield (B9) (47%) said they do have access to some form of off-street parking.

1.7.8 As the graph indicates, those highest number of people who responded to the survey while having access to off street parking tend to come from Corstorphine area (225 people


out of 2,694 people). This figure accounts for 32% the area as a whole as the bar graph shows.

1.7.9 Despite most survey responses coming from the Corstorphine area (712 responses), proportionally, respondents from this area had the least off-street parking availability for residents at 66% (468 of 712).

1.8 Q9. How many vehicles can you park off-street?

1.8.1 1,901 responses were received for this question. This question was only viewable if respondents who stated they do have access to off-street parking.


1.8.2 793 people did not answer this question



1.8.3 Out of the 346 responses that stated they do have access to off-street parking in Q8, 343 responses were recorded for Q9, therefore 3 were left blank. Of those 229 said they could park one vehicle, while 55 people (16%) said they could park 2 vehicles and 50 people (15%) said they could park more than 2 vehicles.


1.8.4 The doughnut charts below show all 343 responses divided by the area they live in. In brackets are the number of respondents recorded from each area.

Bonnington




1 2 More than 2

Corstorphine




1 2 More than 2

Easter Road




1 2 More than 2

Murrayfield (B9)




1 2 More than 2

Roseburn




1 2 More than 2

Saughtonhall




1 2 More than 2

West Leith




1 2 More than 2

Willowbrae North



1 2 More than 2

Other



1 2 More than 2

1.9 Q10. and Q11. – Car Club Membership


1.9.1 Q10 asked if people were members of the City Car Club programme, to which 2,585 people (98%) stated that they were not. Of the 2,648 people who answered this question, only 63 people (2%) are members. 36 people (1%) did not answer the question.

1.9.2 Of the 2,585 people that answered they were not members, only 175 people (6%) stated that they would join if more Car Club vehicles were available near them. 161 people (6%) left the answer blank, while 1038 people (88%) said they would not.

Q10. Are you a member of the City Car Club?	Yes	No
	2%	98%
Q11. Would you join the City Car Club if there were Car Club vehicles near you? (answered no to Q10.)	Yes	No
	6%	88%

1.10 Q12. Do you experience parking problems in your area?

1.10.1 Out of the 2,658 responses that were received for this question 643 (24%) said they do experience issues, whilst 2,015 (75%) say that they do not. 31 answers (1%) had no response.




1.10.2 This data has been cross analysed with the type of respondent in the table below:

Q12. Do you experience parking problems in your area (responding as....)	Yes	No
Resident within the area ¹	585	1818
Resident within the consultation area ²	455	1548
Visitor to the area	25	108

1.10.3 As the table above shows just under a third of residents within the area are experiencing parking problems.

The data for the question was also divided by the area as shown below.



1.10.4 The areas most affected, relative to response numbers, are Roseburn and Easter Road with 46% and 38% respectively.

1.10.5 The area with the most responses, Corstorphine, only 22% stated they had any issues with parking.


¹ People who have stated that they are residents of the area they are responding to.

² People who have stated that they are residents and their postcode falls within the consultation boundary.

1.11 Q13. What problems do you face in your area?

1.11.1 This question was only available to those who selected 'Yes' to the previous question. This section is therefore a breakdown of the 643 respondents who stated that they do experience parking problems.

1.11.2 As a multiple-choice question, all respondents were able to tick as many boxes as were applicable to them for this question. In total, 1,865 boxes were ticked across multiple options by the 643 respondents.




1.11.3 354 respondents (19% of all respondents) considered commuter parking to be the biggest problem they face in the area.

1.11.4 This was followed by 339 (18%) respondents who said people parking dangerously i.e. on corners and/or on yellow lines was also a problem.


1.11.5 Three areas had the most difficulty with commuter parking, whilst another three areas had most issues with parking near their home

1.11.6 Two areas stated that dangerous parking was the most pressing issue and one area mostly had issues with double parking or parking on the footway.


1.11.7 The bar charts below show all 643 responses divided by the area they live in.




Corstorphine




Easter Road




Murrayfield



Roseburn





1.11.8 Of the 354 respondents who considered commuter parking to be the biggest problem in their area, the most common response area was Corstorphine, with 106 (30% of theme related responses) of respondents noting this as a key issue. Commuter parking was also a common concern in Willowbrae North (52, 15%) and Murrayfield (51, 14%).

1.11.9 Of the 339 respondents who said people parking dangerously i.e. on corners and/or on yellow lines was a key local issue, 39 (12% of theme related responses) were from Easter Road and 37 (11%) from the Bonnington area.


1.11.10 The most common issue for respondents from Saughtonhall (21, 6.5% of theme related responses) and Willowbrae North (73, 23% of theme related responses) was the inability to park near their homes.

1.11.11 The most common concern for respondents from West Leith is footway or double parking, with 55 (28% of theme related responses) respondents selecting it as a key issue.

1.12 Q14. When do you experience these parking problems?

1.12.1 This question relates to the time of days respondents say they experience the parking problems in the previous question. Respondents could select multiple times for the problem(s) which occurred.


1.12.2 Every problem has been matched to a time slot each respondent ticked in the survey. Below are tables for each problem and the percentage of people who ticked a time slot in which they stated these parking problems occurred.




1.12.13 The majority of respondents said parking issues are experienced Mon-Fri throughout the day, with the most common answer being Mon-Fri mornings (460 responses). Far fewer people selected the weekend as problematic, with Sundays overall seeing less issues compared to Saturdays.

1.12.14 The bar charts below show all responses divided by the area they live in.


Bonnington: When issues are experienced




Corstorphine: When issues are experienced




Easter Road: When issues are experienced




Murrayfield: When issues are experienced




Saughtonhall: When issues are experienced



Roseburn: When issues are experienced





1.11.15 Of the 460 respondents who said they experienced parking issues between Mon-Fri in the mornings, the most popular responding area was Corstorphine with 134 (29%) responses. Respondents from Bonnington (39), Easter Road (42), Murrayfield (60) and Saughtonhall (51) also identified Mon-Fri mornings as the most frequent period for parking issues.

1.11.16 Sunday overnight was the least frequent time period for six of the eight areas, including Bonnington, Corstorphine, Easter Road, Murrayfield, Roseburn and Saughtonhall. Sunday mornings was the least frequent time period for the remaining areas West Leith and Willowbrae North.

1.11.17 The tables below cross compare the times respondents experience issues with the nature of the issues they identified in question 13.

Q14. Cannot park near my home (303 responses)

Mon - Fri AM	Mon - Fri PM	Mon - Fri Eve	Mon - Fri Overnight	Sat AM	Sat PM	Sat Eve	Sat Overnight	Sun AM	Sun PM	Sun Eve	Sun Overnight
68%	66%	70%	48%	45%	51%	52%	42%	37%	44%	51%	52%

Q14. Commuter parking (316 responses)

Mon - Fri AM	Mon - Fri PM	Mon - Fri Eve	Mon - Fri Overnight	Sat AM	Sat PM	Sat Eve	Sat Overnight	Sun AM	Sun PM	Sun Eve	Sun Overnight
90%	87%	56%	41%	47%	51%	39%	33%	35%	40%	34%	30%

Q14. People parking dangerously i.e. on corners and/or yellow lines (308 responses)

Mon - Fri AM	Mon - Fri PM	Mon - Fri Eve	Mon - Fri Overnight	Sat AM	Sat PM	Sat Eve	Sat Overnight	Sun AM	Sun PM	Sun Eve	Sun Overnight
76%	72%	72%	58%	57%	61%	59%	52%	50%	54%	55%	51%

Q14. Parking across driveways (129 responses)

Mon - Fri AM	Mon - Fri PM	Mon - Fri Eve	Mon - Fri Overnight	Sat AM	Sat PM	Sat Eve	Sat Overnight	Sun AM	Sun PM	Sun Eve	Sun Overnight
87%	84%	59%	43%	52%	57%	45%	36%	42%	46%	42%	36%

Q14. Parking across dropped crossings (97 responses)

Mon - Fri AM	Mon - Fri PM	Mon - Fri Eve	Mon - Fri Overnight	Sat AM	Sat PM	Sat Eve	Sat Overnight	Sun AM	Sun PM	Sun Eve	Sun Overnight
84%	81%	64%	52%	56%	58%	52%	44%	45%	47%	46%	40%

Q14. Footway or double parking (167 responses)

Mon - Fri AM	Mon - Fri PM	Mon - Fri Eve	Mon - Fri Overnight	Sat AM	Sat PM	Sat Eve	Sat Overnight	Sun AM	Sun PM	Sun Eve	Sun Overnight
79%	77%	64%	50%	52%	58%	49%	43%	44%	48%	45%	42%


Q14. Narrow road due to parking on both sides (260 responses)

Mon - Fri AM	Mon - Fri PM	Mon - Fri Eve	Mon - Fri Overnight	Sat AM	Sat PM	Sat Eve	Sat Overnight	Sun AM	Sun PM	Sun Eve	Sun Overnight
80%	78%	64%	51%	54%	57%	50%	44%	44%	46%	44%	40%

Q14. Abandoned Vehicles (117 responses)

Mon - Fri AM	Mon - Fri PM	Mon - Fri Eve	Mon - Fri Overnight	Sat AM	Sat PM	Sat Eve	Sat Overnight	Sun AM	Sun PM	Sun Eve	Sun Overnight
79%	78%	73%	65%	62%	67%	58%	56%	54%	56%	56%	54%

1.13 Q15. What parking improvements would you like to see in your area?




1.13.1 This question was open to all respondents regardless of whether they experienced parking problems.

1.13.2 In total, 4,264 boxes were ticked by all respondents. Similar to the previous question, respondents were able to choose as many options as were applicable to them.


1.13.3 1,271 respondents (30%) believed action taken against vehicles that are parked inconsiderately or dangerously would improve the area.

1.13.4 This was followed by 637 respondents (15%) who suggested improved access to parking spaces for residents would be helpful.

1.13.5 The following bar charts provide an area breakdown for the answers provided in this question.




Corstorphine




Easter Road




Murrayfield



Roseburn






1.13.6 All areas selected action taken against vehicles that are parked inconsiderately or dangerously to be their top preference for improving parking within their areas. Of the 1,271 respondents who selected this answer, the highest responding area was Corstorphine, with 352 (28%) of respondents from the area believing that action against this would have a positive impact on the area. West Leith (188, 15%) Saughtonhall (169, 13%) and Willowbrae North (141, 11%) also saw high levels of responses for this answer.

1.13.7 The least popular solution was improved access to car sharing schemes like City Car Club, with five of the eight areas selecting this as their least frequent response, including Bonnington, Corstorphine, Murrayfield, Roseburn and Saughtonhall. For the remaining areas, Easter Road, West Leith and Willowbrae North, the least frequent response was improved access to local businesses and shops.

1.14 Q16. If parking controls were to be introduced, during what times do you think that they should apply?


1.14.1 This question was asked to all respondents, asking what time they would like parking controls to operate, should they be introduced. Only one selection could be made for each option.

1.14.2 A total of 2,402 answers were recorded for this answer




1.14.3 1,528 of all respondents made 'Other' comments. Similarly, 291 respondents left the question blank.

1.14.4 Below the pie chart looks at the given times without blank and 'Other' responses included in the data. In total, 874 people selected times listed on the survey.




1.14.5 When excluding blank and other responses, 66% (575 people) selected the 8:30-5:30pm M-F option. Second highest at 8% (69 people) was people who selected parking restriction times between 8:00am – 6:30pm M-Sun, this was followed closely by 8:30am – 5:30pm Mon-Sat option by 6% (48 people).


1.14.6 The charts below show the breakdown of timings chosen by area.




Corstorphine: Times of operation preference




Easter Road: Times of operation preference






Murrayfield (B9): Times of operation preference




Roseburn: Times of operation preference





1.14.7 As can be seen from the charts, if controls were implemented, people would like them to operate between 8:30am and 5:30pm, Monday to Friday.

1.14.8 The chart below takes a look at the 1,528 'Other' comments respondents provided. Respondents were free to type in whatever they wanted. Below is an in-depth breakdown of all the comments.



1.14.9 over 80% of the comments (1,194) were respondents who said they did not approve of any parking controls.

1.14.10 Just under 10% of comments (127) were respondents who provided suggested shorter restriction timeframes, of under four hours.

1.14.11 2% (31) made other alternative suggestions.

1.14.12 6% (86) made various suggestions of between 4-12 hours.


1.14.13 2% of respondents (29) wanted parking restrictions to apply longer than 12 hours.

1.14.14 The table below summarizes the data for alternative and Other comments. In particular, specific days respondents said would like parking restrictions. Comments categorised as 'Alternative timings' (136 responses) and 'Other' categories (25 response). Together this accounts for a combined 161 responses.

	Bonnington	Corstorphine	Easter Road	Murrayfield (B9)	Roseburn	Saughtonhall	West Leith	Willowbrae North	Other
No closures specified or doesn't want closures	149	303	60	81	24	219	191	136	31
Short Timeframe (under 2 hours)	5	55	1	20	7	22	8	9	0
Medium Timeframe (between 2-4 hours)	8	27	3	5	1	10	18	9	5
Long Timeframe (over 4 hours)	3	1	3	2	2	4	4	9	1

Alternative arrangement	2	8	2	2	3	10	4	0	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---

1.15 Q17. Are you a blue badge holder?



1.15.1 90% of respondents selected the No response. 2% said they were blue badge holder, while another 2% said their application was pending.

1.15.2 6% of respondents left the question blank.

Appendix 2: Options Assessment

This appendix provides further detail and context intended to assist in determining the most appropriate course of action for each of the areas that form Phase 2 of the proposals arising from the Strategic Review of Parking.

Contents:

1. Introduction
2. Policy Context
3. Impact of Covid-19 on working patterns and commuting
4. Considering the Consultation Results in context
5. Preferred Approach
6. Area Analysis:
 - The A8 Corridor
 - 6.1 Roseburn
 - 6.2 Saughtonhall
 - 6.3 Murrayfield (B9 Area)
 - 6.4 Murrayfield
 - 6.5 Corstorphine
 - 6.6 Collective Assessment
 - Leith & Willowbrae
 - 6.7 Willowbrae North
 - 6.8 Bonnington
 - 6.9 West Leith
 - 6.10 Easter Road
7. City Mobility Plan – Key Linkages to Controlled Parking
8. Review Heat Maps
9. Migration Plans
10. Summary of findings

1. Introduction

The four phases that grew from the results of the Strategic Review were based on both evidence of existing parking pressures and the need to mitigate against potential migration of those parking pressures. These four phases were based on a geographic assessment of the review results and the relationship between areas of existing and proposed controls.

In some cases, the review has proposed controls for areas that do not currently experience significant parking pressures, on the basis that it was prudent to include those areas at this stage in order to protect them from potential migration, rather than to wait until that migration occurred.

The results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 strongly indicate that, in most of the Phase 2 areas, residents do not consider that either the risk of migration, or existing parking pressures, are sufficient to warrant the introduction of parking controls at this time. While Appendix 1 sets out the consultation responses (and further detail can be found within that Appendix in terms of the questionnaire responses, comments etc made as part of that process), this Appendix looks at the reasons behind the proposals for Phase 2 and further considers the policy context and the risk of migration as a means of determining the preferred course of action.

More generally, this appendix also considers the impact that Covid has had on parking across the city, as well as the longer-term implications that changing working patterns and practices might have on parking levels.

This appendix draws together different strands relating to the potential need, or otherwise, for parking controls generally within the Phase 2 area, including:

- the Strategic Review results;
- the review justification for the inclusion in a proposal phase;
- the views of residents and the results of the consultation;
- the potential migration implications of delaying implementation;
- the policy justification for inclusion in a proposal phase;
- the policy implications of delaying implementation;
- the suggested approach.

The findings of the Consultation process, in conjunction with the other considerations highlighted in this report and as set out in this appendix, are summarised in Part 10 of this Appendix.

2. Policy Context

The aims of the Strategic Review of Parking were grounded in an acceptance that the time was right to look at parking pressures in a holistic manner, reflecting the increase in the requests for controls from residents in a number of key areas. The Council has always seen requests for parking controls, but the level of interest that led to the Review indicated that parking pressures had reached levels where their impact was having a significant impact on some residents' ability to park.

The impact of parking on residents, and businesses, is in itself related to the Council's objectives in term not only of its transport strategy, but also in broader terms relating to a safer, greener city. Parking controls have a significant role to play not only in directly addressing parking pressures, but also as a tool to help the Council deliver on policy objectives within the City Mobility Plan (CMP).

Parking controls are an integral part of the CMP, and must be considered in that context – as part of the Council's strategy for delivering the vision for our city, that:

Edinburgh will be connected by a safer and more inclusive net zero carbon system delivering a healthier, thriving, fairer and compact capital city and a higher quality of life for all residents.

Some of the objectives within the CMP that are supported by parking controls are:

- Reduce vehicle dominance and improve the quality of our streets;
- Reduce harmful emissions from road transport;
- Improve the safety for all travelling in our city;
- Maximise the efficiency of our streets to better move people and goods; and
- Encourage behaviour change to support the use of sustainable travel modes.

A primary aim of the CMP is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and address climate change in-line with the Council's commitment to be carbon neutral by 2030. One of the specific actions/policies from the CMP is:

- **CMP policy Movement 33 Parking Controls** *'Extend the coverage and operational period of parking controls in the city to manage parking availability for the benefit of local residents and people with mobility issues'*

This action/policy fulfils a broad range of CMP objectives. The introduction of parking controls not only fulfils the primary benefit of providing parking opportunities for local residents and people with mobility issues by reducing commuter parking opportunities, but also supports a broad range of other benefits through safer and more efficient kerbside parking management and facilitating a range of sustainable travel options.

The full package of CMP policy measures supported/enabled by parking controls are set-out in the table that can be found in Part 7 of this Appendix.:

When considered in this context, the introduction of parking controls cannot be viewed as an isolated measure to manage parking demand. The Council's responsibility in

terms of delivering upon the aims and aspirations of the CMP needs to look at the potential implications of not taking direct action to address the issues created by commuter parking and the high usage of private vehicles. Similarly, the other package of mobility opportunities that can be enabled by parking controls must be determining factors.

Given the linkages within the CMP to the potential benefits from controlled parking, it must be considered that the policy considerations element of the analysis for each of the areas within Phase 2 must be considered to be High.

3. Covid 19

There is little doubt that, in the longer term, Covid has the potential to change the way that people both live and work.

A point expressed by many respondents to the consultation was that, with office staff largely working from home - and with an expectation that few office staff might return to their offices full time, the level of commuting was unlikely to return to pre-Covid levels, thereby negating the need to take action designed to address commuting by private car.

Throughout the pandemic, the impact on retail and hospitality has been significant, with most businesses having to close their doors to customers. However, many office-based businesses, including the Council, have seen their staff working largely from home.

Some businesses have continued to have staff working at their normal place of work and more businesses are now starting to see staff returning to their normal place of work, although not necessarily on a full-time basis. Nevertheless, many people are still working from home in line with ongoing Government guidance that those who can work from home should continue to do so.

A common thread throughout the consultation sessions was the suggestion that there was potentially no need for parking controls in what is being consistently referred to as “the new normal”.

However, there may be a possible desire from central Government to ensure that those businesses that are now able to re-open after many months of closure have a customer base to support that reopening. For many city centre businesses, that customer base will come from a variety of sources but in many cases could include office staff and it is possible that employers may be encouraged to have staff return to their place of work as a means of assisting with economic recovery.

The situation with regards to the new normal remains unclear, but it is likely that the impact of Covid on the way that we work is likely to continue for some time.

That impact could easily influence where people work, but for those with no choice but to travel to their place of work, it could also have an impact on how people travel.

It is worth noting that, during some of the online meetings held as part of the Phase 2 consultation, several attendees indicated that the level of parking in their area had already increased to levels approaching those witnessed pre-lockdown.

While this reported increase in apparent commuter demand in some areas may simply be those who previously commuted by car returning to work, there is also the possibility that some commuters are travelling by car in preference to using public transport. Even though it seems possible that social distancing rules might soon be relaxed, it is also possible that there could be a reluctance amongst commuters to immediately switch back to using buses or trains and that they might continue to travel by private vehicle as a means of reducing their exposure to possible infection.

Consideration has to be given to the different eventualities arising from Covid, whether that is a greater reliance for many on working from home, or a gradual return to the workplace. We must also consider the potential for commuters to use their own vehicle in preference to public transport, or a mixture of commuting part-way by car before walking or cycling to their place of work.

