

# City of Edinburgh Council

10.00am, Thursday 22 September 2022

## Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order – 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 1 Traffic Order to Council for approval to the amendment to the advertised charges.

**Richard Carr**

Interim Executive Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Taylor Ward, Assistant Committee Officer  
Legal and Assurance Division, Corporate Services  
E-mail: [taylor.ward@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:taylor.ward@edinburgh.gov.uk)

# Referral Report

## Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order – referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

### 2. Terms of Referral

---

- 2.1 The report detailed the outcome of the advertisement of the draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which introduced a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in six new areas, and considered the content of the objections made by respondents and made recommendations based on the analysis of those results.
- 2.2 The report also sought the authority to make the advertised TRO, with amendments, and to proceed to implement the introduction of parking controls in the Phase 1 area.
- 2.3 The Transport and Environment Committee agreed:

#### **Motion**

- 1) To note the results of the formal advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking (SROP), the denial of the objections received and the Council's response.
- 2) To approve the setting aside of the remaining objections and approve the making of the advertised Order, with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note that an amendment to the advertised prices for resident, retail, business and trades permits, under statutory notice procedure, was required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, bringing prices in the new zones into line with those that will operate in the extended zones of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) in 2022/23.
- 4) To note that an amendment to the advertised charges for pay-and-display parking, under statutory notice procedure, was required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, that set those prices at the same rates as operate in the extended zones of the CPZ and noted that Visitor Permit prices (which were set as a percentage of pay-and-display would also be amended as a result of the process.

- 5) To note that despite the best efforts of the Council's parking enforcement team, a minority of drivers continue to indulge in anti-social parking and that this has a disproportionate impact on our capital. Therefore Committee was asked that within two cycles a Review of Parking Policy was presented for consideration. The review would draw on best practice and insured parking policy (including enforcement) supported the Council's wider policy agenda where possible.
  - 6) To agree that for enforcement to be effective, penalty charges for parking in breach of any prohibitions needed to be set at an appropriate level, but they had not risen in Scotland since 2001. Therefore, Committee supported the Convener writing to the Scottish Government Minister for Transport to ask that she acted on the 2021 "Penalty Charge Notices for Parking Enforcement Consolation" results and set a higher Penalty Charge Notice or allowed the Council to do so.
  - 7) To refer **to** the amendment to the advertised charges to Council for approval.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

#### **Amendment**

- 1) To note the results on the formal advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking (SROP), the detail of the objections received and the Council's response.
- 2) To approve the setting aside of the remaining objections in the areas of Abbeyhill, Leith Walk and Pilrig, and Shandon; and approved the making of the advertised Order for these areas with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2.
- 3) To agree not to make the advertised Order in the areas of Leith and North Leith, and Gorgie and Gorgie North.
- 4) To agree that the process of monitoring and review within the Abbeyhill colonies as promised on page 65 of the report, should involve public consultation no later than twelve months after the implementation of the new controlled parking restrictions; with a subsequent Committee report on the consultation results and a recommendation on whether to retain this area within N6.
- 5) To note that an amendment to the advertised prices for resident, retail, business and trades permit, under statutory notice procedure, is required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, bringing prices in the new zones into line with those that will operate in the extended zones of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) in 2022/23
- 6) To that an amendment to the advertised charges for pay-and-display parking, under statutory notice procedure, is required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, that will set those prices at the same

rates as operate in the extended zones of the CPZ, and notes that Visitor Permit prices (which are set as a percentage of pay-and-display) will also be amended as a result of this process

7) To refer the amendment to the advertised charges to Council for approval.

- moved by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie seconded by Councillor Lang

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), paragraph 4 of the Amendment was adjusted and accepted as an amendment to the motion

### **Voting**

For the Motion (as adjusted) - 7 votes

For the Amendment - 4 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Cameron, McFarlane, Miller and Work.

For the Amendment: Councillors Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Lang and Munro)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the results of the formal advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking (SROP), the denial of the objections received and the Council's response.
- 2) To approve the setting aside of the remaining objections and approve the making of the advertised Order, with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note that an amendment to the advertised prices for resident, retail, business and trades permits, under statutory notice procedure, was required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, bringing prices in the new zones into line with those that will operate in the extended zones of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) in 2022/23.
- 4) To note that an amendment to the advertised charges for pay-and-display parking, under statutory notice procedure, was required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, that set those prices at the same rates as operate in the extended zones of the CPZ and noted that Visitor Permit prices (which were set as a percentage of pay-and-display would also be amended as a result of the process.
- 5) To note that despite the best efforts of the Council's parking enforcement team, a minority of drivers continue to indulge in anti-social parking and that this has a disproportionate impact on our capital. Therefore Committee was asked that within two cycles a Review of Parking Policy was presented for consideration. The review would draw on best practice and insured parking

policy (including enforcement) supported the Council's wider policy agenda where possible.

- 6) To agree that for enforcement to be effective, penalty charges for parking in breach of any prohibitions needed to be set at an appropriate level, but they had not risen in Scotland since 2001. Therefore, Committee supported the Convener writing to the Scottish Government Minister for Transport to ask that she acted on the 2021 "Penalty Charge Notices for Parking Enforcement Consolation" results and set a higher Penalty Charge Notice or allowed the Council to do so.
- 7) To refer **to** the amendment to the advertised charges to Council for approval.
- 8) To agree that the process of monitoring and review within the Abbeyhill colonies as promised on page 65 of the report, should involve public consultation no later than twelve months after the implementation of the new controlled parking restrictions; with a subsequent Committee report on the consultation results and a recommendation on whether to retain this area within N6.

### **3. Background Reading/ External References**

---

- 3.1 Minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 18 August 2022 (adjourned to 1 September 2022)
- 3.2 [Transport and Environment Committee – 18 August 2022 webcast \(adjourned to 1 September 2022\)](#)

### **4. Appendices**

---

Appendix 1 – report by the Executive Director of Place

# Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday, 18 August 2022

## Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| Executive/routine<br>Wards<br>Council Commitments | Executive<br>7, 9, 12, 13 |
|---|---------------------------|

### 1. Recommendations

---

- 1.1 It is recommended that the Transport and Environment Committee:
  - 1.1.1 Notes the results of the formal advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking (SROP), the detail of the objections received, and the Council's response;
  - 1.1.2 Approves the setting aside of the remaining objections and approves the making of the advertised Order, with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2;
  - 1.1.3 Notes that an amendment to the advertised prices for resident, retail, business and trades permits, under statutory notice procedure, is required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, bringing prices in the new zones into line with those that will operate in the extended zones of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) in 2022/23;
  - 1.1.4 Notes that an amendment to the advertised charges for pay-and-display parking, under statutory notice procedure, is required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, that will set those prices at the same rates as operate in the extended zones of the CPZ, and notes that Visitor Permit prices (which are set as a percentage of pay-and-display) will also be amended as a result of this process;
  - 1.1.5 Refers the amendment to the advertised charges to Council for approval.

**Paul Lawrence**

Executive Director of Place

Contact: Gavin Brown, Head of Network Management and Enforcement

# Report

## Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order

### 2. Executive Summary

---

- 2.1 This report details the outcome of the advertisement of the draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in six new areas, considers the content of the objections made by respondents and makes recommendations based on the analysis of these results.
- 2.2 The report seeks the authority to make the advertised TRO, with amendments, and to proceed to implement the introduction of parking controls in the Phase 1 area.

### 3. Background

---

- 3.1 In [August 2018](#), the Transport and Environment Committee approved the commencement of a Strategic Review of Parking (SROP) that would look at parking pressures across the entire Edinburgh area.
- 3.2 The full results of the review process were considered in [September 2019](#), with [approval](#) being given for four phases of implementation of new parking controls.
- 3.3 In [January 2021](#), the Transport and Environment Committee considered the results of an initial consultation in the Phase 1 area. Based on the results of that informal consultation and having considered the policy linkages behind the proposed parking controls, the Committee [approved](#) the commencement of the legal process to introduce six new CPZs in the nine Review areas covered by Phase 1.
- 3.4 The six areas which formed the advertised TRO were:
  - Abbeyhill;
  - Leith Walk and Pilrig;
  - Leith and North Leith;
  - Shandon;
  - Gorgie and Gorgie North; and

- The existing parking area in Lockharton (B8).

## 4. Main report

---

- 4.1 This report considers the objections received in accordance with legislative requirements and determines the next steps for the advertised TRO. This fulfils the Council's legal obligations in terms of considering the objections received during the formal legal process and determines the next steps for the advertised TRO.

### **Advertising Process and Consultation**

- 4.2 In accordance with legislative requirements, the draft TRO for Phase 1 was advertised on 22 October 2021, for the required 21-day period (scheduled to end on 12 November 2021). In response to concerns that the initial leaflet delivery had not been as effective as intended, the advertisement was extended to the 5 December 2021, with a further leaflet delivery being undertaken to ensure that residents and businesses were informed of the proposals.
- 4.3 Details of the arrangements for advertising the traffic order are detailed in section 7 of this report.

### **Responses Received**

- 4.4 In total, just under 32,000 addresses were included in the leaflet distribution. From the different channels employed to encourage responses to the consultation, a total of 1,003 objections were received.
- 4.5 The objections received, when expressed against the number of leaflets distributed, constitute a little over 3% of those properties consulted. In total, postcode data was provided for 648 responses, of which 59 (9%) showed that the respondent was located in an area not included in the current proposals.

### **Analysis of the responses**

- 4.6 Details of objections received and the Council's considered response to those objections can further be found in Appendix 1.

### **Consideration of the Objections**

- 4.7 Appendix 1 sets out the themes identified by proposal area and shows the number of instances that each theme was raised (i.e. the number of responses that contained that wording or wording to that effect). In many cases, the wording shown will exactly reflect what objectors have said.
- 4.8 Further details of objections are also included in Appendix 1, alongside the Council's response to specific issues that were raised during the consultation. The major themes of those specific issues are:
- Public/private issues;
  - Concerns relating to the proposed Garage Services Permit;
  - Concerns expressed in terms of the proposals for Abbeyhill Colonies; and



- Specific issues relating to the proposals in Portland Street.

4.9 Any changes that are proposed as a result of the consideration of the objections are set out in Appendix 2.

### **Integration with other Projects**

- 4.10 As has previously been reported to Transport and Environment Committee, the proposals for parking controls have been developed in conjunction with other projects and have been developed to incorporate other Council initiatives, such as:
- The rollout of bin hubs as part of the Communal Bin Review; and
  - Commitments made for parking provision linked to Tram to Newhaven.
- 4.11 The written elements of the draft Traffic Order also make changes to a parent Order that governs parking restrictions across the city. The significant majority of these changes relate to the potential introduction of new restrictions, new permits and new Zones, however changes have been incorporated to support, for example, Electric Vehicle (EV) charging parking places.
- 4.12 As none of the objections received related to the TRO articles which affect EV parking places, these changes have been approved separately in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation. This is to ensure that enforcement can take place at existing EV parking places now that tariffs are in place for those using the charging infrastructure.

### **Tram**

- 4.13 The elements of the proposals that make up the proposed northern expansion of the CPZ include some of the areas of the city with the highest levels of parking demand (each of the five review areas included in this part of the TRO sit near to the top of the results which were reported in September 2019, with the lowest ranked area at number 16, while Leith Walk area was recorded as having the highest parking demand of any area within Edinburgh).
- 4.14 The completion of the Trams to Newhaven project has the potential to add further parking demand to these already busy areas, placing increased pressure on the existing kerbside space.
- 4.15 Concern in terms of the potential impact parking, particularly in Leith Walk and Pilrig, was one of the issues that led to an initial approach from residents in these areas asking the Council to consider parking controls as a deterrent to increased parking demand.
- 4.16 The introduction of parking controls in the areas covered by the northern elements of Phase 1 would mitigate against the potential for areas close to the extended Tram line to be used as urban park and rides.
- 4.17 Tram is expected to begin running to Newhaven in Spring 2023. As such, it would be desirable to ensure that the introduction of controls could take place in advance of this to pre-empt any issues arising from increased parking demand.

## **Amendments to the advertised Order**

- 4.18 It is only legally possible to amend an advertised Order if the amendment being made results in the revised restriction being less onerous than the one that was advertised. For example, a yellow line (restrictive) can become a parking place (permissive) without the further need to advertise that change. Similarly, a permit parking place can become a shared use parking place, as shared-use parking allows a wider range of users the ability to park.
- 4.19 While this report is primarily concerned with considering the feedback received from the consultation process, the process of considering and introducing new parking controls involves ongoing reviews. In the course of those reviews, there have been a number of changes identified as now being required.
- 4.20 The changes identified primarily relate to modifications to communal bin locations, but also in the case of changing circumstances. While this report does not detail all these changes, they are outlined and referred to in Appendix 2 as “Consequential Changes”.
- 4.21 Amendments that have been initiated as a result of objections received are also detailed in Appendix 2, where there is an explanation of the means of resolving the proposed change, either as an amendment to the advertised Order, or via separate legal process.
- 4.22 A number of other required amendments have also been identified which have the effect of making the restrictions more onerous. These therefore cannot be accommodated within the current legal process. These will be taken forward under separate legal process, in accordance with the Council’s Scheme of Delegation, with the intention that this process will be completed, if possible, prior to the completion of implementation of the wider measures set out in this report. These changes will be subject to the same legal process as all other Orders, including advertisement and the right to object.

## **Implementation**

- 4.23 Subject to the approval of Transport and Environment Committee to set aside the objections outlined in this report, implementation of the measures contained in the advertised, and amended, traffic order is anticipated to commence towards the end of 2022, and to continue into 2023.
- 4.24 Arrangements will be made to appoint a suitable contractor to undertake the required work.
- 4.25 The need for poles for associated signage will be minimised, utilising existing street furniture where possible and seeking permission to use other means of locating signs that does not require new street furniture. In addition to streetscape benefits, this approach will also ensure that implementation costs are, wherever possible, kept to a minimum.
- 4.26 The numbers of ticket issuing machines is also to be minimised, restricting their use to locations expected to be in higher demand from shoppers and visitors.

- 4.27 As part of the preparatory work leading to implementation, further contact will be made with residents and businesses within the affected areas, advising them of the anticipated implementation schedule and providing further details on permit eligibility and means of application.

### **Amending Fees and Charges**

- 4.28 The Council set its annual fees and charges for resident, retail, business and trades permits, pay-and-display parking and Visitor Permits in February 2022.
- 4.29 The existing fees and charges schedule lists the prices by area.
- 4.30 If the recommendations on Phase 1 of the SROP are approved, an amendment to the advertised prices will be required in order to bring the new zones into line with those that currently operate in the CPZ.

## **5. Next Steps**

---

- 5.1 If the report recommendations are approved, the legal process to introduce parking controls into the area covered by Phase 1 of the SROP will be finalised, with the Order formally being “Made”. This will include the amendments outlined in this report.
- 5.2 Further legal processes will be commenced, as required, to make any amendments that have been identified as part of this process but which cannot be progressed as part of the new Order.
- 5.3 A full implementation plan will be developed for the required tasks, such as the extensive lining and signing works, and an appropriate funding mechanism will also be identified.
- 5.4 A communications plan will be developed in order to ensure that those affected by the implementation works are notified in advance and updated as the project moves forward.