At the present time it is not possible to say with certainty what the long-term impacts will be on working and travelling habits.

4. Considering the Consultation Results in context

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 can be found within Appendix 1 to this report.

From those results it is apparent that there is not widespread support for parking controls as proposed, with many residents stating that, in their view, there are no issues to solve. In most of the areas included within the consultation there is a clear majority of residents indicating that they do not currently experience parking problems.

However, that view is not held by every respondent, with a number of residents citing problems with commuter parking or inconsiderate or unsafe parking practices. It is worth noting that these residents often reside in streets which had been categorised through the Strategic Review of Parking as having high parking pressures and where it had been identified that action may be needed.

It should also be noted that the proposals for parking controls that were put forward for the consultation were primarily intended to aid residents in those streets that were experiencing high parking pressures and to further protect residents in surrounding streets and areas from the potential migration of those parking pressures. In the case of the A8 corridor in particular, even though most of the areas consulted indicated that they did not experience parking problems, there is evidence to show that many of those respondents reside from streets identified as having high parking pressures.

It must also be considered that the results in Roseburn are suggestive of a pressing need to introduce parking controls. With over 90% of roads in that area subject to high parking pressure and the consultation results indicating that 56% of respondents from within the Roseburn area consider that there are parking problems, it would be difficult to determine that parking controls should not be introduced in that area.

It must therefore be recognised that this introduction could have a knock-on effect, increasing parking demand in both Murrayfield and Saughtonhall as the nearest uncontrolled areas to Roseburn along the A8 corridor.

While many of the areas most affected by parking pressure in the north of the city were included in Phase 1, there is considerable potential for parking pressures to migrate as a result of the implementation of parking controls in these areas.

The situation in Leith, where Phase 1 proposals would see controls introduced in Pilrig and Leith Walk, could have a significant impact on the neighbouring areas of Bonnington, Easter Road and West Leith. Despite the consultation results for each of these areas, which indicate a widely held view that there are no parking problems, that situation could quickly change should Phase 1 be introduced as currently proposed. There could be a similar situation with potential parking controls in Abbeyhill, which is included in Phase 1, affecting parking pressures within Willowbrae North.

The consultation results must, therefore, be viewed in terms of that wider context, with parts of Phase 2 in particular designed not only to address existing parking pressures in these areas, but to mitigate against potential future pressures which may occur due to the displacement of vehicles from areas covered by Phase 1 of this review.

Whether a decision on the future of the Phase 2 proposals is made on the basis of the Review results or the consultation results, there are clear linkages between the different areas and phases which must be taken into consideration.

5. Preferred Approach

- 5.1 Taking into account both the results of the review and the results of the consultation exercises, it is considered that the preferred approach for all Phase 2 areas is to proceed with legal process as planned and programmed to introduce Controlled Parking Zones.
- 5.2 This approach takes progressive and decisive action to meet our commitment to achieve the 2030 carbon neutral target. It reflects the primary findings of the Strategic Review, recognising existing parking pressures, their impact and the need to address them. It offers the most significant impact in terms of meeting the Councils objectives of reducing reliance on private vehicles as a primary mode of transport, increases the likelihood that more commuters will choose public transport or active travel options for the whole, or a greater proportion of, their journey. It would further deliver:
- improved access to parking for residents, businesses and visitors
 - reduced overall traffic flows and congestion, improving public transport reliability and journey times
 - reductions in pollution through a reduction in overall vehicle movements and as a result of reduced queuing at junctions
- 5.3 Acting now removes the potential for these areas, many of which have been highlighted by the review as suffering the impacts of existing parking pressures, to be further impacted by a migration of existing pressures from adjoining areas.

6. Area Analysis

The following sections look, on an area by area basis, at those factors that were initially used to determine whether an area should be included in a proposed phase of work arising from the Strategic Review of Parking. They also consider the potential benefits of inclusion at this stage, and the implications for each area of not being included. Where there is further history behind the proposals, consideration is also given to previous consultations.

These assessments are based on the following factors:

- a) Review results – the results of the assessments carried out on a street by street, area by area basis across the city. The resulting rankings are based on parking pressure and rate each area between 1 (worst parking pressure) to 124 (least parking pressure).
- b) Likelihood of Potential Migration – considers the likelihood that parking that currently occurs in another area will move to within a Phase 2 area. Based on a Low, Medium and High scale.
- c) Impact of Potential Migration – considers the extent to which an area could be affected by migration. Based on a Low, Medium and High scale that recognises both the number of adjoining areas and the relative parking pressures in those areas.
- d) Policy considerations – considers how the introduction, or otherwise, of measures would impact delivery of the key aims of the City Mobility Plan. Based on a Low, Medium and High scale, with consideration being given to the make-up of the area and the direct benefits to the area in terms of meeting policy objectives.

Note: As explained in section 2 of this Appendix, it is considered that the policy rating for each area must be considered to be High, reflecting both the wider objectives within the CMP and the potential implications for delivering upon those objectives should parking migrate into these areas.

A8 Corridor

6.1 Roseburn

Description

Roseburn sits directly to the west of the existing N5 Zone of the CPZ and lies largely to the south of the A8, one of the busiest bus routes into the city centre. Roseburn has direct access to the Edinburgh Tram, with a Tram stop located within the Roseburn area.

In terms of property composition, Roseburn is comprised of a mixture of residential, retail, industrial and recreational properties. Much of the area is high density housing and, while some of the newer residential properties have off-street parking, the older, tenement properties do not.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, Roseburn was the second only to Leith Walk in terms of observed parking pressure. Like Leith Walk, over 90% of the area was observed to experience “High” levels of parking pressure.

This rating reflects the high-density nature of the housing stock, but also the varied business properties. As the closest point to the city centre, it is an attractive destination for those seeking free parking.

(b) Likelihood of Migration

The location of Roseburn alone, sitting alongside one of Edinburgh’s busiest arterial routes and directly adjacent to an existing controlled parking zone, means that there is a likelihood of parking from other, neighbouring areas moving to the Roseburn Area should those areas become controlled.

It should also be noted that Roseburn sits adjacent not only to other Phase 2 areas but is also adjacent to the Phase 1 area of Gorgie North and that there is a likelihood of migration from that area in addition to other Phase 2 areas.

It is considered that the likelihood of migration into Roseburn should be considered as High.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

Roseburn lies in close proximity to three other areas that are potentially included in the proposals arising from the Strategic Review of Parking. All of those areas have been shown to have existing parking levels that were classed as “Medium”.

With parking levels already at 90%, the potential for additional parking migration is limited. However, any additional pressure from migration on the could have a significant impact on the availability of parking for residents and visitors to the area. For that reason, it is considered that the likely level of potential migration is Medium.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, the A8 corridor has been considered as a single entity. Addressing commuter parking issues on this route would improve traffic movement, reduce congestion and improve air quality.

In terms of Roseburn itself, the introduction of parking controls to an area that is predominantly residential, but which also has a number of retail, hospitality and industrial premises, means that there is potential to reduce existing parking pressures by managing use of kerbside space and by removing the ability of this area to be used by commuter parking.

That reduction would improve accessibility for residents, their visitors and to other visitors to the area, improving the liveability of the area and assist the Council in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

The Policy Justification for introducing parking controls in the Roseburn Area is considered to be High.

(e) Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

A total of 104 questionnaire responses were received from the Roseburn area. Of those, 81 originated within the Roseburn area itself. Of those, 45 (56%) indicated that they experienced parking problems.

Summary

Review Placing	2
Observed Parking Pressure Level	90
Responses indicating that they experience parking problems	56%
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	High
Impact of potential migration from other areas	Medium
Policy Justification	High

Conclusion

Based on the level of existing parking pressures alone, there is considered to be justification for the introduction of parking controls in the Roseburn area.

The consultation results also show that, of those respondents who live in the Roseburn area, a small majority indicate that they experience parking problems.

Taking into account the likelihood of migration and the potential impacts of that migration strengthens the argument for introducing controls.

There would be clear benefits to that introduction, freeing up space that would make the area more accessible for residents and their visitors.

6.2 Saughtonhall

Description

Saughtonhall is a primarily residential area lying to the south of the A8, one of the busiest bus routes into the city centre. There are a small number of retail and hospitality properties situated mainly on Saughtonhall Drive and on the A8 itself (Western Terrace).

In terms of property composition, Saughtonhall is comprised of a mixture of housing styles, including modern flats, 1940's and 50's maisonettes, 1940's bungalows and terraced properties. There is also a mix in terms of access to off-street parking, with many properties relying on on-street parking provision.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, Saughtonhall placed 26th overall, with 29% of streets observed as having "High" levels of parking pressure and 65% of streets having "Medium" pressure.

Compared to other areas in the 20-30 range in the overall prioritised list, Saughtonhall compares favourably, having a lower percentage of street with "High" pressure than the other areas in this range.

(b) Likelihood of Migration

Saughtonhall's inclusion in Phase 2 is primarily driven by its location and on the basis of looking holistically at the A8 corridor, with other neighbouring areas (Roseburn, B9 and Corstorphine) all showing higher levels of parking pressure, or higher numbers of streets with "High" levels of parking pressure.

If any one, or more, of the adjoining areas were to be controlled, then there is significant likelihood for migration of parking pressures into Saughtonhall.

It must also be noted that Saughtonhall lies adjacent to part of the Phase 1 area and that there is also potential for migration from Gorgie North.

On the basis of the review results for neighbouring areas, and Saughtonhall's position alongside the A8, and its position relative to other Review areas, it is considered that the potential for migration into Saughtonhall is High.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

As stated above, Saughtonhall lies adjacent to four other areas included in the Phase 2 proposal. Should one of those areas proceed while Saughtonhall does not, then there is a likelihood of migration. Should more than one area proceed, then that likelihood increases significantly.

Given the current parking pressure levels within Saughtonhall, it might appear that there is an ability for Saughtonhall to accommodate migrated parking within significant impact. However, the overview figures do mask the fact that there are a number of streets that are subject to high parking pressures and that those streets are located in positions either closer to adjoining review areas or to

nearby bus routes. Depending on where parking migrates to, there is the potential for that migration to have an impact on the ability of residents and their visitors to park, as well as on accessibility to local shops and businesses.

It is considered that the likely impact of potential migration is Medium.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, the A8 corridor has been considered as a single entity. Addressing commuter parking issues on this route would assist traffic movement, reduce congestion and improve air quality, assist in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

In terms of Saughtonhall itself, the introduction of parking controls to an area that is predominantly residential, but which also has a number of retail and hospitality premises, means that there is potential to protect the existing parking provision and to mitigate against the increased use of this area by commuter parking. Managing kerbside space would also benefit local businesses, providing space that could be used by their customers.

While there are currently few indications of high parking demand, the potential for migrated parking to undermine the policy benefits of introducing measures in neighbouring areas, as well as the implications for residents and businesses of migrated parking, is a concern. Including Saughtonhall at this stage would negate those negative impacts.

The Policy Justification for introducing parking controls in the Saughtonhall Area is considered to be High.

(e) Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

A total of 401 questionnaire responses were received from the Saughtonhall area. Of those, 346 respondents provided information that placed them within the Saughtonhall area itself. Of those, 33 (10%) indicated that they experience parking problems in their area.

(f) Summary

Review Placing	26
Observed Parking Pressure Level	62
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	High
Impact of potential migration from other areas	Medium
Policy Justification	High

(g) Conclusion

Residents of Saughtonhall rightly indicate that parking pressures in their area, when considered in isolation, do not appear to warrant action at this time.

Looking at the A8 corridor as a whole, however, and considering the implications for areas like Saughtonhall of introducing parking controls to neighbouring areas, there is clear justification for the introduction of parking controls in the Saughtonhall area, both in terms of protecting the policy benefits delivered through the introduction of measures in neighbouring areas, but also as a means of protecting residents and businesses from the negative impacts of future migration.

It must also be considered that introducing parking controls in areas alongside a key arterial route has significant potential to aid in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

6.3 Murrayfield (B9 Area)

Description

The B9 area of Murrayfield is a predominantly residential area lying to the north of the A8, one of the busiest bus routes into the city centre. There are a small number of retail properties situated in the Coltbridge area, and a small number of hotels on the A8 itself (Western Terrace).

In terms of property composition, B9 is mainly comprised of Georgian terraced housing, with a smaller number of tenements and detached or semi-detached properties. The terraced and tenement properties tend to have no access to off-street parking, relying on on-street provision.

B9 is a Priority Parking Area, where a proportion of the kerbside space is set aside as permit holder parking. Those controls operate for a 90-minute period Monday to Friday, giving priority to residents over other users. All remaining space may be used freely and is subject to no restriction.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, B9 placed 37th overall, with 39% of streets observed as having “High” levels of parking pressure and 36% of streets having “Medium” pressure.

Compared to other areas in the 30-40 range in the overall prioritised list, B9 has a higher percentage of streets with “High” pressure than the other areas in this range.

(b) Likelihood of Migration

The inclusion of B9 in Phase 2 is driven both by its location and on the basis of looking holistically at the A8 corridor. While other neighbouring areas (Roseburn, Murrayfield, Saughtonhall and Corstorphine) show varying levels of parking pressure, there is a strong likelihood of migration if any one, or more, of the adjoining areas were to be controlled.

It must also be noted that B9 is the area most accessible from the existing CPZ and that the potential introduction of controls in Roseburn would have significant potential to lead to a relatively short migration into B9.

On the basis of the review results for B9 and its neighbouring areas, and B9's position alongside the A8, and its position relative to other Review areas and the existing CPZ, it is considered that the likelihood of migration into B9 is High.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

As stated above, B9 lies adjacent to four other areas included in the Phase 2 proposal. Should one of those areas proceed while B9 does not, then there is a likelihood of migration. Should more than one area proceed, then that likelihood increases significantly.

While the review results do indicate that parking pressures are not as acute in this area as in other areas now being considered for controls, the review results also show existing pressures in the streets closest to the A8. That situation could easily deteriorate if other areas were to see measures introduced. With commuters likely to find the most convenient location in which to park, it would be likely that parking pressures would continue near to the A8, but that the extent of their impact would spread further into B9, impacting on residents' ability to park.

It is also likely, however, that migration might spread across different areas and that there could be an element of dilution along the A8. The current status as a Priority Parking Area would partly mitigate against the impacts of migration, but would still allow use of any uncontrolled space as commuter parking.

It is considered that the likely impact of potential migration is Medium.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, the A8 corridor has been considered as a single entity. Addressing commuter parking issues on this route would assist traffic movement, reduce congestion and improve air quality, assist in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

In terms of B9 itself, the introduction of parking controls to an area that is predominantly residential, but which also has retail and hospitality premises, means that there is potential to protect the existing parking provision and to mitigate against the increased use of this area by commuter parking. Managing kerbside space would also benefit local businesses, providing space that could be used by their customers.

As an existing Priority Parking Area, the Council has established a need to protect residents from the impact of commuter parking. The results of the process that led to the introduction of B9 revealed commuter parking usage that was impacting on residents ability to park.

While current indications of high parking demand are largely restricted to those streets nearest to the A8, the geographical location of B9, its easy access to public transport and the availability of space means that there is potential for migrated parking to undermine the policy benefits of introducing measures in neighbouring areas, as well as having implications for residents and businesses. Including B9 at this stage would negate those negative impacts.

The Policy Justification for introducing parking controls in the B9 Area is considered to be High.

(e) Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

Note: For the purposes of the consultation, the Murrayfield and B9 areas were amalgamated. The consultation results quoted therefore refer to the entire area. The results will be the same for both Murrayfield and B9.

A total of 296 questionnaire responses were received from the Murrayfield and B9 areas. Of those, 265 respondents provided information that placed them within the consultation area itself. Of those, 59 (22%) indicated that they experience parking problems in their area.

Summary

Review Placing	37
Observed Parking Pressure Level	56
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	High
Impact of potential migration from other areas	Medium
Policy Justification	High

Conclusion

Considering B9 on its own, taking into account the review results and the likelihood for migration, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the introduction of parking controls would address current commuter parking issues and mitigate against future migration.

Looking at the A8 corridor as a whole and considering the implications for areas like B9 of introducing parking controls to neighbouring areas, there is clear justification for the introduction of parking controls in the B9 area.

It must also be considered that introducing parking controls in areas alongside a key arterial route has significant potential to aid in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

6.4 Murrayfield

Description

Murrayfield is a residential area lying to the north of the A8, one of the busiest bus routes into the city centre. The area is predominantly residential, although there are a small number of hospitality properties situated on the A8 itself.

In terms of property composition, Murrayfield is comprised of a mixture of housing styles, the majority of which have access to off-street parking.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, Murrayfield placed 96th overall, with only 3% of streets observed as having “High” levels of parking pressure and 38% of streets having “Medium” pressure. 59% of streets showed “Low” parking pressure.

Murrayfield is the lowest ranked area being considered for parking controls..

(b) Likelihood of Migration

Murrayfield’s inclusion in Phase 2 is driven solely by its location, with other nearby areas (Roseburn, B9 and Corstorphine) all showing higher levels of parking pressure, or higher levels of streets with “High” levels of parking pressure.

If one, or more, of the adjoining areas were to be controlled, then there is significant likelihood for migration of parking pressures into Murrayfield.

While current parking levels would suggest that no action is warranted, consideration must be given to the potential for parking pressures to rise significantly if this area were to be omitted on the basis of the existing parking situation

On the basis of the review results for neighbouring areas, and Murrayfield’s position alongside the A8, and its position relative to other Review areas, it is considered that the potential for migration into Murrayfield is High.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

As stated above, Murrayfield lies in close proximity to four other areas included in the Phase 2 proposal. Should one of those areas proceed while Murrayfield does not, then there is a likelihood of migration. Should more than one area proceed, then that likelihood increases significantly.

Given the current parking pressure levels within Murrayfield, it might appear that there is an ability for this area to accommodate migrated parking without significant impact. That most properties have access to off-street parking provision would also suggest that the impact of migration might be less severe in this area when compared to others. There is, however, likely to be impacts beyond those on residents, with visitors and tradesmen potentially finding it more difficult to find places to park near to their destination.

On that basis, it is considered that the likely impact of potential migration is Medium.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, the A8 corridor has been considered as a single entity. Addressing commuter parking issues on this route would assist traffic movement, reduce congestion and improve air quality, assist in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

In terms of Murrayfield itself, the introduction of parking controls to an area that is predominantly residential means that there is potential to protect the existing parking provision and to mitigate against the increased use of this area by commuter parking.

The Policy Justification for introducing parking controls in the Murrayfield Area is considered to be High.

(e) Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

Note: For the purposes of the consultation, the Murrayfield and B9 areas were amalgamated. The consultation results quoted therefore refer to the entire area. The results will be the same for both Murrayfield and B9.

A total of 296 questionnaire responses were received from the Murrayfield and B9 areas. Of those, 265 respondents provided information that placed them within the consultation area itself. Of those, 59 (22%) indicated that they experience parking problems in their area.

Summary

Review Placing	96
Observed Parking Pressure Level	25
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	High
Impact of potential migration from other areas	Medium
Policy Justification	High

Conclusion

Based on the available evidence from both the review and the recent consultation, there is, on the surface, little evidence to suggest that controls are required at this time.

Looking at the A8 corridor as a whole, however, and considering the implications for areas like Murrayfield of introducing parking controls to neighbouring areas, there is clear justification for the introduction of parking controls in the Murrayfield area.

It must also be considered that introducing parking controls in areas alongside a key arterial route has significant potential to aid in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

6.5 Corstorphine

Description

Corstorphine is one of a number of local town centres within the city boundary. Whilst Corstorphine is primarily a residential area, it has a range of businesses covering retail, industrial, healthcare and hospitality serving both local needs and the needs of the wider community in the west and north west of the city.

Corstorphine straddles the A8, one of the busiest bus routes into the city centre. While business properties are concentrated along the A8 corridor, there are a number of businesses throughout the wider Corstorphine area.

In terms of property composition, Corstorphine has a wide range of housing styles, including modern flats, 1940's bungalows, tenements, detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. There is also a mix in terms of access to off-street parking, with properties in certain parts of the area relying on on-street parking provision. However, many properties do have access to off-street parking.

Corstorphine was one of the four areas where interest in the introduction of parking controls to address commuter parking issues led directly to the Strategic Review of Parking. This followed the submission of a petition on parking issues to the Transport and Environment Committee, with the first report on the Strategic Review detailing the outcome of an early consultation exercise. That exercise indicated that roughly 50% of respondents experienced parking issues, with issues located mainly in close proximity to the A8 route.