## **6. Financial impact**

---

- 6.1 It is anticipated that the work required to implement Phase 1 of the SROP, including all signs and markings work and the provision of any required ticket issuing machines will incur costs of approximately £2.5m. This is based on a detailed assessment of the road marking, signing and ticket machine costs associated with the current design of the proposed measures.
- 6.2 These costs will be split over two financial years (2022/23 and 2023/24) with the areas covered by the northern elements of Phase 1 expected to be completed within the 2022/23 financial year, in advance of the commencement of Trams running to Newhaven.
- 6.3 Phase 1 of the scheme is expected to generate significant revenue for the Council, through elements such as permits and pay and display parking, however this will be

slightly offset by an increase in the operational costs associated with the enforcement contract.

- 6.4 Taking both the additional revenue and operational costs into account, it is anticipated that Phase 1 of the scheme will deliver an annual surplus of at least £2m per annum. Any additional income, after all costs are accounted for, would be used to fund transport improvements across Edinburgh, in line with legislative requirements
- 6.5 The funding mechanism for Phase 1 implementation costs is currently being finalised. However, it is expected that these costs will be met through a re-profiling of the Capital budget programme from within the Place Directorate.

## **7. Stakeholder/Community Impact**

---

- 7.1 An informal consultation exercise on the possible introduction of parking controls in the Phase 1 area was conducted in late 2019. 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 drop-in sessions attended by Project staff, where plans could be viewed, and questions answered by staff in attendance.
- 7.2 The results of that consultation were reported to Transport and Environment Committee in January 2021.
- 7.3 When the Order was advertised in October 2021, notifications were sent out by email and by letter to statutory consultees and to those on the Council's database of parties wishing to be consulted on traffic orders. Details of the consultation were also posted on the Council's website, on the [Tellmesotland](#) website and on a bespoke website prepared for this consultation.
- 7.4 The advertising of the draft traffic order saw further leafletting of addresses within the Phase 1 area (in total, around 31,500 addresses were included in the leaflet distribution), with a targeted direct mailing by Royal Mail to all addresses. The leaflet outlined the proposals and led interested parties to the Council website and that of our consultant, where they could find:
  - 7.4.1 Detailed plans of the proposals; and
  - 7.4.2 Details of how to engage in the consultation process.
- 7.5 The results of the consultation linked to the advertising of the draft Order are contained within this report.

- 7.6 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.
- 7.7 The potential adverse impact of the proposals could be that migration of parking pressures moves to neighbouring areas. Monitoring processes are already in place to ensure that, should any such migration occur, then further action can be taken to address parking pressures that arise in those areas.

## **8. Background reading/external references**

---

- 8.1 None.

## **9. Appendices**

---

- 9.1 Appendix 1 - The Council's response to Objections.
- 9.2 Appendix 2 - Proposed Amendments to the advertised Order.

## **Appendix 1 – The Council’s Response to Objections**

This appendix summarises the objections received during the six-week period during which the proposals were advertised for public comment.

This Appendix further provides a response to the points raised by objectors and, where appropriate or required, indicates what changes are proposed to the advertised proposals. Details of how those changes are to be accommodated can be found in Appendix 2.

The objections have been split into distinct areas, based on the different areas originally identified in the Review, as well as reflecting the proposed new Zones that those areas would constitute should the proposals proceed to implementation.

Further objections have been grouped by type, reflecting significant issues that warranted detailed consideration or responses.

The sections of this Appendix that cover area-based objection themes and comments, which are further broken down into sub-themes, are as follows:

- 1) Leith and North Leith (Zone N8);
- 2) Pilrig and Leith Walk (Zone N7);
- 3) Gorgie and Gorgie North (S6);
- 4) Abbeyhill (N6);
- 5) Shandon (S5) and B8 (S7).

The sections of this Appendix that deal with specific issues or themes are:

- 6) Garage Service Permits
- 7) Public/Private Issues
- 8) Abbeyhill Colonies
- 9) Portland Street

## Section 1

### Leith and North Leith (Zone N8):

| Theme   | No parking issues/worsens situation   |                |   |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme   | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
| No parking issues: existing parking is sufficient/ controls are not required                      | " If the proposal goes ahead, more people who work but do not live here will park in our car park to avoid paying for parking, creating more problems for the residents."                                       | 28             | Private, off-road car parks are outside of the council's authority to manage or control and any issues of unwanted parking would need to be taken up with the car park owner directly.  |
|   | " So not only are we going to have to start paying a lot of money, but we are also likely to have to drive around finding a parking space, which isn't very efficient, convenient or environmentally friendly." |                | The proposal has been designed to offer as much parking availability as is safely possible. Whilst there can never be a guarantee of parking immediately outside homes, the aim of this proposal has been to provide enough parking for all potential permit holders. Where there are shared use bays, those who do not hold or do not wish to purchase a permit, will have the option to use these bays.   |
| No parking issues: current time/weekday proposals won't address problem / problems are in evening | "I can guarantee if I bought a permit I would not be able to park despite this."<br><br>"This makes the proposed residents parking allocation even more inadequate."  | 86             |   |
| No parking issues: from commuters/visitors parking issues   | "I live here and have no problem finding a parking place either during the day or late in the evening."   | 100            | While there may not currently be parking problems in every street, areawide surveys indicated that parking pressures currently exist in the majority of the areas within Phase 1, with this proposal covering 5 of the ten areas where parking pressures were greatest. Leith was ranked 8 <sup>th</sup> and North Leith 18 <sup>th</sup> . Rather than address concerns individually and implement piecemeal restrictions, these proposals are partially to address existing issues and partially to mitigate against displacement from other areas. |
|   | "Currently I, and everyone in my stairwell has absolutely no issues availing of parking in and around our residences."  |                |   |
| Worsen situation: safety/ traffic/ speed  | "There is no commuter parking pressure in our area to be addressed."  | 16             |   |
|   | "there have NEVER been any issues with residents and visitors parking I.e. there is enough room for everyone, never a problem getting a parking space."   |                |   |

| Sub-theme   | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Worsen situation: reduce spaces / no guarantee of a space   | "Implementing CPZ between the hours of 8.30 - 5.30 will make no difference to the problems we face. In fact, it will make life harder for residents who would now also have to pay."                      | 10             | The initial engagement asked respondents to indicate their preferred period of control, with 47% of the responses in support of the 8:30am-5:30pm option. Considering that these are the times when commuter parking, and parking for local shops and businesses is at levels of peak demand, this option was deemed the most appropriate for the area. |
|   | "The only time it may prove slightly difficult is late at night when everyone is home. However, this is solved by simply driving round the block until a space is found & walking back round the corner." |                |   |
| Worsen situation: Puts parking pressure on surrounding streets/ car parks/ colonies with differing restrictions | "The street will become a narrow 2-way street with traffic too close to the curb. Much less safe for pedestrians who could step off the curb into traffic. "  | 17             | The designs are aimed to create 'chicanes' in certain roads where speeds are often higher. Monitoring of these issues will occur.   |
|   | " It will also have the disbenefit of increasing speeds on Portland St. At the moment, drivers have to drive slowly and negotiate their progress with drivers coming the opposite direction."             |                | <b>See specific section on Portland Street</b>  |