As a busy local shopping centre with many businesses of varying types, and as an area well served by frequent bus services to the city centre, this area will generate a variety of parking practices.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, Corstorphine placed 27th overall, with 64% of streets observed as having “High” levels of parking pressure and 7% of streets having “Medium” pressure.

Compared to other areas in the 20-30 range in the overall prioritised list, Corstorphine is one of the most heavily impacted areas in terms of streets subject to “High” pressure.

The results reflect the findings of the previous consultations, as well as showing that parking pressures are worst around the A8.

(b) Likelihood of Migration

Corstorphine, as one of drivers behind the Strategic Review, is somewhat different to the other A8 areas, in that it is, in itself, a primary generator of journeys. The diverse businesses will themselves draw commuters and visitors

into the area, all of whom will be vying for the available space close to local amenities.

While that might mean that there is a greater likelihood of migration *from* Corstorphine, rather than to it, there would be a risk of parking that currently takes place in Roseburn, Murrayfield or Saughtonhall moving to Corstorphine should those areas become controlled. With many streets already busy, that migration would spread into other parts of the Corstorphine area, impacting on those streets not currently subject to parking pressure.

On the basis of the review results for neighbouring areas, and Corstorphine's position alongside the A8, it is considered that the potential for migration into Corstorphine is Medium.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

Again, the situation in Corstorphine is different to that of other areas on the A8 corridor. The impact of additional parking pressure could be greater in Corstorphine should other areas proceed with the introduction of controls.

As a local shopping centre, local businesses will rely on a customer base that does not come entirely from within the immediate area. If a greater proportion of the available kerbside space is taken up by commuters (who will arrive earlier and leave later than shoppers etc), then that parking could have a significant impact on the ability of local businesses to receive customers.

Most of the properties in Corstorphine without access to off-street parking are also located close to the A8, where the same increase on parking would have a significant impact on residents' ability to park, as well as their ability to receive visitors, tradesmen etc.

It is considered that the likely impact of potential migration is High.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, the A8 corridor has been considered as a single entity. Addressing commuter parking issues on this route would assist traffic movement, reduce congestion and improve air quality, assist in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

In terms of Saughtonhall itself, the introduction of parking controls to an area that is predominantly residential, but which also has a number of retail and hospitality premises, means that there is potential to protect the existing parking provision and to mitigate against the increased use of this area by commuter parking. Managing kerbside space would also benefit local businesses, providing space that could be used by their customers.

(e) Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

A total of 712 questionnaire responses were received from the Corstorphine areas. Of those, 428 respondents provided information that placed them within the consultation area itself. Of those, 101 (24%) indicated that they experience parking problems in their area.

Summary

Review Placing	27
Observed Parking Pressure Level	62
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	High
Impact of potential migration from other areas	High
Policy Justification	High

Conclusion

In many ways Corstorphine is the lynchpin for the A8 route. As a local shopping centre, parking controls have the significant potential to deliver benefits in terms of accessibility to local shopping and businesses, whilst addressing the issues caused by those commuters who currently take advantage of the excellent public transport links.

Addressing parking pressures and problems in an area like Corstorphine would have a significant impact in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

6.6 A8 Corridor – Collective Assessment

Description

The A8 corridor links Scotland's major road network (The M8 and M9) to the city centre, routing traffic through residential areas to the west of the city centre.

Background

One of the primary triggers for the Strategic Review was the level of interest from residents of Corstorphine. That area sits 27th in the priority list and, while this latest consultation has elicited responses not entirely supportive of parking controls, in policy terms Corstorphine holds the key to addressing many of the parking and traffic-related issues that exist on the A8 corridor.

Taking the A8 route as a single entity, it would simply not be possible, or logical, to introduce controls into one area without considering the impact of that introduction on other areas. Nor would it be prudent to consider controls in Corstorphine and not consider controls in Saughtonhall or Murrayfield, when many of the current issues on the A8 corridor are attributable to traffic levels and restricted traffic flows that occur at locations such as Clermiston, Western Corner – locations closer to the city centre than Corstorphine – when those areas would be likely to become busier if Corstorphine were to be controlled. Encouraging parking to move further into the city would exacerbate existing issues rather than solve them.

Review Results

While the results from the review vary from area to area, there is consistent evidence from the heatmaps generated by the review surveys that parking pressures exist alongside the A8 route, occurring wherever there is easy and unrestricted parking and immediate access to local businesses or to convenient access to public transport.

Although the highest parking pressures occur in the Roseburn area, primarily by virtue of the nature of properties and population density, the next highest pressures are evident in Corstorphine, where the local shops and businesses and easy access to uncontrolled streets provides easy access for commuters.

Policy considerations

Traffic data suggests that there are daily flows on the A8 west of Drumbrae roundabout of around 30,000 vehicles, with daily flows of around 23,000 vehicles between Clermiston and Western Corner.

Air quality monitoring also shows that St John's Road was the 6th most polluted road in Scotland in 2019.

The Council has committed, through the City Mobility Plan, to work towards net zero by 2030. To achieve this requires bold and decisive action to reduce vehicle emissions and to manage the use of our roads.

Introducing controlled parking in those areas where there is parking pressure will help to achieve that aim, but measures cannot be restricted to areas of existing pressure, especially where there is potential for those pressures to simply move to another area.

This is the situation on the A8, where some areas show evidence of significant pressures whilst others do not. It is simply not possible to address issues of pollution, congestion and safety by taking a piecemeal approach.

For these reasons it is considered that the A8 must continue to be viewed as a single entity, with parking controls forming an essential part of managing traffic coming in along that route. Those controls have the potential to:

- Reduce traffic volumes
- Reduce pollution
- Reduce parking pressures
- Improve accessibility
- Improve public transport journey times
- Meet objectives within the CMP

6.7 Willowbrae North

Description

Willowbrae North is a primarily residential area lying to the east of Abbeyhill. There are a small number of retail and hospitality properties situated mainly on London Road.

Willowbrae North is bounded to the north by London Road, one of the main bus routes into the city centre from the east. It is within a relatively short walking distance of the city centre and, via Holyrood Park, the Old Town and the Scottish Parliament.

To the north of London Road lies the site of the new Meadowbank Stadium, as well as two large office buildings.

While a small number of residential properties have access to off-street parking, the majority, mainly terraced, have no off-street parking facilities.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, Willowbrae North placed 5th overall, with 94% of streets observed as having “High” levels of parking pressure. Of the other areas in top 5, none have a higher number of streets subject to “High” pressure.

This rating reflects the high-density nature of the housing stock but is also indicative of its relative proximity to the city centre and being well-served by local bus services to and from the city centre.

(b) Likelihood of Migration

Willowbrae North’s situation, adjacent to one of Edinburgh’s busiest arterial routes and to a proposed Phase 1 controlled parking zone, means that there is potential for migration from other, neighbouring areas moving to this area should those areas become controlled.

The controlling factor in terms of possible migration is that the streets within Willowbrae North are already busy, and that this might prevent significant migration.

On the basis that the introduction of parking controls in Abbeyhill remains a proposal, it is considered that the potential for migration into Willowbrae North should be classed as Medium.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

Willowbrae North lies in close proximity to one area that is included in the proposals arising from the Strategic Review of Parking. That area has been shown to have existing parking levels that were classed as “High”.

With parking levels at 86% in Abbeyhill and 85% in Willowbrae North, there is, despite the limited availability of parking space in this area, still considered to be

potential for migration. In addition, any additional pressure from migration could have a significant impact on the availability of parking for residents and visitors to the area. For that reason, it is considered that the likely impact of potential migration is High.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, there would be benefits in addressing commuter parking issues on the A1/London Road route in terms of assisting traffic movement and reducing congestion.

The introduction of parking controls in an area that is predominantly residential, but which also has a small number of retail, hospitality and office premises, means that there is some potential to reduce existing parking pressures by managing use of kerbside space and by removing the ability of this area to be used by commuter parking.

That reduction would improve accessibility for residents, their visitors and to other visitors to the area, improving the liveability of the area and assisting the Council in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

The proposed measures would also mitigate against potential migration from the neighbouring Abbeyhill Area and protect residents against increased parking pressure. Extending controls to this area would also both deliver on policy objectives in Willowbrae North and protect the policy benefits from introducing parking controls in neighbouring areas.

It is considered that the Policy Justification for parking controls in this area should be classed as “High”.

Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

A total of 317 questionnaire responses were received from the Willowbrae North area. Of those, 253 respondents provided information that placed them within the consultation area itself. Of those, 83 (33%) indicated that they experience parking problems in their area.

Summary

Review Placing	5
Observed Parking Pressure Level	85
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	Medium

Impact of potential migration from other areas	High
Policy Justification	High

Conclusion

While the indications from the recent consultation process are that a majority of residents do not experience parking problems, Willowbrae North's placement in the overall prioritised list (position 5) would suggest that problems do exist.

The existing parking pressures have the potential to increase if controls are introduced into neighbouring Abbeyhill.

It is considered that there would be clear benefits to the introduction of parking controls, creating space that would make the area more accessible for residents and their visitors.

6.8 Bonnington

Description

Bonnington lies generally to the north of not only the existing CPZ (Zone N1), but also to the north of the proposed CPZ covering the Pilrig area. It is bounded to the north by Ferry Road, a busy arterial route that serves Newhaven and Leith.

Whilst Bonnington is primarily residential, there are also a number of industrial premises within the area, both within industrial estates and within the general make-up of the area. There are also a number of retail and hospitality premises, as well as several garage premises.

Housing stock is primarily comprised of tenements or more modern flat developments, although there are other, more recent housing estates where there is an element of off-street parking.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, Bonnington placed 11th overall, with 60% of streets observed as having “High” levels of parking pressure and 35% of streets having “Medium” parking pressure.

The percentage of streets within Bonnington with High pressure is lower than some of the other areas in the same part of the overall, prioritised list.

(b) Likelihood of Migration

Bonnington’s situation, adjacent to one of Edinburgh’s busiest arterial routes and to a proposed Phase 1 controlled parking zone, means that there is potential for migration from other, neighbouring areas moving to this area should those areas become controlled.

On the basis that the introduction of parking controls in Pilrig remains a proposal, it is considered that the potential for migration into Bonnington should be classed as High.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

Bonnington lies in close proximity to one area that is included in the proposals arising from the Strategic Review of Parking. That area has been shown to have existing parking levels that were classed as “Medium”.

With parking levels at 75% in Pilrig and 77% in Bonnington, there is considered to be significant potential for migration. In addition, any additional pressure from migration could have a significant impact on the availability of parking for residents and visitors to the area. For that reason, it is considered that the likely impact of potential migration is High.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, the migration of parking from the neighbouring Pilrig, Leith and North Leith areas would undermine any policy benefits achieved from the introduction of parking controls into that area. At the same time, there would be benefits in addressing commuter parking issues close to Ferry Road in terms of assisting traffic movement and reducing congestion.

The introduction of parking controls in an area that is predominantly residential, but which also has a number of retail, industrial, hospitality premises, means that there is potential to reduce existing parking pressures by managing use of kerbside space and by removing the ability of this area to be used by commuter parking.

That reduction would improve accessibility for residents, their visitors and to other visitors to the area and assist the Council in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

It is considered that the Policy Justification for parking controls in this area should be classed as “High”.

Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

A total of 288 questionnaire responses were received from the Bonnington area. Of those, 242 respondents provided information that placed them within the consultation area itself. Of those, 45 (19%) indicated that they experience parking problems in their area.

Summary

Review Placing	11
Observed Parking Pressure Level	77
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	High
Impact of potential migration from other areas	High
Policy Justification	High

Conclusion

Looking solely at the level of existing parking pressures, there is considered to be sufficient justification for the introduction of parking controls in the Bonnington area.

While the consultation results clearly show that residents do not currently consider that they experience parking problems, the review results do show that

there are many streets within the Bonnington area that are subject to high demand. That demand, and the overall levels of parking pressure, could increase significantly if controls are introduced into neighbouring areas.

There would be clear benefits to that introduction, freeing up space that would make the area more accessible for residents and their visitors.

6.9 West Leith

Description

West Leith comprises the Lochend, Ryehill and (parts of) Restalrig areas. These are primarily residential areas lying generally to the east of the city centre.

Whilst they are primarily residential, there are also a number of retail premises within the area, centred mainly around Restalrig Road, as well as a number of hospitality premises.

Housing stock is a mix of colony flats, 1930's villas and terraced or tenement housing. There are also a number of more recent developments mainly comprised of flats.

Access to off-street parking is similarly mixed.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, West Leith placed 12th overall, with 65% of streets observed as having "High" levels of parking pressure and 28% of streets having "Medium" parking pressure.

The percentage of streets within West Leith with High pressure is consistent with other areas in this part of the prioritised list, but West Leith has a higher proportion of streets with "Medium" pressure. All areas in this part of the list have been identified as requiring action, based on the observed pressures.

(b) Likelihood of Migration

West Leith shares a boundary with the Easter Road area, also included in Phase 2, and the Phase 1 areas of Leith Walk and Leith. There is significant potential for parking to migrate from those neighbouring areas to West Leith should those areas become controlled.

On the basis that the introduction of parking controls in Leith Walk and Leith remains a proposal, and that the neighbouring area of Easter Road is also included in Phase 2, that the potential for migration into West Leith should be classed as High.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

West Leith sits directly adjacent to three other areas that occupy positions in the 15 areas worst affected by parking pressure. Leith Walk occupies the number 1 slot with 92% pressure, while Leith is at position 8 with 79% and Easter Road sits at number 16 with 74% pressure.

Not only is there considered to be significant likelihood that parking will migrate, but it must also be considered that concentrated migration from three busy areas could have a significant impact on parking in the Lochend area in particular, with potential knock-on effects into Ryehill and Restalrig.

For these reasons, it is considered that the likely impact of potential migration is High.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, the migration of parking from the neighbouring areas would undermine any policy benefits achieved from the introduction of parking controls. While it may be the case that much of the parking in West Leith is predominantly residential in nature, there is evidence, particularly in the vicinity of Leith Links, that commuter parking takes place within this area.

The introduction of parking controls in an area that is predominantly residential, but which also has a number of retail, industrial, hospitality premises, means that there is potential to reduce existing parking pressures by managing use of kerbside space and by removing the ability of this area to be used by commuter parking.

That reduction would improve accessibility for residents, their visitors and to other visitors to the area, improving the liveability of the area and assisting the Council in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

It is considered that the Policy Justification for parking controls in this area should be classed as “High”.

Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

A total of 366 questionnaire responses were received from the Bonnington area. Of those, 303 respondents provided information that placed them within the consultation area itself. Of those, 62 (20%) indicated that they experience parking problems in their area.

Summary

Review Placing	12
Observed Parking Pressure Level	75
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	High
Impact of potential migration from other areas	High
Policy Justification	High

Conclusion

Looking solely at the level of existing parking pressures, there is considered to be justification for the introduction of parking controls in the West Leith area.

Considering the potential impact of migrated parking increases that justification as a means of mitigation.

While the consultation results suggest that residents do not consider that they currently experience parking problems, that situation could change quickly if controls are introduced into the neighbouring areas of Leith Walk, Easter Road and Leith.

6.10 Easter Road

Description

Easter Road is the area lying between Easter Road itself and Lochend Road. It is largely residential area, but has some retail premises and, most notably, a football stadium. There are also some industrial premises.

Housing stock is primarily a mix of tenements and more recently constructed flats.

Access to off-street parking is limited, with the majority of properties relying on on-street provision.

A petition from the Leith Central Community Council, who cover the Easter Road area, was one of the main factors in the Council deciding to undertake the Strategic Review of Parking. That petition reflected the concern from that Community Council area of the impact of non-residential parking and called for action to address parking issues.

(a) Review Results

Of the 124 areas in the review, Easter Road placed 15th overall, with 53% of streets observed as having “High” levels of parking pressure and 41% of streets having “Medium” parking pressure.

The percentage of streets within the Easter Road area with High pressure is marginally lower than other areas in this part of the prioritised list but with a higher proportion of streets with “Medium” pressure. All areas in this part of the list have been identified as requiring action, based on the observed pressures.

(b) Likelihood of Migration

Easter Road shares a boundary with the West Leith area, also included in Phase 2, and the Phase 1 areas of Leith Walk and Abbeyhill. There is significant potential for parking to migrate from those neighbouring areas to Easter Road should those areas become controlled.

On the basis that the introduction of parking controls in Leith Walk and Abbeyhill remains a proposal, and that the neighbouring area of West Leith is also included in Phase 2, that the potential for migration into Easter Road should be classed as High.

(c) Impact of Potential Migration

Easter Road sits directly adjacent to three other areas that occupy positions in the 12 areas worst affected by parking pressure. Leith Walk occupies the number 1 slot with 92% pressure, while Leith is at position 8 with 79% and West leith sits at number 12 with 75% pressure.

Not only is there considered to be significant likelihood that parking will migrate, but it must also be considered that concentrated migration from three busy areas could have a significant impact on parking in this area.

For these reasons, it is considered that the likely impact of potential migration is High.

(d) Policy Considerations

In terms of policy objectives, the migration of parking from the neighbouring areas would undermine any policy benefits achieved from the introduction of parking controls. The proximity of the Easter Road area to areas already within the CPZ, as well as areas that may soon become part of the CPZ, means that there is significant likelihood for this area to be used as alternative commuter parking..

The introduction of parking controls in an area that is predominantly residential, but which also has a number of retail and industrial premises, means that there is potential to reduce existing parking pressures by managing use of kerbside space and by removing the ability of this area to be used by commuter parking.

That reduction would improve accessibility for residents, their visitors and to other visitors to the area, improving the liveability of the area and assisting the Council in meeting the aims of the City Mobility Plan.

It is considered that the Policy Justification for parking controls in this area should be classed as “High”.

(e) Consultation Results

The full results of the consultation exercises conducted for Phase 2 of the Review can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the responses received, focusing on key elements of the consultation.

A total of 144 questionnaire responses were received from the Easter Road area. Of those, 82 respondents provided information that placed them within the consultation area itself. Of those, 24 (29%) indicated that they experience parking problems in their area.

Summary

Review Placing	15
Observed Parking Pressure Level	74
Likelihood of parking migrating from other areas	High
Impact of potential migration from other areas	High
Policy Justification	High

Conclusion

Looking solely at the level of existing parking pressures, there is considered to be justification for the introduction of parking controls in the Easter Road area.

Considering the potential impact of migrated parking increases that justification as a means of mitigation.

The consultation results do show that less than a third of respondents from within the area consider that they currently experience parking problems. With the Easter Road area lying directly adjacent to the Phase 1 area of Leith Walk, there is a significant risk of migration. It is worth noting that Easter Road would be the closest uncontrolled point to the city centre, it is likely that

The policy objectives behind Phase 1 areas would be undermined if those pressures could simply migrate into Easter Road.

7. City Mobility Plan Linkages

The following table shows the policies within the City Mobility Plan that would be supported by the introduction of measures designed to manage parking.


Policy reference/title	Policy wording
People 1 Supporting Behaviour Change.	Encourage changes in behaviour towards the use of sustainable modes of travel through information provision, initiatives and campaigns.
Movement 1 Mass Rapid Transit.	Expand the tram/mass rapid transport network to the north and south of the city as well as to Newhaven and explore the potential to develop or extend mass rapid transit routes into Fife, West, Mid and East Lothian.
Movement 4 Bus Priority Measures.	Expand and enforce public transport priority measures to improve journey time reliability and operational efficiency within the city and wider region.
Movement 14 Walking and Wheeling.	Enhance and where necessary expand the walking/wheeling network to serve and connect key destinations across the city.
Movement 15 Cycling.	Expand and enhance the citywide network of cycle routes to connect key destinations across the city, including increased segregated cycle infrastructure on main roads.
Movement 16. Shared Mobility.	Support the expansion of shared mobility options across the city and maximise their integration to support the broader public transport system.
Movement 17 Taxis and Car Share Partnerships.	Strengthen partnerships with the taxi trade and car sharing partners to support the shift to zero emission vehicles and the introduction of new technology to improve safety, standards and accessibility
Movement 18 Mobility on Demand	Support the expansion of demand responsive transport and the development of a Mobility as a Service system as an alternative to traditional modes, especially in areas poorly served by public transport.
Movement 19 Mobility Hubs.	Identify opportunities for mobility hubs in existing communities and major new developments that provide a range of sustainable travel choices and amenities including public transport, shared mobility, click and collect and electric vehicle charging.
Movement 22 Tackling Inconsiderate Parking.	Work within legislation to tackle issues associated with parked vehicles obstructing footways, crossing points, roads and junctions.
Movement 25 Strategic Approach to Road Space Allocation.	Develop and deliver a strategic approach to allocating road space between modes of travel to define the degree of priority to be given to different modes on different streets.
Movement 26 Managing Deliveries and Servicing.	Reduce the impact of delivery and servicing vehicles such as through access and timing restrictions, edge of town consolidation centres, micro distribution centres and local click and collect facilities while supporting deliveries by foot and bicycle.
Movement 28 Monitoring and Evaluation.	Ensure robust monitoring and evaluation of traffic and travel behaviour through regular and consistent data gathering.
Movement 30 Low Emission Zone Scheme.	Reduce harmful emissions from transport through the implementation of a Low Emission Zone scheme and supporting measures.

Policy reference/title	Policy wording
Movement 31 Cleaner Vehicles.	Encourage the switch to cleaner vehicles by supporting the growth of EV infrastructure, including the development of a citywide charging network, and monitoring progress in other low and zero emission technologies.
Movement 34 Residents Parking Permits.	Manage the way residents parking permits are issued based on demand, location and vehicle emissions.
Movement 35 Parking in New Developments.	Limit the level of parking in new developments based on current and planned levels of walking/wheeling, cycling and public transport access and the capacity of surrounding streets, and include requirements for electric vehicle charging, disabled persons parking places, car club and bike hire space.
Movement 36 Parking, Waiting and Loading Restrictions.	Review, apply and enforce parking, waiting and loading restrictions whilst balancing the needs of local businesses and residents and people with mobility difficulties.
Movement 37 Workplace Parking Levy.	Following consultation, a workplace parking levy will be designed and presented for consideration.
Place 4 Liveable Places.	Create more liveable places by managing motorised vehicle access and traffic in the city centre, town centres and residential areas.
Place 5 Streets for People.	Create more liveable places by reducing the level of on street parking in areas well served by public transport whilst enabling parking for local residents and people with mobility difficulties.

8. Review Heat Maps

The following pages show the heatmaps generated from the original assessments from the Strategic Review of Parking. Also included is detail from the consultation, showing the location of those respondents from within each area who answered the question relating to their experience of parking problems.

Roseburn: Heat Map



Roseburn: Consultation responses: Do you experience parking problems?



Saughtonhall: Heat Map




Saughtonhall: Consultation responses: Do you experience parking problems?




B9: Heat Map



Murrayfield: Heat Map




B9 and Murrayfield: Consultation responses: Do you experience parking problems?



Corstorphine: Heat Map



Corstorphine: Consultation responses: Do you experience parking problems?



Willowbrae North: Heat Map




Willowbrae North: Consultation responses: Do you experience parking problems?




Bonnington: Heat Map



Bonnington: Consultation responses: Do you experience parking problems?




West Leith: Heat Map




West Leith: Consultation responses: Do you experience parking problems?



Easter Road: Heat Map



Easter Road: Consultation responses: Do you experience parking problems?




9. Migration Plans


The following pages show the relationship between different Phases of the Review, as well as the geographic location of the Phase 2 areas compared to existing and proposed areas of parking control.

These plans indicate where there is a potential for migration of parking.


Plan A: - Showing the relationship between areas of proposed control on the A8 corridor, the existing CPZ and the Phase 1 and Phase 3 Review areas. The plan includes details of current parking pressure, indicating the potential sources of migration into Phase 2 areas.



Plan B: - Showing the relationship between the Bonnington area, the existing CPZ and the Phases 1, 3 and 4 Review areas. The plan includes details of current parking pressure, indicating the potential sources of migration into Phase 2 areas.



Plan C: - Showing the relationship between proposed Phase 2 areas, the existing CPZ and the Phase 1 Review areas. The plan includes details of current parking pressure, indicating the potential sources of migration into Phase 2 areas.



10. Overall Summary

In preparing the proposed phasing of work arising from the Strategic Review of Parking, consideration was given not only to the existing parking pressures, but also to the potential implications of not taking action in adjoining areas.

This approach has resulted in areas, like Saughtonhall, parts of Murrayfield, West Leith and Bonnington, where existing parking pressures do not currently affect the entire area, being included in one of the initial phases.

It is clear from the consultation results, not only in those areas, but in other areas as well, that those who have responded do not generally believe that there are parking problems that require to be solved.

At the same time, it has long been the case that there have been requests made of the Council to address parking issues that are attributed to commuter parking. This is especially true in local shopping areas like Leith, Gorgie and Corstorphine, but also equally true in areas that are close to public transport links or that are simply geographically close to the city centre, like Abbeyhill, Roseburn and Shandon.

A migration of parking pressures from any area where new controls are introduced is an anticipated outcome. In almost every case, the areas that have indicated that they currently experience no parking problems are located directly adjacent to areas that are likely to become controlled parking zones. Mitigating against migration is a key consideration for all Phase 2 areas.

Concern has been expressed by a number of consultation respondents in relation to the impact of Covid on working practices and commuting. Whilst it is the case that there is a lack of clarity in terms of the longer-term impacts of Covid, taking action now will not only help to address pre-Covid parking pressures but will also counter changing habits post-Covid.

However, the overriding consideration must be the linkages that controlled parking has with the City Mobility Plan (CMP), and the ability of controlled parking to deliver upon a number of key policies, most notably reducing reliance on private transport as a primary means of travel to a place of work.

Introducing controlled parking to each of the areas included in Phase 2 would be a decisive step in delivering upon the CMP and assisting in achieving carbon neutrality by 2030.

On this basis, there is clear justification to proceed with the introduction of controlled parking within the Phase 2 area, as per the original findings and recommendations arising from the Strategic Review of Parking.

Appendix 3: Phase 2 Proposal & Enforcement Options

This appendix outlines the proposed parking controls for the Phase 2 area of the Strategic Review of Parking.

It is split into three parts:

- A. The outline proposal for parking controls
- B. Report by The Project Centre: Operational Recommendations
- C. Report by The Project Centre: Permit Holder Analysis

Part A – The outline proposal for parking controls

The described parking controls will apply to the following Review Areas:

A8 Corridor			Leith & Willowbrae		
Review Area	Rank	Parking Pressure	Review Area	Rank	Parking Pressure
Roseburn	2	90	Willowbrae N	5	85
Saughtonhall	26	62	Bonnington	11	77
Corstorphine	27	62	West Leith	12	75
B9	37	56	Easter Road	15	74
Murrayfield	96	25			

1. Overview

- 1.1 The proposal for the Phase 2 area mirrors those controls and allowances currently in operation in both the Peripheral and Extended areas of the existing CPZ, as well as those proposed for Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking. Those controls operate (and in the case of Phase 1 of SROP, are proposed to operate):
 - Monday to Friday inclusive
 - Between the hours of 8:30am and 5:30pm.
- 1.2 Reference should be made to Part B of this Appendix, where there is further detail as to the reasons behind the proposed hours of control in each area.
- 1.3 Certain controls operate 24 hours a day. Those controls include:
 - Double yellow lines (with or without loading restrictions);
 - Disabled parking places;
 - Car Club Parking places
- 1.4 Other controls, such as those on main routes, may operate at different times to those shown on the CPZ entry plates. In such cases those controls will be separately signed with their times of operation.
- 1.5 In a CPZ, all lengths of kerbside space must be subject to a form of parking control. Any areas that are not made available for parking (i.e. a parking place) will be controlled by yellow lines, in either single or double line format depending on their location.
- 1.6 This approach ensures that parking throughout the CPZ area is subject to management of the available space. That management controls who may park,

how long they may park, provides allowances for loading and helps to provide for road conditions designed to improve road safety for all users by keeping junctions and crossing points clear of parked vehicles.

2. Parking Places

- 2.1 Parking places within the new zones will generally be comprised of a mixture of the following parking place types:
- Permit holder parking places, available for use by permit holders only
 - Shared-use parking places, available for use by permit holders and by pay-and-display users, with the latter required to pay the applicable rate of parking charge and subject to a maximum length of stay
 - Pay-and-display parking places, typically located in the vicinity of local shops and/or businesses and limited to use by pay-and-display users, subject to payment and to a maximum length of stay
- 2.2 This approach ensures that resident permit holders have access to the majority of space where it is appropriate or safe to park, whilst local shops and businesses are served by dedicated pa-and-display parking places as well as by any vacant shared-use parking.
- 2.3 Other parking place types will be provided where appropriate, with all existing parking places being accommodated within the design. Full details of the design and layout of the parking places will be finalised in readiness for advertising the traffic order, should it be decided to proceed to the legal process for any or all of the areas in Phase 2.
- 2.4 The layout that was consulted upon in early 2021 included, as far as was possible at that time, other Council initiatives, such as the Communal Bin Review and the rollout of cycle storage.

3. Permits

- 3.1 In common with the Extended zones of the current CPZ, the Council will grant the following permits for use within the proposed Zones:
- Resident Parking Permits
 - Visitor Parking Permits
 - Retail Parking Permits
 - Business Parking Permits
 - Trades Parking Permits
- 3.2 Reference should also be made to Appendix 4 of the report to this Committee from January 2021, where details of the proposed permit for businesses offering garage services can be found. This permit is proposed as a new addition proposed zones within Phase 1 and would also be made available within Phase

2 areas. That permit would be in addition to other permits that will be available in the new zones.

- 3.3 Garage-related permits aside, all other permit types will operate in the same way that they currently operate in the existing CPZ, with the same eligibility criteria and terms and conditions of use applying in the new zones. Those requirements are detailed in the existing Order governing the CPZ. The proposed Zones would be added directly to that Order, meaning that all current requirements would automatically apply to all restrictions, parking places and permits.
- 3.4 Details of the proposed charges for all permit types can be found in Appendix 5 to this report.

4. Pay-And-Display parking

- 4.1 Pay-And-Display parking provision will be available in both dedicated pay-and-display parking places and in shared-use parking places across each of the proposed zones.
- 4.2 Reference should be made to Part B of this appendix, where further detail can be found in respect of our consultant's recommendations for pay-and-display lengths of stay.
- 4.3 Having considered our consultant's findings, it is proposed that provision will be available in different lengths of stay, depending on location and likely demand, of the following durations:
- 2 hour parking, typically limited to dedicated pay-and-display and in the vicinity of local shops and businesses
 - 4 hour parking, the "standard" approach to pay-and-display across the proposed zones
 - 6 hour parking, typically found in areas of lower demand
 - 9 hour parking, limited in availability to a handful of locations on the fringes of the zones and provided only where there is limited residential demand
- 4.4 Charges for pay-and-display will mirror those in the Extended zones of the existing CPZ.
- 4.5 Example lengths of stay are shown in Appendix A to the report prepared by Project Centre. Those lengths of stay will form the basis of the proposal for Phase, but are subject to further change in order to provide parking opportunities that support local businesses by encouraging turnover of parking.

6. The Zones

- 6.1 Additional work has been carried out in order to determine the extents of the proposed zones. That work looked in detail at residential properties within the Phase 2 area, as well as vehicle ownership data taken from the 2011 census. It then applied anticipated permit uptake levels, based on existing uptake levels in the current zones.
- 6.2 The aim of that work was to ascertain whether further consideration was required to the initial Review areas in terms of ensuring (in as far as was possible) that there would be sufficient space in each zone to accommodate the likely demand from permit holders.
- 6.3 The findings of that work can be found in Part C of this Appendix.
- 6.4 The recommendation from that work is that B9, Murrayfield, Roseburn and Saughtonhall should be considered as one large zone. Based on the number of spaces that would be created and the number of permits that could potentially be issued, as well as the geographic splits between the different areas (split either by features such as Murrayfield Stadium or defined by the A8) it is instead proposed to create three new zones, should it be decided that the proposals for Phase 2 are to proceed.
- 6.5 Similarly, it is proposed to maintain Easter Road and West Leith as separate entities.
- 6.6 On that basis it is now proposed that the Zones arising from Phase 2 of the Review should be as follows:

Review Area	Proposed Zone Reference
B9	N9
Murrayfield	
Roseburn	N10
Saughtonhall	N11
Corstorphine	N12
Willowbrae North	S8
Easter Road	S9
West Leith	S10
Bonnington	S11

7. Ticket issuing Machines

- 7.1 Ticket issuing machines are located throughout the existing zones of the CPZ, allowing payment to be made for parking using coins. There are also a limited number of machines that accept cashless payment, introduced as part of a trial to gauge usage levels.
- 7.2 The use of cashless payment options, and in particular the use of Ringgo as a means to pay for parking by telephone or via mobile app, continues to increase when compared to payments involving physical coinage. Recent months have seen further increases in cashless payments, with indications suggesting that more users are switching to options that do not involve handling coins.
- 7.3 Ticket issuing machines account for a significant proportion of the initial outlay when introducing new parking controls. In 2006/07, when the CPZ was last extended, approximately 50% of the total implementation cost related to the purchase and installation of such machines. There are further costs associated with ticket issuing machines, including for the ongoing collection of physical cash from the machines and for maintenance the machines themselves.
- 7.4 Ticket machines have been rationalised across the CPZ, with a view to reducing the future cost of replacement as those machines near the end of their useful life and to reduce cash-collection and maintenance costs.
- 7.5 The work undertaken on our behalf by The Project Centre considered four ticket machine options:
 - 1) Cash/cashless ticket machines in all areas
 - 2) Cash/cashless ticket machines in high demand areas only
 - 3) Cash/cashless ticket machines in high demand areas and cashless machines in all other areas
 - 4) No ticket machines
- 7.6 The general finding from consideration of the available options was that greater emphasis should now be placed on cashless options.
- 7.7 With cashless payments now accounting for in excess of two thirds of all transactions, it is proposed to generally adopt an approach that reduces the reliance on physical payments and recognises the growing move towards cashless options. It is considered that Option 2 is the most cost-effective option, whilst meeting the needs of those wishing or needing to park in the most popular areas.
- 7.8 Based on current levels of cashless payment and the potential savings in terms of infrastructure and ongoing costs, it is proposed that a cashless version of Option 2 be adopted across all of the areas in Phase 2. This would mean that ticket machines would only be introduced in areas where there is likely to be significant demand and turnover of parked vehicles, which would result in ticket machines being used only in the vicinity of local shops and close to business

premises where there might be a regular requirement for public access. In all other locations, payment will be possible only via Ringgo.

- 7.9 All locations supported by cashless ticket machines will allow payment to be made via card reader, with payment also being possible by Ringgo.

8. Enforcement

- 8.1 Enforcement in the existing CPZ takes place on the basis of set enforcement schedules, where our enforcement contractor is required to visit each street covered by restrictions. The frequency of those visits is set down in schedules that assign visit requirements for each street.
- 8.2 Busier streets such as main routes and those streets heavily-used as places to park are visited with the greatest regularity, as a means of ensuring that restrictions are complied with, that those streets are kept clear of vehicles parked in contravention of the restrictions and that, where parking opportunities exist, those opportunities are protected by means of regular enforcement and enforcement actions.
- 8.3 The approach to enforcement in the proposed new zones will mirror this approach, targeting resources where they are most needed.



CPZ Phase 2 Operational Recommendations

Days and Hours of Enforcement and Ticket Machine Options

Client Name: City of Edinburgh Council

Reference: 1000007414

Date: May 2021

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Project Centre has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions from City of Edinburgh Council. Project Centre shall not be liable for the use of any information contained herein for any purpose other than the sole and specific use for which it was prepared.

Rev	V01		
Reason	First draft		
Prepared by	Lauren Campton		
Date	14/05/2021		
Reviewed by	Darren Ryan		
Date	24/05/2021		
Authorised by			
Date			

File path: G:\Project Centre\Project-BST\1000007414 - NSL-CEC CPZ Ph2
Operational Recommendations\2 Project Delivery\3 Reports\1 Draft Reports

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) has commissioned Project Centre to undertake a detailed analysis of the consultation responses from the Phase 2 Strategic Review of Parking (SRoP), which is currently being progressed, and to provide recommendations on parking controls and ticket machine requirements.

An investigation covering a survey of existing parking conditions, an assessment of potential need for parking controls across the city and a prioritised list of areas where new parking controls are to be considered was produced. From this strategic citywide review, areas were proposed for Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) in phases and designs were developed.

Designs for Phase 2 were opened to public consultation which allowed residents to review the proposed designs and provide their feedback. Comments from this consultation were used to provide recommendations on enforcement periods for the areas of Phase 2.

The comments from the engagement consultation were analysed and any preferred time of operation for the parking controls was reviewed. As a result of the consultation analysis, proposed parking enforcement controls have been recommended for the following:

- Lengths of stay based on geographical needs (shops, businesses etc)
- Options for P&D rates based on likely demand, comparing to existing rates across CPZ
- Days of control
- Hours of control
- Number of ticket machines (three scenarios)

This report has reviewed each area of Phase 2 individually, providing an overview of the area, consultation results and then providing recommended parking enforcement controls and justifications for each proposal.

Cashless ticket machine opportunities have been reviewed, providing an introduction into cashless machines and why they are beneficial. The use of cashless payment opportunities will go towards helping CEC achieve its goal of zero carbon by 2030.

The proposed areas of Phase 2 will cause the existing CPZ of Edinburgh to extend. It is recommended that the parking enforcement controls of the existing areas are reviewed to ensure consistency throughout the proposed and existing zones.

CONTENTS PAGE

PAGE NO.

CLIENT REQUIRMENTS	7
1.1 Introduction	7
1.2 Background	7
METHODOLOGY	9
1.3 Parking Controls and Ticket Machines	9
BONNINGTON	11
1.4 Existing Environment	11
1.5 Consultation Feedback	11
1.6 Proposed Enforcement Period	11
1.7 Ticket Machines	13
CORSTORPHINE	14
1.8 Existing Environment	14
1.9 Consultation Feedback	14
1.10 Proposed Enforcement Period	14
1.11 Ticket Machines	15
EASTER ROAD	16
1.12 Existing Environment	16
1.13 Consultation Feedback	16
1.14 Proposed Enforcement Period	16
1.15 Ticket Machines	17
MURRAYFIELD (B9 PPA)	18
1.16 Existing Environment	18
1.17 Consultation Feedback	18
1.18 Proposed Enforcement Period	18
1.19 Ticket Machines	19
ROSEBURN	20

1.20	Existing Environment	20
1.21	Consultation Feedback	20
1.22	Proposed Enforcement Period	20
1.23	Ticket Machines	21
SAUGHTONHALL		22
1.24	Existing Environment	22
1.25	Consultation Feedback	22
1.26	Proposed Enforcement Period	22
1.27	Ticket Machines	23
WEST LEITH		24
1.28	Existing Environment	24
1.29	Consultation Feedback	24
1.30	Proposed Enforcement Period	24
1.31	Ticket Machines	25
WILLOWBRAE NORTH		26
1.32	Existing Environment	26
1.33	Consultation Feedback	26
1.34	Proposed Enforcement Period	26
1.35	Ticket Machines	27
TICKET MACHINE COSTS		28
1.36	Overview	28
1.37	Option 1	28
1.38	Option 2	28
1.39	Option 3	28
1.40	Option 4	28
CASHLESS TICKET MACHINES OPPORTUNITIES		29
1.41	Introduction	29

1.42	Opportunities	29
1.43	Benefits	29
1.44	Case Study	30
NO TICKET MACHINE PROVISION		31
1.45	Introduction	31
1.46	Benefits	31
1.47	Challenges	31
1.48	Conclusion	32
RECOMMENDATIONS		33
CONCLUSION		34
APPENDIX A		35
QUALITY		36

1. CLIENT REQUIRMENTS

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) has commissioned Project Centre to undertake a detailed analysis of the consultation responses from the Phase 2 Strategic Review of Parking (SRoP), which is currently being progressed, and to provide recommendations on parking controls and ticket machine requirements.

1.1.2 The consultation analysis has been reviewed to determine the following parking control requirements:

- Lengths of stay based on geographical needs (shops, businesses etc.)
- Options for P&D rates based on likely demand, comparing to existing rates across CPZ
- Days of control
- Hours of control

1.1.3 Proposed requirement for ticket machine numbers and costs, have been based on three potential scenarios:

- Option 1 - Cash/Cashless Machines in all areas
- Option 2 - Cash/Cashless Machines in high demand areas only
- Option 3 - Cash/Cashless Machines in high demand areas and Cashless only machines in all other locations
- Option 4 – No ticket machine provisions

1.1.4 While the comments received during the Phase 2 engagement consultation will act as a guide towards the most agreeable restrictions the recommendations will, as far as possible, align with existing CPZ restrictions.