| Theme                                    | Visitor parking concern (permit)   |                |   |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                                | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
| Cost of permit will discourage visitors  | "This will cause inconvenience for visitors, tradespeople, and the youth centre, and also additional costs for permits."   | 12             | The visitor permit system is currently under review with the view to offer my flexibility with times and accessibility to obtain, such as apps like Ringo.  |
|  | "it seems like that measures would only serve to increase costs to residents, introduce complexity for visitors (I'd love to know where you are thinking of locating a pay and display option) and present an enforcement issue."  |                | Visitor Permit prices are, however, set at a level lower than pay-and-display, with current Visitor Permits available at a rate of 2/3 of pay-and-display, but offering 50% more time.<br><br>Pay-and-display options will be available throughout the zones, in the form of shared-use parking.  |
| Elderly/disabled people rely on visitors | "My husband and I are disabled and rely on our children to care for us and they visit regularly. I do not want to have to pay to see my children nor do I want them to be timed by their visits."  | 7              | One of the main aims of parking controls is to improve accessibility. One of the ways that we do that is to offer an increased (double) number of visitor permits to those who have disabled badge. Those permits are also available at half the normal price.  |
|  | "This cul de sac has a lot of older residents who rely on visitors and don't necessarily have the funds to buy permits/visitor permits."   |                | The price for visitor permits is also set at a much-reduced rate when compared to other forms of pay-and-display parking.<br><br>The visitor permit system is currently under review with the view to offer my flexibility with times and accessibility to obtain, such as apps like Ringo  |
| Access for tradespeople/services         | "Introducing permit parking will disrupt this, not least because it will make it more difficult for residents to have visitors, receive deliveries or home-based services."<br><br>"There are several hundred apartments etc in the area, there are always people who rent, continually moving, trying to get removal vehicles parked somewhere and there are always tradesmen from fixing domestic appliances to painters etc." | 13             | The Council currently operates a range of permits and offers a range of allowances to accommodate situations like this, recognising that parking controls need to support the servicing requirements of residents and businesses.<br><br>The Trades Permit offers tradespeople monthly or annual permits that enable them to park without further charge and without limit within any part of the CPZ.<br><br>There are specific allowances within the traffic order to enable loading and unloading, as well as more significant situations like house removals. |

| Theme                      | Permit costs concern  |                |  |
|----------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                  | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
| Cost is unaffordable       | <p>"You are targeting an area of multiple deprivation by expecting people to pay to park."</p> <p>"As 2 essential car users in the household for work purposes, we would struggle like many many others in the local area to budget for extra cost of parking permits or meter paying."</p>                   | 44             | Controlled parking brings a range of benefits in terms of parking availability and accessibility. It has long been recognised that those who benefit from parking controls should contribute towards its cost. For that reason, permit charges currently cover approximately 50% of the total cost of operating, enforcing and maintaining the Councils controlled parking scheme.   |
| Permit should be cost-free | <p>"Surely if they are for the benefit of the local community then a permit should be issued free of charge for anyone living within these zones."</p> <p>"Do not charge for permits where parking has always been free!"</p>   | 4              | The operation, enforcement and maintenance of the current permit scheme has significant costs associated with it. As per the answer above, those who benefit from parking controls are asked, via permit prices, to contribute towards running costs, with the remainder being met from other sources of parking income.   |
| Money making scheme        | <p>"This decision is morally wrong and is purely designed to generate more income for the city."</p> <p>" I do not believe this is the favourable opinion of the residents of Edinburgh but rather a decision taken by the council to extract more money from residents to fund their failing campaigns."</p> | 17             | <p>The Strategic Review of Parking was initiated by residents of a number of areas of the city, who asked the Council to consider parking controls. The results of surveys confirmed the need to manage parking in several areas.</p> <p>While parking may generate some income for the Council, that income is not guaranteed. There are significant costs associated with operating parking controls, which the Council asks permit holders to contribute towards. There are traffic management, health and environmental considerations that the Council has detailed in reports leading to the advertisement of this Order. Rather than being a financially driven scheme, these measures will assist the Council in meeting climate change goals, whilst improving conditions for residents and businesses.</p> |

| Theme                                    | Private land/road query   |                |   |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                                | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
| Misuse of private car park               | <p>"We have a small car park which is often misused by other residents."</p> <p>" I expect that the new restrictions would simply encourage misuse of private car parks and other free parking areas at the supermarkets and Ocean Terminal,"</p>                     | 3              | Private, off-road car parks are outside of the council's authority to manage or control and any issues of unwanted parking would need to be taken up with the car park owner directly.  |
| Already private parking (CPZ not needed) | <p>" Look at the extensive private developments in Leith which utilise large areas of land for private permit parking."</p> <p>" The majority of residential properties in the immediate area are post-2000 modern developments with designated private parking."</p> | 3              | Car parks that were constructed as roads would only be controllable by the Council, in its role as roads authority. Any resident concerned about parking on any private road should contact the Council for confirmation of status. Consideration could be given to extending parking controls onto private roads, provided that legislative requirements were met. |

| Theme  | Congestion  |                |   |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme  | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
| Street used as rat run                               | "Portland Street is already used as a cut-through to avoid the traffic lights. By removing parking / introducing double yellow lines, you are increasing the useable road width making it easier for cars to use it as a 2-way street and cut-through."   | 2              | <b>See specific section on Portland Street</b>  |
|  | "By closing The Shore in one direction, the council has already created a 'rat run' down Seaport Street that means instead of just having idling traffic on one side of our home, we now have it on both."  |                | Unfortunately, consideration of such measures, or their impact, is outwith the scope of this Order, or this legal process.  |
| Traffic calming required                             | "Perhaps a one-way system, Portland St / North Fort St, would be better, to reduce the through traffic."<br><br>"Add speed bumps to stop cars travelling at speed."   | 2              |   |
| Effect of roadworks                                  | "the works at the west end of Pilrig St and the contra flow section outside McDonald Rd fire station make that route extremely time consuming, while the snarl ups that permanently beset Great Junction Street means that the alternative route down Bonnington road makes travelling to Seafield by car so gruelling that it is genuinely quicker to walk."<br><br>"Between the never-ending road works, tram works and the state of local roads, Leith traffic has become one of the worst in town and despite the suggestion that the plans will address this, it is apparent that they will only make the situation worse and create even more congestion around the affected area." | 2              | Noted for better inter-departmental comms.<br><br>The introduction of parking controls would, however, be expected to have a beneficial impact on congestion, with fewer commuter vehicles travelling into these areas. |
| Traffic unable to park forced onto surrounding roads | "By reducing the overall parking in this area for residents cars, more will be forced out onto Ferry Road outwith the restricted times causing congestion on a main road."<br><br>" It will simply create congestion on the surrounding side streets where there is unrestricted parking."  | 5              | Rather than address concerns individually and implement piecemeal restrictions, these proposals are to mitigate displacement from other areas.  |
| Widening road will increase traffic                  | "What is the basis behind taking measures to widen Portland Street increasing the traffic flow and pollution on a residential street."  | 1              | <b>See specific section on Portland Street</b>  |

| Theme                            | Commuter parking issues  |                |  |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                        | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| Car required for commute         | <p>"Many of us rely on our vehicles to be able to get to work, take children to school, see family and make a living and these new proposals simply make having a car almost impossible. "</p> <p>" those with often require access to a vehicle due to employment out of town and for myself working in anti social hours."</p> | 2              | <p>Parking controls accept that there are those who require a vehicle and provide opportunities for residents and businesses to have access to space in which to park, primarily by removing or managing non-residential parking.</p> <p>Not anti-car, future-proofing. Rather than address concerns individually and implement piecemeal restrictions, these proposals are to mitigate displacement from other areas.</p> |
| Cars not used for commuting      | "We do not have a problem with commuter parking being such a small street and every resident has their own space in their driveway or if they own a second car this can be parked outside their driveway with no bother to anyone."  | 1              | Rather than address concerns individually and implement piecemeal restrictions, these proposals are to mitigate displacement from other areas.   |
| Charge commuters not residents   | "I understand the need to prevent commuter parking in my area, so make the permits free for residents where it has always been free!"  | 1              | <p>Money gained from permits will go back into enforcement/upkeep of restrictions.</p> <p>Charging commuters to park isn't a sustainable option. CPZ is a means of persuading commuters onto more sustainable forms of transport.</p>  |
| Commuters using resident parking | Commuter parking is a two way problem. Motorists who live on my street also commute out of the area and it's at night when they return where the problem lies  | 1              | Parking controls are designed to address parking issues attributable to incoming commuters. Initial data gathering did not suggest that there was support for evening parking. This reflects other work carried out in other locations, where evening and overnight controls were not supported.   |