1.1.5 The distance to a proposed ticket machine is no greater than 100 metres and other than on low speed and traffic volume roads, crossing the road to use a ticket machine has been avoided.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 The City of Edinburgh Council's Local Transport Strategy (LTS) recognises the importance of managing parking demand, particularly with respect to improving accessibility and supporting the needs of residents and local businesses.

1.2.2 The introduction of parking controls can help prioritise parking spaces for residents – determining who may park in a parking bay and for how long, assist disabled people or those who have reduced mobility, improve accessibility to shops and businesses, and in some cases reduce car ownership.

- 1.2.3 The location of the Phase 2 areas has been recommended in the Strategic Parking Review produced by Project Centre (see report ref 1000005209) which investigated and identified areas of parking pressure throughout the City of Edinburgh. The investigation included a survey of existing parking conditions, an assessment of potential needs for parking controls across the city and provided recommendations for areas of Edinburgh where formalised parking controls could benefit residents. These areas of Edinburgh have been grouped into four phases.
- 1.2.4 CPZ designs for Phase 1 have already been developed and taken to a public engagement consultation which concluded in November 2019 with the findings being presented at Committee on 28th January 2021.
- 1.2.5 Following Phase 1, proposed CPZ designs for Phase 2 were developed and consulted on over a four-week period from Monday 15th February to Sunday 28th March 2021. The consultation provided residents with an opportunity to view, comment and advise upon the proposed designs at an early stage of the development.
- 1.2.6 The responses and feedback from the consultation sessions, questionnaires, interactive maps, and respondent's location were analysed and the results were collected into a report 'Strategic Review of Parking - Consultation and engagement on proposed changes to the operation of parking controls around Edinburgh City Centre – Phase 2'.
- 1.2.7 The basis of the consultation review has allowed for resident's feedback to be incorporated into the new proposed enforcement recommendations for Phase 2 of the CPZ design.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Parking Controls and Ticket Machines

- 2.1.1 The public consultation provided resident respondents with the opportunity to express when they experience parking problems in their area to scenarios from Monday to Sunday, between morning, afternoon, evening and overnight time periods.
- 2.1.2 The responses were analysed and used to determine if there were any preferred recommendations for parking controls outlined by the respondents.
- 2.1.3 A desktop assessment was carried out to review existing charges, length of stay, days, and hours of operation for the nearest existing CPZ to those being designed for Phase 2.
- 2.1.4 Where there was a correlation between the consultation response for enforcement preferences and nearest existing CPZ operation, consideration was given to replicating the existing CPZ restrictions.
- 2.1.5 When there was no correlation between consultation responses and existing restrictions, the parking controls aligned closely to the nearest existing CPZ restrictions, ensuring they were operationally viable, while still trying to meet the desires of consultation respondents.
- 2.1.6 The P&D prices align with neighbouring existing CPZ areas. The City of Edinburgh Council updated their P&D prices in April 2021, as such, we have used those as the basis of our analysis.
- 2.1.7 Data was collected on potential generators of parking pressure such as places of business or transport routes. The specific business operation was identified to determine what level of parking turnover was required to support the operation of the proposed parking bays. The turnover is managed through both the hours of stay available as well as the cost of parking, both of which align closely with existing CPZ operations.
- 2.1.8 Three options for ticket machine provision were determined through first providing ticket machines at locations that are accessible to all P&D and Shared Use bays. Where possible, the walking distance to a ticket machine is no greater than 100 metres and other than on low speed and low traffic volume roads, crossing the road to use a ticket machine has been avoided.
- 2.1.9 Once all the ticket machine locations had been established, the two other ticket machine options were designed:
 - Option 2: Cash/Cashless Machines in high demand areas only

- Option 3: Cash/Cashless Machines in high demand areas and Cashless only machines in all other locations
- 2.1.10 Shared Use and P&D bays located on roads which have many generators of parking pressure including shops, businesses, schools, churches and transport routes are assumed to be high demand.
- 2.1.11 High demand areas require cash/cashless ticket machines as varying users will occupy the bays during the proposed restrictions and not all users will use cashless payment options.
- 2.1.12 Cashless only machines have been proposed on low demand roads, that will mainly have residential parking only.
- 2.1.13 Tables showing the proposed length of stay, hours and days of control, charges and number of ticket machines required per street, across options 1 to 3, are shown in Appendix A.
- 2.1.14 The fourth option to be considered is that no ticket machines at all are provided. This option will be discussed in its own section.

3. BONNINGTON

3.1 Existing Environment

3.1.1 Bonnington which neighbours existing CPZs N1 and N2 and Phase 1 areas Pilrig, Leith and North Leith, primarily consists of roads with industrial units and several residential streets with limited access to off-street parking facilities. Bonnington Road and Ferry Road, both have bus routes present which run regularly into the city centre, along with shops and businesses generating additional pressure in the area.

3.2 Consultation Feedback

3.2.1 A total of 2,382 resident responses were recorded from the engagement consultation, with 242 respondents responding for Bonnington.

3.2.2 The first scenario asked respondents to express when they cannot park near their homes, which received 22 responses from residents in total. 13 (59%) selected Monday – Friday morning, 14 (64%) respondents out of the 22 voted Monday – Friday afternoon. Furthermore, Monday – Friday evenings was selected by 17 (77%) resident respondents.

3.2.3 In total, 6 resident respondents answered the scenario based on whether they experience abandoned vehicles on their street. 5 (83%) respondents selected Monday – Friday morning and afternoon time periods, whilst the evening time between Monday – Friday had a lower selection with 4 (67%) respondents.

3.2.4 The third scenario asked respondents if they experience commuter parking, which 22 answered for Bonnington. 20 (91%) selected Monday – Friday mornings and 19 (86%) resident respondents selected Monday - Friday afternoons. 13 (59%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evenings.

3.2.5 Generally, Monday to Friday received the highest votes for all the scenarios, with respondents suggesting they experience parking problems throughout all the time periods.

3.3 Proposed Enforcement Period

3.3.1 As access to off-street parking is limited on some streets in Bonnington, the recommended maximum stay for Shared Use and P&D bays is 4 hours for the majority of the bays, aligning with CPZ N1 and N2 and Phase 1 areas.

3.3.2 West Bowling Green Street and Bangor Road have been recommended to have a variation of 4 hours and 9 hours maximum length of stay as both roads consist of Shared Use and P&D bays.

3.3.3 As the Shared Use bays on West Bowling Green Street are located outside residential properties and generators of pressure are nearby, it is

recommended for these bays to have a maximum length of stay of 4 hours. However, the P&D bays on West Bowling Green Street are located close to the industrial units and away from bus routes so they are recommended to have a maximum length of stay of 9 hours to allow spaces to be used by people attending the businesses.

- 3.3.4 The P&D bays on Bangor Road are recommended to have a maximum length of stay of 9 hours as these bays are further away from bus routes so these timings will provide spaces if needed for people at the businesses to park. The Shared Use bays are recommended to have maximum length of stay of 4 hours as the bays are located near residential properties with limited access to off-street parking and are located close to bus routes on Great Junction Street and Bonnington Road.
- 3.3.5 The P&D bays in Swanfield and P&D bay on the eastern end of Ferry Road, both are recommended to have maximum length of stay of 2 hours as they are located in high demand areas. The bays in Swanfield are in an industrial area which has private parking areas. The P&D bays here would ensure a turnover of space for any visitors/customers. Swanfield is accessed off Bonnington Road which provides a regular bus service and also has Shared Use parking which could be utilised. The P&D bay on the eastern end of Ferry Road is located outside multiple local shops with several regular bus routes operating on Ferry Road. These short maximum stay hours will allow more non-residential users to utilise the bay encouraging turnover for local businesses.
- 3.3.6 The Shared Use and P&D bays located on the western end of Ferry Road both have recommended maximum length of stay of 6 hours. There is little residential demand for the bays, however, as multiple bus routes are present on Ferry Road allowing 6 hours will help discourage commuter parking.
- 3.3.7 P&D bays on Warriston Road, Broughton Road, Bonnington Road have a recommended maximum stay of 6 hours. These bays have a longer maximum stay, as they are available for non-permit holders. There are limited generators of parking pressure near these bays, except bus routes so allowing 6 hours will help deter commuter parking.
- 3.3.8 South Fort Street has several residential properties with no access to off-street parking facilities, so the Shared Use bays have a maximum stay of 4 hours to deter any commuter parking and allow permit holders to park. However, the P&D bays on South Fort Street have no generators of parking pressure nearby, except bus routes on Ferry Road, so it is recommended for these bays to have a maximum stay of 9 hours.

- 3.3.9 CPZ N1 and N2 and Phase 1 areas which neighbours Bonnington, currently have parking restrictions from Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:30pm. As residents expressed highly that they mostly experience parking problems between Monday – Friday with all time periods receiving high votes, the days and timings of the proposed enforcement period for Bonnington are Monday – Friday 8:30am – 5:30pm.
- 3.3.10 The ticket prices for Bonnington have been set at £2.50 per hour, which aligns with existing CPZs and Phase 2 areas.

3.4 Ticket Machines

- 3.4.1 If ticket machines were to be placed in all areas of Bonnington, then 62 would be the requirement. This means that there is a ticket machine within 100m distance of each Shared Use and P&D bay.
- 3.4.2 Within Bonnington, a selection of roads including Bangor Road, Bonnington Road, Newhaven Road and Ferry Road have been assumed as high demand due to the generators of parking pressure surrounding each road. These generators include businesses, shops, schools, churches, and bus routes.
- 3.4.3 In total, 44 ticket machines would be required for the high demand areas (Option 2) in Bonnington.
- 3.4.4 Cashless ticket machines have been located mainly on residential streets including Easter Warriston, Gosford Place, Dalmeny Road and Bonnyhaugh. Residential streets require cashless machines as users of the bays will generally be permit holders, so 18 cashless machines and 44 cash accepting machines are required for Option 3 for Bonnington.

4. CORSTORPHINE

4.1 Existing Environment

- 4.1.1 Corstorphine comprises mainly of residential streets which have sufficient access to off-street parking facilities. The main generators of parking pressure within the area include bus routes on St John's Road, along with local shops and businesses, medical centres and possibly Edinburgh Zoo.

4.2 Consultation Feedback

- 4.2.1 610 resident responses were recorded concerning Corstorphine. From the 610, 47 resident respondents stated that they cannot park near their home, with 43 (91%) selecting Monday – Friday morning and afternoon time periods. While 27 (57%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evenings.
- 4.2.2 13 resident respondents indicated that they experience abandoned vehicles on their street. 11 (85%) selected Monday – Friday mornings and afternoon time periods, whilst 6 (46%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evenings.
- 4.2.3 96 resident respondents confirmed that they experience commuter parking on their street. Monday – Friday morning and afternoon time periods received the highest number of votes with 93 (97%) respondents selecting this period. 44 (46%) selected Monday – Friday evenings.
- 4.2.4 Overall, Monday to Friday morning and afternoons received the highest votes for all the scenarios.

4.3 Proposed Enforcement Period

- 4.3.1 Corstorphine does not neighbour any existing CPZs, however, it does neighbour other areas of Phase 2, Saughtonhall and Murrayfield (B9 PPA). To align closely with neighbouring areas, the parking restrictions for maximum stay for majority of Shared Use and P&D bays is 4 hours. Furthermore, as Corstorphine is mainly residential, these restrictions will suit residents and deter any commuter parking.
- 4.3.2 However, the recommended maximum stay for Victor Park Terrace and Featherhall Avenue is 2 hours. The Shared Use bays are located on residential streets with limited to no access to off-street parking facilities which will result in higher demand for parking permits. There are multiple generators of parking pressure nearby including Ladywell Medical Centre East, shops and bus routes on St John's. Reducing the maximum stay to 2 hours will allow bays to be more readily available for permit holders and encourage a turnover of parking for local businesses.
- 4.3.3 Pinkhill has generators of parking pressure present such as Edinburgh Zoo, bus routes on St John's Road and Manor Grange Care Home. There are

very limited residential properties on Pinkhill requiring parking spaces. As a result, the recommended maximum stay for the Shared Use bays on Pinkhill is 9 hours as there is not a high demand for parking spaces by permit holders.

- 4.3.4 As the results of the consultation review expressed high concerns about parking issues in the morning and afternoon time periods, the days and timings of the enforcement period is Monday – Friday 8:30am – 5:30pm. These restrictions align with Phase 2 areas and existing CPZs.
- 4.3.5 The ticket prices for Corstorphine have been set at £2.50 per hour, which aligns with existing CPZs and Phase 2 areas.

4.4 Ticket Machines

- 4.4.1 Corstorphine is a large area in comparison to the other areas with many Shared Use bays, therefore for Option 1, 75 ticket machines would be required.
- 4.4.2 Roads which have been assumed as high demand include Pinkhill, Victor Park Terrace, Glebe Road, Manse Road and Kirk Loan. These roads have many generators of parking pressure present which include bus routes, businesses, schools, and churches. In total, 42 ticket machines would be required for Option 2.
- 4.4.3 For roads within Corstorphine which have a lower demand and will mainly be used by permit holders, have cashless machines only provided. Barony Terrace, Forrester Road, Gordon Road and Dunsmuir Court consist mainly of residential properties and so are assumed as low demand. In total, 33 cashless machines and 42 cash accepting machines would be required for Option 3.

5. EASTER ROAD

5.1 Existing Environment

5.1.1 The majority of Easter Road area consists of terraced residential streets and apartment blocks which have limited to no access to off-street parking facilities, creating a high demand for parking spaces. Additionally, the area is located beside areas of Phase 1, Leith Walk and Abbeyhill which have high parking pressures.

5.1.2 Generators of parking pressure for the area include bus routes along Easter Road, St Clair Street and Hawkhill Avenue, industrial units, Hibernian Football Club and work offices.

5.2 Consultation Feedback

5.2.1 In total, 125 resident responses were collected for the Easter Road area from the engagement consultation.

5.2.2 26 resident respondents stated that they cannot park near their home, with 19 (73%) selecting Monday – Friday mornings, 15 (58%) selected Monday – Friday afternoons, whilst 22 (85%) chose Monday – Friday evenings.

5.2.3 23 resident respondents stated that they experience abandoned vehicles on their street, with 19 (83%) selecting Monday – Friday mornings, 17 (74%) selected Monday – Friday afternoons, whilst 22 (96%) chose Monday – Friday evenings.

5.2.4 19 resident respondents stated that they experience commuter parking on their street, with 16 (84%) selecting Monday – Friday mornings and 15 (79%) selected Monday – Friday afternoons and evening time periods.

5.2.5 Overall, Monday – Friday evenings received high votes from the respondents for Easter Road.

5.3 Proposed Enforcement Period

5.3.1 As the area of Easter Road is residential with very limited access to off-street parking, there is a high demand for parking spaces. As a result, the maximum stay for majority of the Shared Use bays is 4 hours. Having maximum stay set at 4 hours for the bays, allows for permit holders to have access to bays and will deter commuter parking as there are many generators of pressure in the area.

5.3.2 However, it is recommended for the Shared Use bays on St Clair Street to have maximum length of stay set at 9 hours. These bays can have longer maximum stay as there is no residential frontage so there will be a low demand for permit holder parking.

5.3.3 The period of enforcement for Easter Road is Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:30pm. These restrictions align with neighbouring areas of West Leith, Leith Walk and Abbeyhill.

5.3.4 The ticket prices are £2.50 per hour, which aligns with the new pricing structure as of April 2021.

5.4 Ticket Machines

5.4.1 In total, Easter Road would require 23 ticket machines for Option 1.

5.4.2 Several roads in Easter Road such as St Clair Street, Albion Road, Hawkhill Avenue and St Clair Avenue have been assumed as high demand due to the generators of parking pressure present. As a result, 11 ticket machines would be required for Option 2.

5.4.3 Cashless ticket machines are needed on streets which are mainly residential and are away from generators of parking pressure including West Kilnacre, Lochend Butterfly Way, Thorntreeside and Hawkhill Close. Parking on these streets will mainly be permit holders so 12 cashless machines and 11 cash accepting machines would be required for Easter Road.

6. MURRAYFIELD (B9 PPA)

6.1 Existing Environment

6.1.1 Murrayfield (B9 PPA) is primarily a residential area, with roads having varying access to off-street parking facilities. Roads including Campbell Road and Lennel Avenue have substantial access to off-street parking, whilst, Murrayfield Gardens, Abinger Gardens and Orimdale Terrace have limited access to off-street parking.

6.1.2 Generators of parking pressure within the area include bus routes to the city centre on Corstorphine Road, Ravelston Dykes and bus routes on Murrayfield Road. Murrayfield (B9 PPA) neighbours existing CPZ N5 and proposed Phase 2 areas; Roseburn and Saughtonhall.

6.2 Consultation Feedback

6.2.1 The total number of resident respondents for Murrayfield (B9 PPA) was 275. From the total number, 32 resident respondents stated that they cannot park near their home, with 28 (88%) selecting Monday – Friday mornings and 26 (81%) selected Monday – Friday afternoons. 13 (41%) resident respondents voted for Monday – Friday evenings.

6.2.2 12 respondents acknowledged that they experience abandoned vehicles on their street, with 12 (100%) respondents selecting Monday – Friday mornings and 11 (92%) choosing Monday – Friday afternoons. Although only 6 (50%) chose Monday – Friday evenings.

6.2.3 48 resident respondents stated that they experience commuter parking on their street, with 45 (94%) selecting Monday – Friday mornings. Monday – Friday afternoons was selected by 41 (85%) respondents, whilst Monday – Friday evenings was selected by 20 (42%) resident respondents.

6.2.4 Monday – Friday mornings and afternoons seems to be when respondents experience parking problems the most within the Murrayfield (B9 PPA) area.

6.3 Proposed Enforcement Period

6.3.1 As Murrayfield (B9 PPA) neighbours CPZ N5 and is mainly a residential area with varying levels of access to off-street parking facilities, the maximum stay for the majority of the Shared Use bays is 4 hours. Offering shorter maximum stay will deter commuters and allow permit holders to have spaces in the high demand roads for parking.

6.3.2 The Shared Use and P&D bay located on Murrayfield Place is recommended to have a maximum stay period of 2 hours. This is due to the

present of bus routes on Corstorphine Road and the bays are located within close to proximity to shops and businesses on Murrayfield Place.

- 6.3.3 Furthermore, Kinellan Road is recommended to have a maximum length of stay of 6 hours for the Shared Use bays. There are limited residential properties located on Kinellan Road so there is a lower demand for residents requiring these bays. However, due to bus routes being present on Ellersly Road and Murrayfield Road, maximum 6 hours is proposed as this will help deter commuter parking.
- 6.3.4 CPZ N5 which neighbours Murrayfield (B9 PPA) has its current parking restrictions from Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:30pm. After assessing the consultation results, respondents voiced that they mostly experience parking problems Monday – Friday morning and afternoon time periods. On this basis, the days and timings of parking restrictions recommended are Monday – Friday, 8.30am – 5.30pm.
- 6.3.5 As Murrayfield (B9 PPA) is neighbouring CPZ N5, the ticket prices are £2.50 per hour.

6.4 Ticket Machines

- 6.4.1 With many Shared Use bays and one P&D bay proposed in Murrayfield (B9 PPA), a total of 54 ticket machines would be required for Option 1.
- 6.4.2 Roads including Murrayfield Road, Murrayfield Place, Ormidale Terrace, Abinger Gardens and Coltbridge Terrace have been assumed as high demand as they generators of parking pressure in their vicinity. These generators include shops, bus routes or schools and churches so parking in the bays may not be mainly residential.
- 6.4.3 In total, 31 ticket machines would be required for the high demand areas (Option 2) in Murrayfield (B9 PPA).
- 6.4.4 Cashless ticket machines have been provided on streets that are mainly residential with few to no generators of parking pressure nearby, such as Succoth Park, Succoth Gardens and Succoth Place. Parking on low demand streets will mainly be by permit holders so 23 cashless machines and 31 cash accepting machines would be the requirement for Option 3.

7. ROSEBURN

7.1 Existing Environment

- 7.1.1 The main generators of parking pressure include businesses, shops, schools, bus routes and a tram stop are located on Roseburn Street and Roseburn Terrace within the Roseburn area. Additionally, residential properties have varying access levels to off-street parking facilities generating additional parking pressure.