| Theme                                | Inconsiderate parking   |                |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                            | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
| Abandoned vehicles                   | <p>"Incidentally, we have a couple of cars, a van and a taxi abandoned in our parking bays and the response from the council is that the parking bays are private and not up to them to do anything about it."</p> <p>"Many of my neighbours have gone to the Council to ask if there could be something done about the high amount of permanently parked and never used taxis, because it was creating so many difficulties for the rest of the neighbours to park, and the Council said that no, as things were, they could not do anything."</p> | 2              | <p>Parking controls will address many parking issues, but only those where the controls are directly applied. Parking in private areas is not covered by these proposals.</p> <p>Under these proposals, any vehicle parked during the hours of control will need to show evidence of having a permit, or having paid to park, or belong to a class of vehicle (or be carrying out an activity) permitted by the Order. Otherwise, any vehicles would be liable to enforcement action.</p> |
| Business parking in residential area | <p>"I have made parking difficult for the rest of us because they like to have up to 12 taxis parked around the area."</p> <p>"What does pose a problem at times is the use of on-street parking by local businesses for their vehicle fleets."</p>   | 2              |   |

| Theme                         | Safety concern  |                |  |
|-------------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                     | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
| Longer walk to property       | "This means a longer walk to my building, which I don't mind during the day. But what about the evenings, especially during winter months when it's dark so early?"   | 8              | Parking Controls should have the effect of improving accessibility and availability of parking. While we cannot guarantee a space near to your home, parking controls will reduce the demand for space by non-residents, creating opportunities that do not currently exist. |
| Danger from increased traffic | "It is only a matter of time before someone is injured and this increased traffic will exacerbate that."  | 8              | Parking controls are likely to have the opposite effect, reducing the number of vehicles travelling into these areas.  |
| Impact on sightlines          | "Vehicles parking or exiting from these bays will be forced to stop traffic in both directions due to the narrow street, sometimes this will be done unsighted due to larger vehicles obscuring views. This will be extremely dangerous with 2 way traffic travelling at increased speeds." | 2              | Parking places have only been provided where it is considered that it is safe to park. Consideration has been given to access and egress requirements. Parking layout could be reviewed if issues are identified.  |

## Section 2

### Pilrig and Leith Walk (N7);

| Theme  | No parking issues/worsens situation  |                |  |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme  | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| No parking issues: existing parking is sufficient/ controls are not required                           | "Residents parking here is not overwhelmed or a problem and this plan would be of no benefit to the local residents other than adding additional living costs which are already being stretched at this time."   | 31             | While there may not currently be parking problems in every street, areawide surveys indicated that parking pressures currently exist in the majority of the areas within Phase 1, with this proposal covering 5 of the ten areas where parking pressures were greatest. Of 124 areas surveyed, Leith Walk was ranked 1 <sup>st</sup> and Pilrig 13 <sup>th</sup> . Leith Walk in particular showed an average parking occupancy of 92%, with 91% of all streets subject to High parking pressure. While Pilrig was, on average, less heavily parked, many of the streets closest to Leith Walk were also subject to High parking pressure. |
| No parking issues: current time/weekday proposals won't address problem / problems are in evening      | "As such I can tell you that the only times when parking is difficult is at night and when there is a Hibs game (which is generally on Saturdays and evenings) these are times that permit holders don't apply." | 3              |  |
| No parking issues: from commuters/visitors parking issues  | " There is no issue with other people coming to park on my street who do not live there."  | 11             |  |
| Worsen situation: reduce spaces / no guarantee of a space  | "Unless it can be shown that car ownership is going to be reduced in some way then the council should be working to provide more. not less parking."   | 19             | Leith Walk (including Pilrig) was one of three areas where petitions were submitted to the Council asking for action to be taken to address parking pressures and deal with commuter parking. As stated above, these issues may not be evident in every street, but in looking at solutions like parking controls, the Council recognises the potential for migration, which is the reason why controls are being proposed on an area basis, rather than street-by-street.   |
| Worsen situation: Puts pressure on surrounding streets/ car parks/colonies with differing restrictions | " removing much of the on street parking would only push the issue onto Newhaven Road and Bonnington Road."  | 15             | In terms of operating times, early engagement shows 47% of the responses for the preferred timeframes, were in support of the 8:30am-5:30pm option. This option was deemed the most appropriate for the area.  |
| Worsen situation: safety/ traffic/ speed   | " If this is a daily occurrence you are risking the health and safety of the people that live in the area as there is only one road in and out."   | 4              | Monitoring is planned so that any migration, as well as inconsiderate or unsafe parking can be directly addressed.   |

| Theme                                     | Visitor parking concern (permit)   |                |   |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                                 | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
| Cost of permit will discourage visitors   | "The proposed changes are unmanageable and obstructive to visitors. Why should we have to pay for visitors to attend our private residence?"                                   | 5              | <p>The visitor permit system is currently under review with the view to offer my flexibility with times and accessibility to obtain, such as apps like Ringo.</p> <p>Visitor Permit prices are, however, set at a level lower than pay-and-display, with current Visitor Permits available at a rate of 2/3 of pay-and-display, but offering 50% more time.</p> <p>Pay-and-display options will be available throughout the zones, in the form of shared-use parking.</p>   |
| Visitors at weekend when CPZ in operation | "I would object to any parking charges on the weekend when people may have visitors."  | 1              | The proposals would not operate at the weekend, nor would any charges apply outside of the proposed Monday to Friday 8:30 to 5:30 time period.  |
| Access for tradespeople/services          | "will the bin lorries be able to get round the West end turn of Cambridge Gardens into Cambridge Avenue if the cars are parked on the SW kerb rather than the NW kerb as now?" | 3              | <p>The Council currently operates a range of permits and offers a range of allowances to accommodate situations like this, recognising that parking controls need to support the servicing requirements of residents and businesses.</p> <p>The Trades Permit offers tradespeople monthly or annual permits that enable them to park without further charge and without limit within any part of the CPZ.</p> <p>The design of the scheme has been undertaken in conjunction with colleagues from Waste. Consideration has also been given to access requirements in order to maintain servicing requirements. Double yellow lines will protect junctions for this purpose.</p> |



| Theme                |  | Permit costs concern |  |
|----------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| Sub-theme            | Example Responses  | no. objections       | Response   |
| Cost is unaffordable | "Having to pay for a permit to park in front of my home is ridiculously unfair and would create an unnecessary additional financial burden."                               | 18                   | Controlled parking brings a range of benefits in terms of parking availability and accessibility. It has long been recognised that those who benefit from parking controls should contribute towards its cost. For that reason, permit charges currently cover approximately 50% of the total cost of operating, enforcing and maintaining the Councils controlled parking scheme.<br><br>With the cost of permits being linked to either vehicle size or emissions, there are options available in terms of permit costs. |
| Money making scheme  | "Please recognise there is no reasonable requirement for parking permits on this street and the only reason I forsee is Edinburgh City Council trying to make more money." | 5                    |  |