7.2 Consultation Feedback

- 7.2.1 In total, 90 resident responses were recorded from the public consultation for Roseburn. 28 resident respondents stated that they cannot park near their home, with 23 (82%) respondents selecting Monday – Friday morning, whilst 26 (93%) respondents for this scenario chose Monday – Friday afternoon. 17 (61%) selected Monday- Friday evening time.
- 7.2.2 21 resident respondents stated that they experience abandoned vehicles on their street, with 17 (81%) selecting Monday – Friday morning time. Monday – Friday afternoon period received 19 (90%) votes, whilst 12 (57%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evening time.
- 38 resident respondents stated that they experience commuter parking on their street, with 34 (89%) selecting Monday – Friday morning, 37 (97%) selected Monday – Friday afternoon, whilst 20 (53%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evening time.
- 7.2.3 Generally, Monday – Friday received the highest votes for all the scenarios, with respondents suggesting they experience parking problems the most in the afternoons.

7.3 Proposed Enforcement Period

- 7.3.1 As Roseburn consists of residential streets with varying levels of access to off-street parking and has multiple generators of parking pressure present, the recommended maximum stay for the Shared Use bays is 4 hours. This maximum stay period aligns with neighbouring area of CPZ S4 and N5 and Phase 1 area Murrayfield (B9 PPA).
- 7.3.2 The new days and timings for the parking controls of Roseburn align with neighbouring CPZ S4 and N5, which are Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:30pm. Additionally, these controls also align with the consultation review, as residents voted mostly for Monday – Friday, afternoons.
- 7.3.3 Roseburn is neighbouring CPZ S4 and N5 so the ticket prices are £2.50 per hour.

7.4 Ticket Machines

- 7.4.1 For Roseburn, 19 ticket machines would be required for Option 1.
- 7.4.2 Roseburn Street, Roseburn Crescent and Roseburn Gardens have been assumed as high demand due to the generators of parking pressure present including including Murrayfield tram stop, local businesses, bus routes, Roseburn Public Park and Roseburn Primary Schools.
- 7.4.3 On this basis, 12 cash/cashless ticket machines are required for Option 2.
- 7.4.4 Parking on Russell Gardens, Roseburn Place and Roseburn Maltings will mainly be residential and as a result, 7 cashless machines would be required for Option 3 with the other 12 accepting cash.

8. SAUGHTONHALL

8.1 Existing Environment

8.1.1 Saughtonhall is primarily a residential area, with various roads having limited or no access to off-street parking facilities such as Saughton Gardens, Saughton Grove and Glendevon Place. Additionally, few generators of parking pressure are present in the Saughtonhall area including bus routes on Balgreen Road/Saughtonhall Drive and Corstorphine Road, Balgreen tram stop and Murrayfield Medical Centre.

8.1.2 Saughtonhall neighbours Phase 2 areas Corstorphine, Murrayfield (B9 PPA), Roseburn and Phase 1 area Gorgie North.

8.2 Consultation Feedback

8.2.1 The overall number of resident respondents for Saughtonhall was 352. Out of the overall number, 20 resident respondents said that they cannot park near their home, 17 (85%) voted Monday – Friday mornings, 12 (60%) selected Monday – Friday afternoons, whilst 11 (55%) chose Monday – Friday evenings.

8.2.2 Only 7 resident respondents selected the scenario about experiencing abandoned vehicles on their street. 5 (71%) voted for Monday – Friday mornings, 4 (57%) selected Monday – Friday afternoons, whilst 7 (86%) chose Monday – Friday evenings.

8.2.3 17 resident respondents stated that they experience commuter parking on their street, 15 (88%) selected Monday – Friday mornings, 12 (71%) selected Monday – Friday afternoons, whilst Monday – Friday evenings received 11 (65%) votes from resident respondents.

8.2.4 Generally, Saughtonhall received mixed votes, with Monday – Friday receiving the most votes and all timings through the day being selected.

8.3 Proposed Enforcement Period

8.3.1 Saughtonhall neighbours Roseburn, Murrayfield (B9 PPA), Corstorphine and Gorgie North so the recommended enforcement restrictions align closely to these areas, while considering the consultation results.

8.3.2 As a majority of the roads in Saughtonhall are residential, the maximum stay of the Shared Use bays for most of the area is 6 hours. This time allows for usage of the bays but will deter commuter parking which may be caused by bus routes present on Saughtonhall Drive/Balgreen Road and Corstorphine Road and Balgreen tram stop.

8.3.3 Balgreen tram stop, bus routes and a local shop are located around a Shared Use and P&D bay on the south end of Balgreen Road. As a result

of the generators of pressure, these bays have a recommended maximum stay of 4 hours.

- 8.3.4 Though, as the Shared Use bays at the north end of Balgreen Road are not located near residential properties, they have a maximum stay of 6 hours. However, as bus routes are present on Corstorphine Road, the 6 hours will help deter any commuter parking.
- 8.3.5 Neighbouring areas of Gorgie North, Corstorphine and Roseburn currently have parking restrictions set from Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:30pm. After assessing the consultation results, respondents voiced that they mostly experience parking problems Monday – Friday. However, no time suggestions received a significant vote.
- 8.3.6 On this basis, the days and timings of parking restrictions are Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:30pm. These restrictions align with Roseburn, Corstorphine and Gorgie North.
- 8.3.7 The ticket prices are set at £2.50 per hour for the Shared Use and P&D bays which aligns with existing CPZs and areas from Phase 2.

8.4 Ticket Machines

- 8.4.1 The total number of required ticket machines for Option 1 in Saughtonhall would be 45.
- 8.4.2 Roads within the area that have been assumed as high demand include Balgreen Road, Braid Drive, Saughton Crescent and Saughtonhall Avenue. These roads have generators of parking pressure within their vicinity including bus routes, Balgreen tram stop, Murrayfield Medical Centre and Saughtonhall Church.
- 8.4.3 In total, 19 ticket machines would be required for the high demand areas (Option 2) in Saughtonhall.
- 8.4.4 Cashless ticket machines have been provided on streets that are mainly residential with few to no generators of parking pressure nearby, such as Braid Grove, Saughton Gardens and Braid Avenue. Parking on low demand streets will mainly be by permit holders so 26 cashless machines and 19 cash accepting machines would be the requirement for Option 3.

9. WEST LEITH

9.1 Existing Environment

- 9.1.1 Located beside Abbeyhill, Leith Walk and Leith (areas of Phase 1), West Leith comprises of residential streets with many having limited or no access to off-street parking facilities. Several generators of parking pressure are present in the area including bus routes on Restalrig Road and Lochend Road, Hermitage Park Primary School, Restalrig Park Medical Centre and shops/businesses.

9.2 Consultation Feedback

- 9.2.1 West Leith received a total of 327 resident responses from the consultation review. From this total figure, 41 resident respondents had indicated that they cannot park near their home, 23 (56%) voted Monday – Friday mornings, 25 (61%) selected Monday – Friday afternoon, whilst 34 (83%) chose Monday – Friday evenings.
- 9.2.2 17 resident respondents stated that they experience abandoned vehicles on their street, with 13 (76%) selecting Monday – Friday morning and afternoon time periods, whilst 15 (88%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evenings.
- 9.2.3 The scenario based on if respondents experience commuter parking on their street, received 20 votes. 18 (90%) resident respondents selected Monday – Friday morning, 17 (85%) selected Monday - Friday afternoon and Monday – Friday evenings received 13 (65%) votes.
- 9.2.4 Overall, Monday – Friday received the highest votes from the resident responses for each scenario.

9.3 Proposed Enforcement Period

- 9.3.1 As West Leith consists of residential streets with limited or no access to off-street parking facilities, together with roads which have bus routes present, the maximum stay for Shared Use and P&D bays is 4 hours for the majority of the area. These restrictions align with neighbouring areas. The shorter maximum stay for the bays will help deter any commuter parking and allow residents to use the bays easily.
- 9.3.2 The P&D bays on Restalrig Road and Alemoor Crescent, are recommended to have a maximum stay of 2 hours due to the generators of parking pressure including a medical centre and shops/businesses. Shorter maximum stay hours will allow bays to be more readily available for paying customers.

- 9.3.3 Hermitage Park has a Shared Use bay located outside of Hermitage Park Primary School. This bay is also within walking distance to Lochend Road which has bus routes present. As such to discourage commuter parking and allow the bay to be for residents, the maximum stay for this bay is 2 hours.
- 9.3.4 The recommended maximum length of stay for the Shared Use bays on East Hermitage Place and Hermitage Place is 9 hours. There is sufficient proposed permit holder bays for residents to utilise on the other side of the road and even if residents do use some of these shared use bays, there is still an abundant of space.
- 9.3.5 After reviewing the consultation review, residents expressed that they mostly experience parking problems between Monday – Friday. However, the time periods generally received the same number of votes for each day. On that basis, the days and timings of parking restrictions are Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:30pm. These timings align with Abbeyhill, Easter Road, Leith and Leith Walk.
- 9.3.6 The ticket prices are set at £2.50 per hour which aligns with neighbouring areas from Phase and 2 and existing CPZs.

9.4 Ticket Machines

- 9.4.1 Regarding West Leith, the requirement number for ticket machines for Option 1 would be 34.
- 9.4.2 Roads including Restalrig Road, Lochend Road and East Hermitage Place have been assumed as high demand as they have many generators of parking pressure nearby. These include bus routes, shops/businesses, schools and healthcare centres. In total, 23 ticket machines would be required for Option 2.
- 9.4.3 Cashless ticket machines are required on streets which will mainly be used by residents. These streets include Ryehill Terrace, Ryehill Grove, Easter Hermitage and Hawkhill. In total, 11 cashless machines and 23 cash accepting machines would be required for Option 3.

10. WILLOWBRAE NORTH

10.1 Existing Environment

- 10.1.1 Willowbrae North consists of several residential streets with limited or no access to off-street parking facilities, creating a high demand for parking spaces. In addition, Willowbrae Road and London Road generate additional pressure on the area as bus routes, shops and businesses are located along these two roads. Holyrood Park is within close to the proximity which will attract visitors to the area. Moreover, Willowbrae North neighbours Abbeyhill which is a proposed CPZ area from Phase 1.

10.2 Consultation Feedback

- 10.2.1 A total of 290 resident responses were recorded from the engagement consultation for Willowbrae North. 70 resident respondents out of the 290, stated that they cannot park near their home, with 31 (44%) selecting Monday – Friday morning and afternoon time periods, whilst 57 (81%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evening time.
- 10.2.2 17 resident respondents stated that they experience abandoned vehicles on their street, with 10 (59%) selecting Monday – Friday morning and afternoon time periods, whilst 13 (76%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evening time.
- 10.2.3 48 resident respondents stated that they experience commuter parking on their street, with 35 (73%) selecting Monday – Friday morning, 32 (67%) selected Monday – Friday afternoon, whilst 36 (75%) respondents chose Monday – Friday evening time.
- 10.2.4 Monday to Friday received the highest votes for all the scenarios, with respondents suggesting they experience parking problems throughout the day.

10.3 Proposed Enforcement Period

- 10.3.1 As Willowbrae North neighbours Abbeyhill and is a residential area with limited access to off-street parking facilities, the maximum stay for Shared Use bays is 4 hours. These timings align with Abbeyhill and existing CPZs which are nearby and the shorter maximum stay for the bays will help deter any commuter parking and allows for permit holders to get parked.
- 10.3.2 Abbeyhill which neighbours Willowbrae North has parking restrictions recommended from Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:30pm. After reviewing the engagement consultation results, residents expressed that they mainly experience parking problems between Monday – Friday throughout the day. On this basis, the enforcement period for Willowbrae North will be Monday – Friday, 8.30am – 5.30pm aligning with Abbeyhill and consultation results.

- 10.3.3 The ticket prices for Willowbrae North have been set at £2.50 per hour, which aligns with the new price of the existing CPZs.

10.4 Ticket Machines

- 10.4.1 For Willowbrae North, the requirement number of machines for Option 1 (machines in all areas) would be 14.
- 10.4.2 Roads such as Meadowbank Avenue, Queen's Park Avenue and Wolseley Crescent have been assumed as high demand as they have a small number of generators of parking pressure in the vicinity. These generators include shops, businesses, bus routes and parks so parking in the bays may not be mainly residential.
- 10.4.3 In total, 7 ticket machines would be required for the high demand areas (Option 2) in Willowbrae North.
- 10.4.4 Cashless ticket machines are required on streets such as Lilyhill Terrace, Lismore Crescent, Queen's Park Court and Meadowbank Crescent as these are mainly residential with few to no generators of parking pressure nearby. Parking on low demand streets will mainly be by permit holders so 7 cashless machines are required for Option 3 with the other 7 accepting cash.

11. TICKET MACHINE COSTS

11.1 Overview

11.1.1 The cost of the ticket machines based on the three potential scenarios have been calculated.

11.1.2 The cost of an individual ticket machine which also includes installation is approximately £4,100. The price of the machine remains the same, no matter what type of machine is required.

11.2 Option 1

11.2.1 Option 1 was based on a scenario of placing Cash/Cashless ticket machines everywhere within the Phase 2 enforcement areas. As a result, a total of 326 Cash/Cashless Machines would be required for the areas of Phase 2.

11.2.2 The cost of providing Cash/Cashless Machines everywhere is in the regions of £1,336,600.

11.3 Option 2

11.3.1 Option 2 was offered as a scenario where Cash/Cashless Machines would only be placed in high demand areas within the Phase 2 enforcement areas. In total, 189 ticket machines would be required for Option 2.

11.3.2 The cost of providing Cash/Cashless Machines in high demand areas only is in the region of £774,900.

11.4 Option 3

11.4.1 The capital cost of Option 3 is exactly the same as Option 2. However, there are additional benefits over option 2 through reduced cash collection costs and higher security.

11.5 Option 4

11.5.1 Option 4 is based on providing no ticket machines at all and only providing signs for RingGo payments. Offering RingGo only payments provides considerable cost savings as the cost of placing poles and signs is significantly cheaper than placing ticket machines.

12. CASHLESS TICKET MACHINES OPPORTUNITIES

12.1 Introduction

- 12.1.1 The UK is at the tipping point of huge developments in cashless payments and finance technology by turning towards an entirely cashless economy. Many individuals are now using contactless cards or mobile payments as this is the most convenient way to pay prompting people to not carry cash.
- 12.1.2 Buying, emptying, and maintaining cash parking machines is no longer cost efficient for local authorities and private operators, with many looking to remove the option entirely.

12.2 Opportunities

- 12.2.1 As of 2019, Edinburgh has two of the top six most polluted streets in Scotland (Nicolson Street and St John's Road) (Friends of the Earth, 2020), and as a result, changes need to be made to target carbon neutrality by 2030.
- 12.2.2 CEC has a great opportunity to utilise the excellent mobile phone coverage that is across Edinburgh and the entire Lothian region. All wards that make up the City of Edinburgh have good 2G, 3G, 4G network coverage with EE now providing 5G network coverage in central Edinburgh. Having access to this high level of coverage across the city will help support mobile payments and cashless ticket machines.
- 12.2.3 CEC's currently cashless provider RingGo could help to reduce traffic congestion caused by cars circulating looking for a space as RingGo shows motorists where parking is being offered. It highlights places where empty spaces are most likely to be found and then allows motorists to navigate to their chosen location with spoken directions.
- 12.2.4 The Coronavirus has fast-tracked the development of contactless payments and mobility. Authorities are looking to keep citizens safe now that cash ticket machines are no longer the best choice. Removing the cash ticket machines eliminates a vector for infections, not just of the coronavirus but several colds and flus.

12.3 Benefits

- 12.3.1 As cards and mobile payments are replacing cash payment, moving to digital payments will save time and money. Reducing or removing cash ticket machines will help local authorities save money, because it cuts costs of maintenance, upgrades, vandalism, and theft of cash from ticket machines.

- 12.3.2 Additionally, using cashless payments provides a single source of enforcement data, leading to enforcement efficiencies and increased opportunities for ANPR usage.
- 12.3.3 Cashless machines allow for detailed reporting capabilities for all parking activity in the City, with meta-data such as vehicle type, fuel type, point of origin, and dwell time. In addition, these detailed reports can be used for future parking/transport policy decision making.
- 12.3.4 Using cashless payment options allows for the availability of emissions-based parking to amend paid parking charges based on factors such as fuel type. This can help improve the air quality of Edinburgh by encouraging cleaner transport choices, as well as providing additional income if a surcharge on higher polluting vehicles is implemented.

12.4 Case Study

- 12.4.1 RingGo has encouraged councils to digitise parking operations and save resources by removing or reducing their machine fleets. RingGo customers have the benefit of using by far the UK's largest cashless parking solution.
- 12.4.2 London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham (H&F) has declared a Climate and Ecological Emergency and is committed to being carbon neutral by 2030. The biggest contributor to greenhouse gases in the borough is road traffic.
- 12.4.3 The borough is comprehensively covered in controlled parking zones (CPZ) and they have been focused on building a scheme to prioritise parking for local people and reduce commuter parking usually during the 9am – 5pm times.
- 12.4.4 The number of motorists opting to pay for parking in H&F using P&D ticket machines has significantly reduced in recent years and current data shows that around 96% of payment are made through RingGo. The remaining 4% that use P&D machines are almost entirely made using credit/debit cards with less than 1% using cash.
- 12.4.5 Civil Enforcement Officers use existing systems to determine if payment has been made through the RingGo system. No special enforcement equipment is required and no change in enforcement procedures are necessary to enforce emission-based parking charges.
- 12.4.6 Cashless parking will provide H&F council with more options to control vehicle behaviours, and it is expected that a change to emission-based charging with a diesel surcharge will naturally move users over to cashless parking as it would provide them with the best price.

13. NO TICKET MACHINE PROVISION

13.1 Introduction

- 13.1.1 A future without P&D machines could become a new reality as a vast majority of payments are now being completed using cards or online payments. With 95% of adults now owning a mobile phone, there has been a rapid increase in the use of Apple, Android and Samsung Pay.
- 13.1.2 Even before Coronavirus, cash usage was in a decline. Now more than ever, there is a reduced desire to touch shared surfaces, as even cashless machines require you to press a button. These factors will contribute to a lower usage of both cash and cashless machines.
- 13.1.3 Using no ticket machine options such as RingGo provides many benefits including cost savings, improving street appearance and increases data and knowledge.

13.2 Benefits

- 13.2.1 No ticket machine options provide significant cost saving opportunities for local councils. There are no longer high installation fees as the cost of installing a signpost and sign is significantly cheaper than installing a cash or cashless machine. Additionally, in some circumstances, existing posts may be able to be used, further reducing costs, as a sign may only be required in certain areas.
- 13.2.2 Additionally, costs can be saved using no ticket machine options as there is no longer a need to maintain the ticket machines. The costs associated with cash collections, processing and banking, along with vandalism and theft are also removed.
- 13.2.3 Removing ticket machines from streets and providing signposts and signs has the potential to reduce street clutter, helping improve the overall aesthetics of a street. However, streets will not be totally clutter free as signposts and posts are still being placed.
- 13.2.4 Where no ticket machines are provided, it is still possible for motorists to pay by cash by visiting local businesses who are part of the PayPoint scheme. Local businesses hold electronic terminals that digitally record the vehicle registration and parking location. This in turn can help to increase footfall into local businesses.

13.3 Challenges

- 13.3.1 It is important to note that cashless payment options rely heavily on connectivity for use, either network errors or server faults could cause a significant issue in providing a service, creating an issue to pay.

13.3.2 Additionally, maintaining a cash option is important for accessibility and social inclusion as not everyone will own a smartphone or use it for online payments.

13.3.3 Edinburgh is a major tourist destination. Due to mobile phone roaming charges, some tourists may be discouraged from using their mobile phones while abroad.

13.4 Conclusion

13.4.1 Providing no ticket machines has many benefits, with the main one being cost savings for local Councils. However, there are several other factors that a Council would need to take into consideration before removing ticket machines such as who is anticipated to use the area, are there local shops in the vicinity and mobile phone coverage.

13.4.2 Some areas where it would be possible to introduce parking controls with no ticket machines include high demand areas where there are shops nearby to the parking bays so that they can provide some facility for people to pay with cash or by card.

13.4.3 Areas would need to be considered on an individual basis on whether they are suitable or not. Prior to implementing any scheme that had no ticket machines, an equalities impact assessment should be undertaken.

14. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 14.1.1 Moving forward, parking in Edinburgh will benefit greater from cashless payment options. Cashless ticket machines are best suited over cash ticket machines as they cost less to run and operate compared to cash ticket machines. The costs of running cash ticket machines include resourcing personnel to collect the cash, maintenance and upgrades of ticket machines, theft, and vandalism, which can cause a loss of income.
- 14.1.2 Cashless payment options allow for councils to save money and provides touch free parking, creating a safer and healthier environment for users.
- 14.1.3 Switching to cashless payment options and cutting cash ticket machines provides environmental benefits as:
- Reduced journeys for collections and banking of the cash
 - Reduced journeys for machine maintenance, vandalism, and repair
 - Reduced electricity usage
 - Save on administrative costs
- 14.1.4 The criteria for high demand areas requiring cash ticket machines could be reassessed so that the proposed requirement of cash ticket machines could be reduced. The proposed requirement for cash ticket machines could be narrowed down to areas that would require them the most e.g. where there is more elderly (churches/community centres) and in tourist areas.
- 14.1.5 With the potential introduction of several new CPZ areas, becoming increasingly distance from the existing CPZ, a wholesale review of parking charges would be beneficial. This could create a staggered pricing strategy across the CPZ areas, with higher prices in the city centre and lower prices outside the city centre zone. Additionally, parking prices in higher demand areas such as Leith Walk could be reviewed, and charges could be set to match the demand of the area.
- 14.1.6 Furthermore, times of enforcement periods should be reviewed for all CPZ areas. Current timings of restrictions are from 8:30am – 5:30pm. However, some areas including Murrayfield (B9 PPA) and Corstorphine would benefit from varying timings to make sure the desires of residents are met. In some cases, this may require an extension to existing operating times.

15. CONCLUSION

- 15.1.1 The primary aim of the project was to review the engagement consultation results and to propose parking enforcement recommendations for Phase 2.
- 15.1.2 Through reviewing the consultation results and completing desktop assessments of the existing CPZ's within Edinburgh, suggestions for parking restrictions regarding maximum stay, days, timings, and prices have been provided for each area in Phase 2. The results have considered both consultation results and neighbouring CPZ, making sure there is a link between both.
- 15.1.3 The required number of ticket machines was based on three scenarios and all ticket machines are within a 100m walking distance. The number of ticket machines required ranges from 7 to 75 dependant on the Option chosen.
- 15.1.4 Through a desktop assessment, cashless ticket machines have many benefits and many local authorities are now switching to cashless payment options, and these should be prioritised within Edinburgh. It is recommended that the criteria of high demand streets be reviewed, to reduce the number of cash machines.
- 15.1.5 The recommended pricing structure is based on current on-street pay and display prices which is correct at the time of analysis. At the time of implementation of any CPZ areas these prices would need to be reviewed and amended to ensure that they are still reflective of the current operations.
- 15.1.6 Additionally, it is recommended that there should be an in-depth review of all CPZ enforcement controls in Edinburgh to make sure restrictions are set correctly for each area and that there is a varying difference between the city centre zone and surrounding areas with parking demand taken into consideration.

16.

Appendix A

Quality

It is the policy of Project Centre to supply Services that meet or exceed our clients' expectations of Quality and Service. To this end, the Company's Quality Management System (QMS) has been structured to encompass all aspects of the Company's activities including such areas as Sales, Design and Client Service.

By adopting our QMS on all aspects of the Company, Project Centre aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. Ensure a clear understanding of customer requirements;
2. Ensure projects are completed to programme and within budget;
3. Improve productivity by having consistent procedures;
4. Increase flexibility of staff and systems through the adoption of a common approach to staff appraisal and training;
5. Continually improve the standard of service we provide internally and externally;
6. Achieve continuous and appropriate improvement in all aspects of the company;

Our Quality Management Manual is supported by detailed operational documentation. These relate to codes of practice, technical specifications, work instructions, Key Performance Indicators, and other relevant documentation to form a working set of documents governing the required work practices throughout the Company.

All employees are trained to understand and discharge their individual responsibilities to ensure the effective operation of the Quality Management System.



Award Winning

national
transport awards

LTA LONDON
TRANSPORT
AWARDS



british
parking
awards
2018
WINNER



british
parking
awards
2020
WINNER

Certifications



FS 77166

Accreditations



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE | Platinum
Until 2020



Memberships



Contact

London Head
Office

Unit 2 Holford Yard
London
WC1X 9HD
tel: 0330 1358 950

Old Street Office

29-33 Old Street
London
EC1V 9HL

Brighton Office

38 Foundry Street
Brighton
BN1 4AT
tel: 01273 056 122

Slough Office

Fourth Floor
The Urban Building
3-9 Albert Street
Slough, SL1 2BE
tel: 0330 1358 950

Edinburgh Office

12 Lower Gilmore
Place
Edinburgh, EH3 9NY

Manchester Office

Bartle House
Oxford Court
Manchester, M2 3WQ
tel: 0161 914 9300

info@projectcentre.co.uk • www.projectcentre.co.uk



CPZ Phase 2 Permit Holder Analysis

Client Name: City of Edinburgh Council

Reference: 7510

Date: May 2021

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Project Centre has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions from City of Edinburgh Council. Project Centre shall not be liable for the use of any information contained herein for any purpose other than the sole and specific use for which it was prepared.

Rev	V01		
Reason	First draft		
Prepared by	Gavin Reid		
Date	26/05/21		
Reviewed by	Darren Ryan		
Date	26/05/21		
Authorised by			
Date			

File path:

CONTENTS PAGE

PAGE NO.

1.	INTRODUCTION	2
2.	METHODOLOGY	3
3.	RESULTS	5
3.2	B9	7
3.3	Bonnington	7
3.4	Corstorphine	8
3.5	Easter Road	9
3.6	Murrayfield	9
3.7	Roseburn	10
3.8	Saughtonhall	11
3.9	West Leith	11
3.10	Willowbrae North	11
4.	RECOMMENDATIONS	13
5.	CONCLUSION	16
APPENDIX A		17
QUALITY		18

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 The City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) has commissioned Project Centre (PCL) to undertake analysis on Phase 2 of the Strategic Review of Parking (SRoP) in order to understand the level of vehicle ownership in each of the areas listed in Table 1. Phase 2 of the SRoP proposed the introduction of controlled parking zones, a formalised approach to parking through the use of permit holder parking, shared use bays and pay and display amongst other controls.
- 1.1.2 Based on the level of vehicle ownership data collected for the areas, PCL have identified locations where demand is likely to be high for proposed permit parking and determined the likely uptake in permits.
- 1.1.3 Recommendations have been provided for changes in zone boundaries and/or reallocation of parking bays to accommodate the likely uptake or permits.
- 1.1.4 This report deals only with the anticipated permit holder uptake. It does not include detailed analysis on the level of visitor or commuter parking that will also take place in these areas, which will have an impact upon the availability of space for residents through the reduction in available shared-use space. However, it is considered that this will have minimal impact as it is likely that the highest demand time for share-use spaced will be between 8am-6pm during which time there will also be greater movement of resident's vehicles.
- 1.1.5 As this report deals solely with the availability of permit holder spaces and does not consider visitor or commuter parking, it is not a reflection of the overall parking demand in an area and hence the need to implement controls.

Table 1: List of Phase 2 Areas

Area	
B9	West Leith
Bonnington	Corstorphine
Easter Road	Murrayfield
Roseburn	Saughtonhall
Willowbrae North	

2. METHODOLOGY

- 2.1.1 The vehicle ownership level data for each area within Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking has been collated from the Official Scottish Government Census Data (2011) using postcodes. Postcodes in the census data were cross-referenced with the boundaries for the analysed areas that had been proposed as part of the initial design phase for CEC's SRoP.
- 2.1.2 The census data provided specific postcode data ranging from one to 5 different postcodes per block, which generally equated to groups of no more than 150 residents. In areas where the data covered more than one street an average was used.
- 2.1.3 The information provided by the census data included number of households within the postcode area and the percentage of car/van ownership. The ownership level was split into four categories; no car or van, 1 car or van, 2 car or vans and 3 or more car and vans.
- 2.1.4 In order to account for the increase in vehicle ownership since 2011 when the Census data was last collected, an 10% increase has been applied to replicate the inflation in population and vehicle uptake. The figure of 10% has been established from Department for Transport data on licensed cars at the end of the year by keepership, specifically statistical data set TSGB09 and table VEH0204 which was last updated on 30th April 2020. This data shows there were 2,264 licensed cars at the end of 2011 and 2,525 at the end of 2019.
- 2.1.5 In the existing CPZs, permit uptake is roughly at 60% of households with vehicles. As such this has been used as the basis for the permit uptake in the study areas.
- 2.1.6 The final figure of vehicle ownership had an assumed permit uptake ratio per area applied which varied depending on the predicted resident need for permits. The assumed permit uptake ratio figures vary from 0.5-0.6 and are ranked by area in low, medium and high. Low being 0.5, medium being 0.55 and high being 0.6. These figures are multiplied against the 2019 vehicle ownership figures per post code and from this the permit to design space ratio is calculated. It has been assumed that where there is low access to off street parking, similar to existing CPZ zones, there will be a higher demand for parking so an uptake ratio of 0.6 has been applied. Low uptake ratios of 0.5 are assumed to be areas where there is more access to off-street parking

facilities, either through driveways, garages or under croft parking or the vehicle ownership levels are likely to be lower i.e. Easter Road.

Table 2: Area Specific Permit Uptake Ratios

Area	Uptake ratio
B9	0.55
BONNINGTON	0.6
CORSTORPHINE	0.55
EASTER ROAD	0.6
MURRAYFIELD	0.5
ROSEBURN	0.55
SAUGHTONHALL	0.55
WEST LEITH	0.6
WILLOWBRAE NORTH	0.6

3. RESULTS

- 3.1.1 The results of the level of vehicle ownership analysis and corresponding demand for permit uptake are shown in Table 3. Based on the results of the analysis there are no areas with a demand greater than 1.0. Areas such as Bonnington and Roseburn are the highest in demand at 0.91. The areas should be able to cope with the demand for residents permits.
- 3.1.2 In order to visualise the data the calculated permit uptake ratio has been mapped on to the individual streets in the areas based on the following categories; Green (0-0.74) low demand, Orange (0.75-0.99) medium demand and Red (1+) high demand area.
- 3.1.3 The permits to design space ratio is based on all shared-use spaces being available for use. However, a number of these will be utilised by visitors and commuters. As such the permits to design ratio presented, in practice, will be higher than shown in table 3.

Table 3: Calculated Permit to Design Space Ratio Table

Area	Permit holder Spaces	Shared Use Spaces	No. of Permits Required	Permits to Design Space Ratio
B9	641	381	544	0.53
Bonnington	712	517	1123	0.91
Corstorphine	1033	603	877	0.53
Easter Road	361	353	591	0.89
Murrayfield	160	196	213	0.75
Roseburn	157	205	332	0.91
Saughtonhall	647	377	810	0.79
West Leith	678	328	799	0.79
Willowbrae North	490	144	411	0.72

3.2 B9

3.2.1 Overview

Overall, the B9 area requires a low demand for permits with a permit uptake ratio of 0.53. The area is connected to the Murrayfield area, which has potential to be joined together. The streets within B9 have an even mix of on-street and off-street parking for residents.

3.2.2 High Demand Areas

The high demand areas in B9 fall on the east side. There are a cluster of streets around the same area; Murrayfield Place, Coltbridge Avenue and Upper Coltbridge Terrace. These streets have a permit uptake ratio greater than 1. The streets have pressures on them currently and all have limited off street parking. To cope with the demand in the area residents can park on nearby streets which have lower demand. Streets such as Coltbridge Terrace and Murrayfield Avenue offer more on-street parking within a short walking distance for residents. Another high demand street is Succoth Avenue with an individual uptake ratio of 1.04. This street has homes with off-street parking such as driveways and garages which will reduce on street parking demand.

3.3 Bonnington

3.3.1 Overview

Bonnington Area has one of the highest predicted permit to design ratios at 0.91. It is predicted that overall the Bonnington uptake of permits would be high due to the lack of off street parking in places and high density housing. Bonnington is close to the city centre so will experience high parking demands during peak hours.

3.3.2 High Demand Areas

Tinto Place and Ashleigh Place are highlighted as areas of high demand, due to ongoing and new developments when the survey for this area was carried out the new development was not present. It is expected the new developments will have access to private off-street parking for residents which will reduce the demand on the area. Tinto Place and Ashleigh Place currently have a predicted permit to design ratio of 6.43 and 2.72 respectively. Other areas of high demand include Chancelot Crescent with a ratio of 7.52. These parking pressures can be reduced by neighbouring streets such as Ferry Road which has a permit to design ratio of 0.55. Chancelot Grove also

has a high permit to design ratio at 2.64, this is due to the high-density housing and lack of off-street parking. Similar to Chancelot Crescent, the neighbouring streets can take on some of the parking pressures and reduce the demand in the area.

On the west side of the area Trafalgar Street displays a strain for parking demands with a ratio of 1.75. Pitt street and Trafalgar Lane which run adjacent and parallel to the street have capacity to ease the pressures on the street due to the lack of space for on street parking.

3.4 Corstorphine

3.4.1 Overview

The Corstorphine area has a low predicted permit to design ratio of 0.53. The area is one of the furthest from the city centre compared with the other areas in phase 2. Corstorphine is deemed to have a medium demand for residents purchasing permits.

3.4.2 High Demand Area

Areas of high demand in Corstorphine include The Paddockholm with a predicted permit to design ratio of 1.16. This will be reduced as there is access for residents to park in allocated private parking bays. The area is sheltered away from the main Corstorphine High Street so will not have the same pressures as other streets from commuters. Another area of high demand is Oswald Terrace, a street which is a continuation of Featherhall Road with a permit to design ratio of 1.90. The parking pressures on the street can be reduced by neighbouring streets such as Featherhall Road which has a permit to design ratio of 0.57. This will allow for parking pressures to be spread and reduce strain on individual streets.

Gordon Loan has a high demand for parking with a permit to design ratio of 1.90. The street allows residents to have access to off-street parking such as driveways and garages which will reduce the parking pressures on the street. As well as this, the joining roads of Old Kirk Road and Gordon Road can provide relief of parking pressures as both fall under 0.75 parking permit to design ratio. Like Gordon Road, Templeland Road has high parking demands with a ratio of 1.66. There are private garages situated at the north end of the street which can reduce parking pressures and joining roads such as Templeland Road can reduce the demand for parking on the street.

3.5 Easter Road

3.5.1 Overview

Easter Road has an overall permit uptake ratio of 0.89 which falls in the medium demand bracket. The area was deemed to have a high demand for permits purchased by residents as there is a high concentration of off-street parking within the individual streets.

3.5.2 High Demand Areas

The streets to the North of the area such as St Clair Road and St Clair Avenue have a permit uptake ratio greater than 1.0, calculated to be 1.62 and 1.32 respectively. These streets have limited off-street parking however, St Clair Street has a predicted uptake ratio of 0.20 so has the capacity to cope with the slight over subscription in nearby streets. Another area of high demand is Hawkhill Close, with a ratio of 2.22. Residents here have access to underground private parking which is not taken into consideration from the census data. This will result in far less need for the parking bays than initially thought and in reality, parking pressures on the street will reduce.

There are four streets which fall under the medium demand category; Albion Gardens, Albion Road, Lochend Park and Lochend Butterfly Way. Each street is in close proximity to the football stadium which on match days and weekends will increase the parking pressures in the area. By introducing controlled parking with resident permit bays this will reduce the commuter pressures.

3.6 Murrayfield

3.6.1 Overview

Murrayfield area has an overall predicted uptake ratio of 0.75. The area has access to off street parking such as driveways and garages which can reduce parking pressures on street. The area is in close proximity to the BT Murrayfield stadium which on matchdays can attract a higher need for parking from commuters. By introducing the controlled parking zones around the area will encourage visitors to use alternative methods of travel.

3.6.2 High Demand Areas

The Murrayfield area has a number of streets which have mews parking areas. These streets have been deemed to not have enough space to allocate spaces and residents can park within the area with a relevant resident's permit. Belmont Avenue, Belmont Park, Belmont Park, Belmont Terrace and Belmont View are all mews areas. By introducing mews areas as opposed to limited parking bays, it will allow residents to continue parking the way they are accustomed and reduce any parking pressures from commuters and visitors. These streets have access to off-street parking like driveways and garages which will contribute to reduced demand on the street. Belmont Gardens has on street parking controls and the west side of the street is a mews parking area. The predicted uptake ratio for the street is currently 0.87. Murrayfield Road is another high demand street which has an uptake ratio of 7.33. The proposed parking for the street has limited on street parking. However, the residents have access to off street parking which will reduce the demand for the street.

3.7 Roseburn

3.7.1 Overview

Roseburn area has a predicted permit to design ratio of 0.91. The area comprises of an even split of properties with access to private parking and properties with on street parking.

3.7.2 High Demand Areas

The high demand areas in Roseburn are on the west side, such as, Roseburn Maltings and Russell Gardens. These areas have a permit to design ratio of 2.04 and 2.42 respectively. These ratios can be reduced to below 1.0 as the residents have access to private parking in the area. There are some controlled parking zones within the streets which can cope with the limited overflow from the private parking and accommodate any commuters and visitors. Other areas of high demand are Roseburn Place (1.61) and Roseburn Gardens (1.08), these areas have high density housing resulting in a higher demand for parking than the street can cope. To accommodate this, streets such as Roseburn Crescent and Roseburn Drive will be able to reduce the parking pressures as they have a low predicted permit to design ratio lower than 0.75.

3.8 Saughtonhall

3.8.1 Overview

Saughtonhall has a predicted permit design ratio of 0.79. Although being in the medium demand for parking category, there are large areas within the zone which are mews parking. By taking into consideration these areas and availability of off-street parking there will be less strain on the area for parking.

3.8.2 High Demand Areas

There are high demand areas within the zone, such as Saughtonhall Avenue, with a permit to design ratio of 1.56. This area has a high percentage of off-street parking and neighbouring streets will be able to spread the demand for parking within the area. Another area of high demand is Beechmount Crescent (2.72) however this area has access to private parking and the joining street of Saughton Crescent has the infrastructure to cope with the demand.

3.9 West Leith

3.9.1 Overview

3.9.2 High Demand Areas

West Leith has two large areas of permit parking and mews areas. There is a large mews area in the centre of this location consisting of Oakville Terrace, Elmwood Terrace, Beechwood Terrace, Ashville Terrace and Woodville Terrace. These streets have a high parking demand but by introducing a mews area here it reduces the demand for visitors parking. This, overall, will bring the parking pressures down as it allows residents to park near their homes without concerns around limited parking bays. Cochrane Place, Elm Place, Rosevale Terrace, Fingieze Place, Rosevale Place, Industrial Place, Noble Place, Lindean Place and Summerfield Place consist of narrow streets with no off-street parking with on average one car per household. Similar to the previous area, creating a mews will discourage visitors from parking without a permit and will allow for residents to park near their homes.

3.10 Willowbrae North

3.10.1 Overview

Willowbrae North has a predicted permit to design ratio of 0.72. The area has a high demand for on-street parking as there is limited access to driveways and garages for the residents.

3.10.2 High Demand Areas

Willowbrae has some high demand areas due to the lack of off-street parking as previously mentioned. The highest demand area is Parsons Green Terrace with a ratio of 6.71. This is due to the high-density housing and limited on street parking space. The neighbouring streets such as Meadowbank Crescent and Considine Terrace also have a high demand for parking which could be attributed to the proximity to the main road. There is potential however, for demand to be reduced further south in Willowbrae on streets such as Scone Gardens and Lilyhill Terrace, both falling under 0.75 permit to design ratio.

Glenlee Gardens and Glenlee Avenue both have high parking pressures, with a demand to permit ratio of 1.22 and 1.55 respectively. The neighbouring streets at the west side of Willowbrae North such as Lismore avenue and Willowbrae Avenue can cope with the high demand and alleviate the problem

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1.1 The findings of the results indicate that some areas can be combined to reduce demand within a single area. The recommended changes to the boundaries of the Phase 1 areas have been outlined below.
- 4.1.2 The areas of Roseburn, Saughtonhall and Murrayfield all have a medium demand within the area. On busier than normal days, such as large events in the city, there may be a higher demand within the area as they are close to the city centre. By combining all with B9 it will increase the area for residents to park.