| Theme  | Consultation materials + queries  |                |   |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                                    | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
| Short notice to respond                      | "The consultation has been made on short notice, during a period of extraordinary upheaval in the neighbourhood whilst tram works are underway on Leith Walk, and with every-shifting COVID restrictions" | 1              | In terms of the legislative requirements, formal/statutory consultation requires a minimum of 21 days. All traffic orders advertised in Edinburgh adhere to that requirement. In this case, the period allowed was 42 days. Additional time was allowed at the end of the consultation for late submissions.  |
| Did not receive cons. materials              | "I would also like to point out it was very hard to find out about this place to introduce paid parking permits, I only heard through word of mouth."   | 1              | Lessons learned with distribution companies. The Council typically uses trusted distribution companies for projects like this.  |
| Issues with website/format                   | "As if this were not enough, the information available through the website is impenetrable, where it is even available."  | 1              | Consultations under Covid have been a learning experience that will ultimately help us to provide detailed information in formats that are easily accessible to all. We developed websites and methods of imparting information that we had not previously employed. Improvements can (and will) be made.   |
| Decision already made/consultation pointless | "I would like to think, this consultation is not just a tick box exercise and not looking for a few extra pounds off you hard working council tax payers."  | 1              | All points raised through the consultation, where they relate to an objection to the premise or the detail of the proposal, are being recorded here so that objectors can see a response to their point. Some of those responses may be general in nature, but our aim is to cover the reasons for objection, present them to Committee and thereby allow an informed decision to be taken.   |
| Not enough/inaccurate information provided   | "As if this were not enough, the information available through the website is impenetrable, where it is even available."  | 1              | We have endeavoured to make the information presented as accurate as it could possibly be, correlating various sources of information in order to provide a single picture of proposed and existing restrictions. If that information was incorrect, we have corrected it, but in many instances, we have been able to confirm that the information we held was correct, or been able to explain the reasons behind any apparent disparity. |
| Previous consultation against CPZ            | "There has already been a consultation, at Pilrig St. Paul's Church, which massively rejected the proposal. "   | 2              | The consultation referred to was part of an informal process carried out in advance of the legal process. The results of that consultation were reported to Committee and the decision taken to proceed to this formal advertising of the proposals, based on the evidence of parking pressures.  |

| Theme                                    |  | Inconsiderate parking |  |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Sub-theme                                | Example Responses  | no. objections        | Response   |
| Unauthorised parking in private car park | "With reduced parking options it is likely people will park in the private allocated spaces in my car park when they are not entitled to (ie use my space and leave me with nowhere to park)." | 1                     | <p>Private, off-road car parks are outside of the council's authority to manage or control and any issues of unwanted parking would need to be taken up with the car park owner directly.</p> <p>Car parks that were constructed as roads would only be controllable by the Council, in its role as roads authority. Any resident concerned about parking on any private road should contact the Council for confirmation of status. Consideration could be given to extending parking controls onto private roads, provided that legislative requirements were met.</p> |
| Business parking in residential area     | "What does pose a significant problem at times outside business hours is the use of on-street parking by local businesses for their vehicle fleets"  | 1                     | <p>Outside of restricted hours there would be little that could be done to remove properly taxed and otherwise roadworthy vehicles. There are restrictions on parking HGVs in residential areas, however.</p>  |

| Theme                                    | Private land/road query  |                |  |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                                | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| Misuse of private car park               | "I am a resident of Iona Street Lane and we already have significant issues with non residents parking their cars in our designated residents spaces."   | 1              | <p>Private, off-road car parks are outside of the council's authority to manage or control and any issues of unwanted parking would need to be taken up with the car park owner directly.</p> <p>Car parks that were constructed as roads would only be controllable by the Council, in its role as roads authority. Any resident concerned about parking on any private road should contact the Council for confirmation of status. Consideration could be given to extending parking controls onto private roads, provided that legislative requirements were met.</p> |
| Already private parking (CPZ not needed) | "We bought this house this year because we needed two parking spaces and the estate which we thought was privately run provides plenty of spaces for the existing residents. parking arrangements here are very cordial and there are never any issues or disputes over spaces." | 1              | <p>We accept that there will be streets, or areas, where there might not be the same wider parking problems. This proposal does recognise this, but also takes account of the potential for parking problems to move into the next available street, which is why controls are being proposed on an area basis and why monitoring of parking pressures will be undertaken should the proposed zones be implemented.</p> <p><b>See also section on Public/Private issues</b></p>  |

| Theme                                | Safety concern   |                |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                            | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
| Longer walk to property              | "It is likely that I will have to park at least a 5 minute walk from my own house meaning that I, a young woman will have to walk in the dark after I finish work which I find really unsafe." | 2              | <p>Parking has been</p> <p>Parking Controls should have the effect of improving accessibility and availability of parking. While we cannot guarantee a space near to your home, parking controls will reduce the demand for space by non-residents, creating opportunities that do not currently exist.</p> |
| Public transport related health risk | "Forcing some to transition from private vehicles to public transport during a pandemic could be dangerous."   | 1              | <p>Fortunately, the signs are encouraging in that we might have now been through the worst of the pandemic. Nonetheless, we do have to consider how our city functions in the future, as well as acting in a way that supports sustainability and addressing climate change.</p>                            |

| Theme                         | Impact on businesses  |                |  |
|-------------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                     | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
| Customers prefer free parking | "Free parking in the area is also good for local businesses." | 1              | Unfortunately, that free parking is often used by commuters, who effectively sterilise space by creating conditions where shoppers and others cannot park. Charging for parking helps to create a turnover of space that supports local businesses by improving accessibility. |

| Theme   | Alt suggestions  |                |  |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme   | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| Increase parking spots for residents                      | "Unless it can be shown that car ownership is going to be reduced in some way then the council should be working to provide more. not less parking."   | 1              | The proposal has been designed to offer as much parking availability as is safely possible. It does remain within the power of individuals and households to determine their need for car ownership. This is not something that the Council can directly influence, other than to promote measures that help residents and others to make informed choices about their mode of travel.   |
| Sufficient public transport/EV instead e.g. park and ride | "Would the more sensible option be to wait until the tram works have been complete and roads returned to their former states before making any irrational decision, Then put a consultation out as we as residents and you as our elected councillors would have a better way of understanding our needs." | 1              | <p>The areas around the route of the tram are already subject to parking pressures. The Review recognised the potential for that situation to deteriorate with the arrival of Tram, and was one of the reasons that the Council was asked to investigate controls in this area.</p> <p>Tram and parking controls are linked and there is distinct synergy in considering these different projects within the same timeframe in order to counter future parking pressures before they occur.</p> <p>Edinburgh is well-served by public transport, but even so there is room to improve. One of the ways that any income that is raised from parking could be spent is on improving public transport infrastructure.</p> |

### Section 3

#### Gorgie and Gorgie North (S6);

| Theme   | No parking issues/worsens situation   |                |  |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme   | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
| No parking issues: current time/weekday proposals won't address problem / problems are in evening | I've lived on Stewart Terrace for 15 years and during that period the only times I've found difficulty finding a parking space is during match days at Tynecastle and Murrayfield. That you are proposing to bring in parking restrictions that will not include most days when matches are on is quite extraordinary. Outwith these times, I've never had an issue getting parked in the area, but now it's being proposed that I will be subject to an annual charge while still likely leaving me unable to find a parking space during the only period when restrictions would be beneficial. | 38             | While there may not currently be parking problems in every street, areawide surveys indicated that parking pressures currently exist in the majority of the areas within Phase 1, with this proposal covering 5 of the ten areas where parking pressures were greatest. While Gorgie was ranked 28 <sup>th</sup> and Gorgie North 14 <sup>th</sup> not treating these areas at the same time as neighbouring Shandon (3 <sup>rd</sup> ) would have the significant potential to exacerbate existing pressures.                             |
| No parking issues: existing parking is sufficient/ controls are not required                      | I have just had a look at the parking proposal for Hutchison Park. We have lived in Hutchison Park for 38 years and we have never had a problem with parking apart from a Saturday when there is a football match on at Tynecastle Stadium. What is the point of putting parking permit areas here as no-one parks here during the day apart from the people that live here. We don't have a problem with people driving here, parking their cars for the day then bussing into town. Is this just another money making scheme?   | 74             | Strategically, addressing parking pressures in areas that lie adjacent to two of the busiest commuter routes into the city is a key element of managing commuter parking as well as congestion, air quality and achieving environmental targets. Evidence from the individual surveys from both Gorgie and Gorgie North shows significant pressures in many streets. Those pressures would increase should parking controls be taken forward in Shandon, or only in those parts of Gorgie/Gorgie North where existing pressures are acute. |
| No parking issues: from commuters/visitors parking issues   | The parking in this Street is not an issue. And the volume of commuters is definitely not at the magnitude that is being implied. It's managed perfectly fine in the 14 years I've lived here. No one double parks on this street either. Last night I counted 4 available spaces and this morning 6. We do not need controlled parking.  | 20             | Rather than address concerns individually and implement piecemeal restrictions, these proposals are partially to address existing issues and partially to mitigate against displacement from other areas.  |