Table 4: Proposed New Zone 1

Zone 1	Permit Holder Spaces	Shared Use Spaces	No. of Permits Required	Permit Ratio
B9	641	381	544	0.53
Murrayfield	160	196	213	0.75
Roseburn	157	203	332	0.91
Saughtonhall	647	377	810	0.79
Area	1605	1157	1899	0.69

Commented [DR1]: This area is very big. I'd suggest making B9 and Murrayfield a zone, merge Roseburn with the adjacent existing CPZ and, make Saughtonhall its own zone. That saves Murrayfield being caught in the middle of any zone

- 4.1.3 The proposed parking zone 1 has a permit to design ratio of 0.69, which falls in the lower demand bracket. This will reduce strain on particular areas within zones and allow for residents to have a larger area to park in. By combining the four areas it reduces the strain on Roseburn which has the highest of the group at 0.91. These areas will also see benefits from the new zone as commuters currently parking within these street to commute into town will no longer be able to do so.

Table 5: Proposed New Zone 2

Zone 2	Permit Holder Spaces	Shared Use Spaces	No. of Permits Required	Permit Ratio
Willowbrae North	490	144	411	0.72

- 4.1.4 Zone 2 consists of Willowbrae North alone, this is due to there currently being no neighbouring controlled parking zone to link the area with. There is potential for this to be combined with the Abbeyhill area which was considered in Phase 1 of the SRoP, should it progress. The two areas are similar in terms of demand for parking and are of similar distance to the city centre. The expected demand for permits within the area will remain below 1.0 as a previous study found the permit to design ratio in Abbeyhill to be 0.88.

Table 6: Proposed New Zone 3

Zone 3	Permit Holder Spaces	Shared Use Spaces	No. of Permits Required	Permit Ratio
Corstorphine	1033	603	877	0.53

- 4.1.5 Corstorphine like Willowbrae North stands alone and has no proposed CPZ areas close by. However, it is sufficiently large enough to be considered as a zone in its own right. Should future areas of consideration, such as Corstorphine South and Corstorphine North be taken forward on the future, the zoning would need to be reconsidered. There is currently a low demand in the Corstorphine area of 0.53 due to access to off street parking.

Table 7: Proposed New Zone 4

Zone 4	Permit Holder Spaces	Shared Use Spaces	No. of Permits Required	Permit Ratio
Easter Road	361	353	591	0.89
West Leith	678	328	799	0.79
Totals	1039	681	1390	0.84

4.1.6 Zone 4 is made up of Easter Road and West Leith. These zones neighbour one and other and both fall within the medium demand for parking permit to design ratio. By combining the two zones maintains a broadly similar overall permit ratio and creates a zone that is in keeping with existing sizes.

Table 8: Proposed New Zone 5

Zone 5	Permit Holder Spaces	Shared Use Spaces	No. of Permits Required	Permit Ratio
Bonnington	712	517	1123	0.91

4.1.7 Bonnington will be a standalone zone in Zone 5. The area does not neighbour any proposed zones within this proposal. Bonnington has a high permit to design ratio and the area will benefit from the controlled parking zones to deal with individual street demands.

5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1.1 Following the analysis of permit holder spaces required for the Controlled Parking Zone area 2, it is clear the distribution of spaces aligns well with the number of predicted permits required by residents based on number of vehicles per household.
- 5.1.2 While some areas are showing a permit uptake ratio close to 1, this is not deemed a reason for particular concern as the analysis undertaken has not measured the availability of private off-street parking. Should further work be undertaken to establish the level of off-street parking available and factor this into the analysis, it is likely that the parking ratios will fall further below 1.
- 5.1.3 For the few areas which have a higher demand the introduction of larger zones by combining nearby areas reduces strain. This works well for Zone 1 as it allows residents of these four areas to park near their properties without the worry of the streets becoming busy with parking pressures.

Commented [DR2]: Possibly review

DRAFT

Appendix A

Quality

It is the policy of Project Centre to supply Services that meet or exceed our clients' expectations of Quality and Service. To this end, the Company's Quality Management System (QMS) has been structured to encompass all aspects of the Company's activities including such areas as Sales, Design and Client Service.

By adopting our QMS on all aspects of the Company, Project Centre aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. Ensure a clear understanding of customer requirements;
1. Ensure projects are completed to programme and within budget;
2. Improve productivity by having consistent procedures;
3. Increase flexibility of staff and systems through the adoption of a common approach to staff appraisal and training;
4. Continually improve the standard of service we provide internally and externally;
5. Achieve continuous and appropriate improvement in all aspects of the company;

Our Quality Management Manual is supported by detailed operational documentation. These relate to codes of practice, technical specifications, work instructions, Key Performance Indicators, and other relevant documentation to form a working set of documents governing the required work practices throughout the Company.

All employees are trained to understand and discharge their individual responsibilities to ensure the effective operation of the Quality Management System.



Award Winning

national
transport awards

LTA LONDON
TRANSPORT
AWARDS

HEALTHY
STREETS
2017

british
parking
awards
2018
WINNER

LONDON
PLANNING
AWARDS
2015/16

CIHT
AWARDS
2015

british
parking
awards
2020
WINNER

Certifications



Accreditations



Memberships



Contact

London Head
Office
Unit 2 Holford Yard
London
WC1X 9HD
tel: 0330 1358 950

Old Street Office
29-33 Old Street
London
EC1V 9HL

Edinburgh Office
12 Lower Gilmore
Place
Edinburgh, EH3 9NY

Brighton Office
38 Foundry Street
Brighton
BN1 4AT
tel: 01273 056 122

Manchester Office
Bartle House
Oxford Court
Manchester, M2 3WQ
tel: 0161 914 9300

Slough Office
Fourth Floor
The Urban Building
3-9 Albert Street
Slough, SL1 2BE
tel: 0330 1358 950

info@projectcentre.co.uk • www.projectcentre.co.uk

Appendix 4 – Setting of Charges

This appendix details the charges that will apply throughout the proposed Controlled parking Zones within Phase 2 of the rollout of the proposals arising from the Strategic Review of Parking.

Details of the proposed charges can be found in the following sections:

1. Resident Permit Prices
2. Pay and display charges
3. Visitor Permit Charges
4. Charges for other permits
5. Refunds and Replacement Permits

The charges detailed reflect the existing situation, as well as the proposed increases to permit charges made through the Parking Action Plan. Details of how those changes affect each charge are detailed in the relevant sections.

1. Resident Permit Prices

- 1.1 Charges for resident's permits operate on a system based on engine size and/or vehicle emissions. With the recommendation being that parking controls within the proposed zones should operate during the same hours of control and on the same days as in the Peripheral and Extended zones of the CPZ, it is therefore proposed that the prices and the pricing structure also take the same form as in those areas.
- 1.2 Current permit charges in the Peripheral and Extended areas are as shown in Table 1, below.

Table 1: Current Resident Permit Charges – Peripheral and Extended Areas

Vehicle Emissions (g/km)		0 to 100 g/km	101 to 120 g/km	121 to 140 g/km	141 to 165 g/km	166 to 185 g/km	186 to 225 g/km	226+ g/km
Permit 1	3-month permit	n/a	£23.50	£33.60	£40.30	£47.00	£60.50	£84.00
	6-month permit	n/a	£42.40	£60.60	£72.70	£84.80	£109.00	£151.50
	12-month permit	£30.30	£70.70	£101.00	£121.20	£141.40	£181.80	£252.50
Permit 2	3-month permit	n/a	£28.20	£42.00	£50.40	£58.80	£78.60	£109.20
	6-month permit	n/a	£50.80	£75.70	£90.90	£106.00	£141.70	£196.90
	12-month permit	£36.30	£84.80	£126.20	£151.50	£176.70	£236.30	£328.20

- 1.3 In addition to the prices shown in Table 1, it is also intended that permit charges in the new zones be subject to the diesel surcharge, as previously approved for use in existing areas of controlled parking in February 2020.
- 1.4 Within the existing zones of the Controlled Parking Zones, the application of the diesel surcharge makes allowances for those residents who currently own a diesel-powered vehicle, allowing such residents until March 2023 before they would be required to pay the surcharge. All new permit applicants will be required to pay the surcharge as soon as it is formally introduced.
- 1.5 For the proposed new zones, it is considered that a similar approach should be taken, in that the surcharge will not be immediately applied, but will come into effect for all permit holders in the new zones after a period of two years has elapsed from the date of coming into effect of the traffic order.
- 1.6 That two-year period will allow for the owners of diesel-powered vehicles to make a conscious choice related to the purchase of their next vehicle, prior to the application of the surcharge.
- 1.7 The charges associated with the Diesel surcharge, and the conditions which will apply, are shown in Table 2, below.

Table 2: Diesel Surcharge applied to all applicable Resident Permit Charges

	Permit Duration	All permit applications (in the two-year period starting on the date of coming into operation of the new Zones)	All permit applications (from a date two years after the date of coming into operation of the new zones)
All Zones and Priority Parking Areas	12 months (annual)	£0	£40.00
	6 months		£24.00
	3 months		£13.20

- 1.8 It should also be noted that, should CPZ be introduced in the Phase 2 area, or any part of it, that any permit charges applied will be subject to annual increases related to RPI. Those increases are to be calculated at the end of each calendar year and applied via Notice procedure, with the revised charges to come into effect at the beginning of April each year.
- 1.9 It is anticipated that the first annual increase using this method of calculation will take place in April 2022. The applicable permit charges within those areas forming part of the Phase 2 proposal will also be subject to that increase. How those increases are calculated and applied will be dependent on the implementation dates for Phase 2, with it being possible that the charges

could initially be introduced at the rates shown in Table 1, above, with revised charges applied via Notice process, or that the increased rates of charge could be applied as soon as the new zones go live on-street.

2. Pay-And-Display Charges

2.1 Table 4 shows the parking charges that will operate within the Zones covered by the Phase 1 Area. It also shows the lengths of stay that apply within each zone.

Zone	Areas Covered	Length of Stay (hours)							
		1	2	4	6	Rate of Charge (Note 1)	9 (All day)	Rate of Charge (Note 2)	Max Charge (Note 3)
N9	B9 / Murrayfield	To be confirmed (Subject to final design review)				£2.40	TBC	£1	£4
N10	Roseburn					£2.40		£1	£4
N11	Saughtonhall					£2.40		£1	£4
N12	Corstorphine					£2.40		£1	£4
S8	Willowbrae North					£2.40		£1	£4
S9	Easter Road					£2.40		£1	£4
S10	West Leith					£2.40		£1	£4
S11	Bonnington					£2.40		£1	£4

Note 1 – Applied on a pro-rata basis in line with existing parking charges within the CPZ. Pro-rata enables shorter lengths of stay based on a proportion of the quoted hourly rate, e.g. 20p would allow 5 minutes of parking.

Note 2 – Rate of charge applies per hour up to that maximum charge (see Note 3). As with other P&D charges, this is applied on a pro-rata basis.

Note 3 – Payment of the maximum charge activates the maximum stay of 9 hours.

3. Visitor Permit Charges

- 3.1 Visitor permit charges are due to change as part of the measures introduced by the Parking Action Plan, with a direct link being made between Pay-and-Display charges and the charges for Visitor Permits. That link will see Visitor Permit charges set at 66% of the lowest standard pay-and-display rate in each zone.
- 3.2 In the proposed new zones, the standard rate of Pay-and-Display charges are £2.40 per hour, which will mean that the charge for a Visitor Permit is to be set at £1.60 per permit. Permits are currently sold in books of ten, making the cost of a book of permits £16.00. Each household will be entitled to purchase a maximum of 150 permits (15 books) each calendar year.
- 3.3 For those residents with blue badges, the allowance is doubled to 300 permits, with charges for Visitor Permits set at half the normal rate (£0.80 per permit, £8.00 per book).
- 3.4 It should also be noted that a separate report on Visitor Permits was considered at Committee on 28th January 2021. That report recommended that an alternative system of Visitor Permits be introduced. In the short term that system would operate in a similar way to the current scratch-card system, albeit using a system of electronic permits. That report further recommended changes to the traffic order that would allow greater flexibility to users. Those changes will also impact on the charges for permits, with those changes potentially being in place prior to the implementation of any new zones.
- 3.5 While this report recommends setting charges in the same way that charges are currently applied, the changes to the Visitor Permit system are expected to result in the rollout of the revised system to the new zones, with permits being made available in Electronic form only.

4. Charges for other Permits

- 4.1 The new Zones will allow the purchase, subject to conditions that currently apply within the extended zones of the CPZ, of:
- Retailers' Permits
 - Business Permits
- 4.2 The new Zones will also see the introduction of Industry Specific Permits designed for use by businesses offering garage services. That permit will be called the Garage Services Permit.
- 4.3 The applicable charges for permits of those types issued within the new zones can be found in tables 5, 6 and 7 below.

Table 5: Charges for Retailers' Permits

		Permit Duration	Charges	
			Diesel Vehicle	All other vehicles
Extended Zones	Permit 1	12 months (Annual)	£390.00	£350.00
	Permit 2		£427.50	£387.50

Table 6: Charges for Business Permits

		Permit Duration	Charges	
			Diesel Vehicle	All other vehicles
Extended Zones	Permit 1	12 months (annual)	£390.00	£350.00
	Permit 2		£427.50	£387.50

Table 7: Charges for Garage Services Permits

	Number of Permits	Permit Duration	Charges
Zones N6 to N8 and S5 to S7	1 to 3	12 months (annual)	£350
	4 to 7		£425
	8 +		£500

5. Refunds and Replacement Permits

- 5.1 Refund and replacement permits are subject to the terms and conditions as set out within the existing traffic order. The rates of refund and the costs associated with providing paper replacements for existing permits are set out in Tables 8, 9 and 10.

Table 8: Refunds for Residents' Permits

Residents' Permits					
	Refunds Payable for:	Rate of Refund per Month			Admin Charge
		12 Month Permit	6 Month Permit	3 Month Permit	
Extended Zones	Any remaining whole months	Equal to 1/12 th of the total cost of the permit	Equal to 1/6 th of the total cost of the permit	Equal to ¼ of the total cost of the permit	£10

Table 9: Refunds for Retailers', Business and garage Services Permits

Retailers' Permit / Business Permit / Garage Services Permit		
	Refunds payable for	Rate of Refund per month
	Any remaining whole months	Equal to 8% (1/12.5) of the total cost of the permit as granted

Table 10: Charges for Replacement Permits

Permit Type	Charges		
	Damaged Permit	Defaced Permit	Lost Permit
Residents' Permit	←	10% of original charge (£10 minimum)	→
Retailers' Permits	←	10% of original charge (£10 minimum)	→
Business Permits	←	10% of original charge (£10 minimum)	→
Garage Services Permit	←	10% of original charge (£10 minimum)	→

- 5.2 The new Zones will allow the purchase, subject to conditions that currently apply within the extended zones of the CPZ, of:

Appendix 5: Update & Revised Timetable

This appendix provides a brief update on each element of the work currently being undertaken within each of the four proposed phases of the Strategic Review.

1. Phase 1 Update

- 1.1 In January 2021 this Committee approved the commencement of the legal process that would introduce Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) in each of the areas covered by Phase 1.
- 1.2 Subsequent to that decision further work took place to:
 - accommodate the approved changes arising generally from the consultation process;
 - add short stay pay-and-display in key shopping areas;
 - review and update locations associated with the Communal Bin Review
 - accommodate all measures agreed through Tram consultations that lie outwith the Limit of Deviation and within the area of the proposed CPZs
 - accommodate previously approved EV charging points within the Phase 1 area
 - consult garage business on their potential uptake of the proposed Garage Services Permit and add specific provision or amend shared-use allocation where required
- 1.3 At the time of writing the final preparations are being made to advertise the draft Order. That advertisement will include the normal legislative steps undertaken when advertising any traffic order, although in line with revised legislative requirements in place by virtue of the Coronavirus (Scotland) Act 2020 no street-bills will be erected on-street. Details will be placed on the Council's website and on Tell Me Scotland, with detailed plans being available to view on our consultant's website.
- 1.4 A leaflet will also be delivered to all properties within the affected area, providing an overview of the proposals and leading interested parties to web resources where the proposals and draft Order can be viewed in full. Details of how to participate in the formal consultation process will be explained in full.
- 1.5 The web information will also provide a dedicated link to details of the Communal Bin Review, showing all bin locations and allowing feedback to be gathered with specific regard to bin locations.

Next Steps:

- 1.6 The responses received from the formal consultation will be analysed and reported to a future meeting of this Committee, when a decision will be sought

in terms of the making of the advertised traffic order and the implementation of the proposed controls.

2. Phase 2 Update

- 2.1 The Phase 2 consultation process took place in early 2021, in line with the proposed consultation approach described in the report to Committee in January 2021.
- 2.2 All drop-in sessions were moved onto an online platform in recognition of the restrictions on gatherings as a result of the ongoing pandemic.
- 2.3 This report provides details of the consultation results.

Next Steps:

- 2.4 The next step for Phase 2 will be to proceed to amend the draft designs to accommodate changes arising from the consultation process and to prepare to advertise the draft Order for any areas where the decision of the Committee is to proceed with the process to introduce parking controls.

3. Phase 3 Update

- 3.1 The initial consultation for Phase 3 took place in April and May of 2021.
- 3.2 The results of that consultation are currently being analysed. Our consultant is preparing the documentation reflecting the consultation results for inclusion in a report to be submitted to a forthcoming meeting of this Committee.

Next Steps:

- 3.3 The results will be reported to Committee towards the end of this year, when a decision will be sought on the future of the proposals in each area covered by Phase 3.

4. Phase 4 Update

- 4.1 The Phase 4 consultation is scheduled to take place during August 2021, and it is anticipated that this process will be underway by the time Committee considers this report.
- 4.2 The areas being consulted upon constitute part of the overall Phase 4, with a number of Phase 4 areas being subject to further monitoring processes prior to a decision being taken in terms of whether they are to move forward or not.
- 4.3 Phase 4 currently consists of a potential CPZ in Portobello, with Priority Parking Areas proposed for Newhaven and Trinity.
- 4.4 The remaining Phase 4 areas (generally covering south Morningside and Stenhouse) are not being consulted upon at this time. The designs for these areas will, effectively, be held until such time as it is determined that it is necessary to implement them. No consultation exercises will be carried out in this area until it is determined by the Council that there is a need to do so.

Next Steps:

- 4.5 Once the consultation exercise has been completed, the results will be analysed and reported to a future meeting of this Committee.

5. Monitoring Update

- 5.1 Monitoring exercises were proposed to be carried out in conjunction with the potential roll-out of new parking controls, with additional exercises to be conducted in the South Morningside area.
- 5.2 With both traffic and parking patterns likely to have been significantly impacted by lockdown, no monitoring has yet taken place. It is expected that the proposed monitoring process will restart in advance of the implementation of the B2 extension, with further work related to Phase 1 scheduled to take place in advance of the introduction of those proposals.
- 5.3 That monitoring is subject to approval to complete the legal process for Phase 1 and that the outcome of that process is the introduction of parking controls in the Phase 1 area. Monitoring work will therefore be commissioned at an appropriate time, such that it takes place in conjunction with approved proposals.

6. Phasing

6.1 The Strategic Review currently consists of four potential phases, each subject to further approval linked to the outcomes of both the informal consultations and to the planned monitoring work.

6.2 The four phases as currently approved are:

Phase	Investigation Area	Areas Included	
	Name		
Phase 1	Leith	Leith Walk	Pilrig
		Abbeyhill	North Leith
		Leith	
	Gorgie/Shandon	Shandon	Gorgie North
		B8	Gorgie
Phase 2	A8 Corridor	Roseburn	Saughtonhall
		Corstorphine	B9
		Murrayfield	
	Leith 2	Willowbrae North	West Leith
		Bonnington	Easter Road
Phase 3	Fettes	B4	B5
		B3	B10
		Fettes	
	Southside	B1	B7
		Prestonfield	
Phase 4	Newhaven/Trinity	Newhaven South	Trinity
	Portobello	Portobello	
Phase 4 (See Note 1)	South Morningside	B2	Cluny
		South Morningside	
	Stenhouse/Saughton	Stenhouse	Saughton
		Broomhouse	

Note 1: Phase 4 is effectively split in two. The second part of Phase 4 will require further monitoring work before any decision is sought to consult upon the possible introduction of controls in these areas. Any decision will only be sought at a time when evidence exists to show that there is a need to do so. That evidence will come from monitoring exercises linked to the B2 expansion and the introduction of Phase 1 controls.