| Sub-theme   | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| Worsen situation: Puts parking pressure on surrounding streets/ car parks/ colonies with differing restrictions | The development is off of the main road, and is quiet and rather private. These plans will only encourage strangers that don't live in the complex to park here, especially if parking spaces will be advertised on the likes of Ringo and would encourage people to park here when attending nearby football and rugby stadium matches.   | 19             | Private, off-road car parks are outside of the council's authority to manage or control and any issues of unwanted parking would need to be taken up with the car park owner directly.  |
| Worsen situation: reduce spaces / no guarantee of a space   | Far from benefitting residents, the proposals would create parking problems where none exist at present.<br>The flatted development consists of 99 dwellings and has 99 marked parking bays including 1 marked "Disabled".<br>There is kerbside parking for approximately 18-20 vehicles.  | 38             | Many streets in this area currently show evidence of parking pressures, as highlighted by the parking surveys conducted at the beginning of the Review. Parking controls will help to manage demand for parking , assisting residents in being able to find an on-street parking space if they have need of one. Parking controls have been shown to create opportunities, rather than limit them.  |
| Worsen situation: safety/ traffic/ speed  | Reduce harmful emissions from road transport; Given the major factor of vehicle emissions near me are from the rush hour traffic, school runs and key arterial roads of Chesser Avenue and Slateford Road there is more of an argument of improving traffic flow instead. While implementing a controlled parking zone may have a benefit I feel the main emissions in the area are due to vehicles passing through the area and in driving to the Edinburgh West Retail Park and nearby Supermarkets. Implementing a controlled parking zone may also have a detrimental effect as residents vehicles are parked elsewhere.<br><br>Improve the safety for all travelling in our city;<br>The roads around my residence have more safety issues due to 2 key factors:<br>1) Their use as 'rat runs' during school hours / rush hour and at weekends from the Edinburgh West Retail Park. Given these vehicles are using the streets to bypass congestion on Chesser Avenue and Slateford Road the proposals of permits during weekdays will not alleviate these issues and may potentially exacerbate it in particular around the Hutchison Road area where no parking is permitted. | 2              | Reducing the number of vehicles belonging to non-residents will have the beneficial effects of reducing congestion, improving traffic flow and offer additional benefits in terms of reduced emissions and improved safety.<br><br>It has long been recognised that traffic levels increase to fill created roadscape. Increasing capacity or flow of traffic simply supports existing issues with congestion, which is why the introduction of parking controls is an approach that seeks to reduce the opportunities for non-residents to find space to park, encouraging those who commute to do so by more sustainable means.<br><br>Other initiatives, such as the rollout of 20mph zones and the potential for Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, are separate to this proposal. |

| Theme  | Congestion   |                |  |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme  | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| Street used as rat run                               | I think the council needs to look a traffic calming measures as a priority as the area is used as a cut through from Slateford Road to Chesser Avenue and access to the retail park including heavy goods vehicles.  | 1              | While outwith the scope of this consultation, these comments will be passed to colleagues responsible for traffic management.  |
| Traffic calming required                             | I think the council needs to look a traffic calming measures as a priority as the area is used as a cut through from Slateford Road to Chesser Avenue and access to the retail park including heavy goods vehicles.  | 1              |  |
| Traffic unable to park forced onto surrounding roads | I would like to formally object to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone Implementation for Edinburgh area S6. This control is wholly unnecessary where there are little to no parking issues. On the bigger picture I would like to object to measures being introduced anywhere in the city. Every time new parking zones are introduced it only causes the problem to be moved elsewhere and causes congestion where the parking is available. | 2              | The Council is aware that parking migration is a risk, which is why a monitoring strategy has been formulated to determine the location and extent of any migration. That information will help to inform future decisions relating to parking controls. |



| Theme                                    | Visitor parking concern (permit)   |                |  |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                                | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| Cost of permit will discourage visitors  | I would like to OBJECT to the proposed parking permit scheme in Gorgie, specifically on Wheatfield Terrace and Wheatfield Street. It's very rare that I can't park close to my flat, and I don't see a need to bring in the permit system. This will cause particular problems when I have family or friends staying with me. Even with the cheaper visitor permits it would be ridiculously expensive for them to park for a week here, despite there being plenty of empty spaces. | 5              | The visitor permit system is currently under review with the view to offer my flexibility with times and accessibility to obtain, such as apps like Ringo. Visitor permits are, however, designed to offer short-stay parking options rather than to accommodate longer stays. Edinburgh is well served by more sustainable travel options that could be utilised for longer visits.   |
| Elderly/disabled people rely on visitors | <p>I am writing to object to the proposed controlled parking in Chesser Crescent.</p> <p>The street is not used by commuters into the centre of Edinburgh. Many houses have drives, some with less than a car space between them so the idea of yellow lines seems ridiculous.</p> <p>There are many residents who are elderly with some requiring carers throughout the day and I am concerned their care could be impacted</p>   | 5              | <p>The visitor permit system is currently under review with the view to offer my flexibility with times and accessibility to obtain, such as apps like Ringo.</p> <p>One of the main aims of parking controls is to improve accessibility. One of the ways that we do that is to offer an increased (double) number of visitor permits to those who have disabled badge. Those permits are also available at half the normal price.</p> <p>The price for visitor permits is also set at a much-reduced rate when compared to other forms of pay-and-display parking.</p> |
| Access for tradespeople/services         | The introduction of double yellow lines will prevent deliveries, carers, even utility vehicles from parking while they carry out their activities.   | 9              | Double yellow lines permit deliveries to be made, up to a limit of 30 minutes. Dropping off and setting down of passengers can also be undertaken on such restrictions, while nearby parking places will accommodate other visitor parking needs.  |

| Theme                                     | Unable/concerned about parking near home  |                |   |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                                 | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
| Permit won't guarantee parking space      |   | 16             | While a space can never be guaranteed, the design of the proposed measures has been predicated on the basic premise that there should be sufficient space for all those who choose to purchase a permit.  |
| Matchday parking (Tynecastle/Murrayfield) | Every single day it is a nightmare to get parked in this area & yet you are proposing to remove what looks to be about half the available spaces and replace them with permit holder spaces, it at all. This just seems like a way to make money out of already strapped for cash people. Gorgie isn't exactly rolling in money is it! Weekends and evenings when there are games at Murrayfield or Tynecastle - what will happen then??  | 10             | The issue of match-day parking is being investigated separately, with further details of possible measures to be reported to this Committee later this year.  |
| Too many cars for number of spaces        | <p>I disagree with the plans to make the west side of wheatfield Road a pay and display only and should at least be marked as pay and display or permit holders area (brown sections).</p> <p>There is around 1/3 of the current parking space for Wardlaw terrace being removed on the south side of the road, which is currently essential parking spaces for many. Removing this section will only increase the problem of lack of parking. I would assume the only reason for doing this is to widen the space for vehicles to pass, but as the top of Stewart terrace is one way, vehicles don't often have trouble passing here. The main areas of concern for passing are on Wardlaw Street, Wardlaw place and Stewart terrace when commercial vans and delivery drivers are temporarily parked.</p> | 1              | <p>Agreed. The design will be amended to change approximately 1/3 of the proposed pay-and-display spaces on Wheatfield Road to shared-use parking places.</p> <p>Agreed. The yellow lines on Wardlaw/Stewart Terrace will be reduced in length so that they extend approximately 30m east of the steps from Slateford Road, providing for safe crossing for pedestrians. The remainder will be transferred to shared-use parking or permit holder parking.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2</p> |

| Theme                            | Commuter parking issues  |                |   |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                        | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
| Car required for commute         | If I decided not to get a permit, I would then have to use my car to go to work before 0830, returning after 1730 adding one more vehicle to the commute.  | 3              | The proposals are generally designed to address issues caused by commuters who commute into these areas.  |
| Cars not used for commuting      | The location of the development is extremely well serviced by Edinburgh's excellent bus service. Putting in place tighter parking controls in this area will not see a reduction in car movements as I suspect the vast majority of those that commute to the city centre use the bus due to restrictions there and those, including myself, that commute further afield won't have their commuting habits altered or benefitted by the introduction of the permits. | 2              | It remains the responsibility of individuals to determine their own travelling needs and to make decisions based not only on those need, but also on the impact of their choices.   |
| Charge commuters not residents   | If commuter parking is such an issue, as you suggest, I don't see why the residents of Appin Street should be punished with the possibility of being unable to park near their homes, or having to pay for the privilege.  | 1              | Charging commuters to park isn't a sustainable or viable option. CPZ is a means of persuading commuters onto more sustainable forms of transport.   |
| Commuters using resident parking | You are going to encourage commuters and other residents into my parking and I do not think I have the right under title deeds to prevent them using these private parking spaces. This proposal is ill-conceived, unnecessary and will create a problem where one does not currently exist! you already solved the problem of silly parking by neighbours by putting in double yellows a few years ago.   | 2              | Private, off-road car parks are outside of the council's authority to manage or control and any issues of unwanted parking would need to be taken up with the car park owner directly.<br><br>Car parks that were constructed as roads would only be controllable by the Council, in its role as roads authority. Any resident concerned about parking on any private road should contact the Council for confirmation of status. Consideration could be given to extending parking controls onto private roads, provided that legislative requirements were met. |

| Theme                      | Permit costs concern   |                |  |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                  | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| Cost is unaffordable       | We don't have a problem with people driving here, parking their cars for the day then bussing into town. Is this just another money making scheme? People are struggling enough with money without this! We object to these plans! As always though, the decision has been made and asking people to let you know their thoughts about these plans is pointless. | 26             | While there may not currently be parking problems in every street, areawide surveys indicated that parking pressures currently exist in the majority of the areas within Phase 1, with this proposal covering 5 of the ten areas where parking pressures were greatest. While Gorgie was ranked 28 <sup>th</sup> and Gorgie North 14 <sup>th</sup> not treating these areas at the same time as neighbouring Shandon (3 <sup>rd</sup> ) would have the significant potential to exacerbate existing pressures.                             |
| Permit should be cost-free | Hutchison View has no parking pressures don't think this has been looked into properly. If this is an issue and you want to ensure that all residents are able to park then why are you not issuing free permits instead you have passed this over to a private company taken the money from residents and lining the pockets of a non Edinburgh based company.  | 2              | Strategically, addressing parking pressures in areas that lie adjacent to two of the busiest commuter routes into the city is a key element of managing commuter parking as well as congestion, air quality and achieving environmental targets. Evidence from the individual surveys from both Gorgie and Gorgie North shows significant pressures in many streets. Those pressures would increase should parking controls be taken forward in Shandon, or only in those parts of Gorgie/Gorgie North where existing pressures are acute. |
| Money making scheme        | It is clear that this CPZ is to act as a revenue generator for Edinburgh Council at the detriment of local residents. Many of the area's residents will struggle to pay for the permit that will be required, as they may already be financially stretched to afford paying for their vehicle.   | 17             | <p>Rather than address concerns individually and implement piecemeal restrictions, these proposals are partially to address existing issues and partially to mitigate against displacement from other areas.</p> <p>Revenue from permits meets approximately 50% of the cost of operating the permit scheme. No surplus revenue is generated from the sale of any permit.</p>  |

| Theme                      | Private land/road query  |                |   |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                  | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
| Non-council adopted road   | With regards to Appin Place specifically, I would like to point out that the council has not adopted the whole road, meaning a large part of it is private land. Your proposal includes adding yellow lines on these sections of the street, which as you are not the owner, would not be legal, and would certainly not be enforceable. The same gone for all the parking within the street. The parking bays are separate to the 'adopted' roadway, and as I understand, were not adopted at the time, so again, these cannot be included into any parking restrictions. Any attempt to do so would not be legal and enforceable and would instead be preventing the owners i.e. the residents of Appin Place, to their legal right to access to their land. | 3              | <p>Private, off-road car parks are outside of the council's authority to manage or control and any issues of unwanted parking would need to be taken up with the car park owner directly.</p> <p>Car parks that were constructed as roads would only be controllable by the Council, in its role as roads authority. Any resident concerned about parking on any private road should contact the Council for confirmation of status. Consideration could be given to extending parking controls onto private roads, provided that legislative requirements were met.</p> <p><b>See also specific section on Public/Private.</b></p> |
| Misuse of private car park | The development is off of the main road, and is quiet and rather private. These plans will only encourage strangers that don't live in the complex to park here, especially if parking spaces will be advertised on the likes of Ringo and would encourage people to park here when attending nearby football and rugby stadium matches. This would cause problems for residents, for example creating noise pollution by people not living here as well as the potential for non- residents to make mess and use the communal bins. As a female living alone this encouragement of non-residents into the development makes me feel less safe.  | 2              |   |

| Theme                      | Alt suggestions   | 19             |   |
|----------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                  | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
| Suggests CPZ times         | <p>Having lived in Moat Street for almost 10 years, I can tell you that the parking problems that occur are almost always after 5.30pm and over the weekend. This is due in the main to sporting events at Murrayfield and Tynecastle, as well as parking and then travelling into the city centre.</p> <p>Any time I am on the street during working hours, the streets have many available parking spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the proposal to introduce parking permits during weekly working hours will be completely ineffective at reducing parking problems for the residents of this area.</p> <p>By introducing this parking zone, all that it will succeed in doing is effectively taxing the residents, who have problems parking out of normal working hours and who will continue to struggle to park during these hours.</p> <p>If a parking zone is to be introduced, then it should be in the evening and at weekends.</p> | 8              | <p>The initial engagement asked respondents to indicate their preferred period of control, with 47% of the responses in support of the 8:30am-5:30pm option. Considering that these are the times when commuter parking, and parking for local shops and businesses is at levels of peak demand, this option was deemed the most appropriate for the area.</p>  |
| Provision of disabled bays | <p>This is nothing more than a waste of tax payers money implementing this and an extra tax on the residents of Edinburgh. Enough money is squandered by Edinburgh Council every year. Such a shame an amazing city is run by the mental asylum.</p> <p>Access to business will be affected. Few disabled spaces are planned. This WILL significantly affect the ability of builders, carers or community NHS staff to do their jobs but to name a few.</p>   | 2              | <p>The introduction of parking controls creates opportunities that may not currently exist, by limiting lengths of stay for non-residents and removing commuter parking.</p> <p>Blue badge holders who are resident are entitled to free permits and can more generally park without charge in any shared-use of pay-and-display bay, as well as on any single or double yellow line.</p> <p>The Council will be honouring any existing disabled bays and will investigate all requests for new bays.</p> |

| Sub-theme   | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Implement traffic calming                                 | I think the council needs to look a traffic calming measures as a priority as the area is used as a cut through from Slateford Road to Chesser Avenue and access to the retail park including heavy goods vehicles.   | 2              | Traffic calming measures are outwith the scope of this proposal, but the Council has taken steps to improve road safety in residential areas through the implementation of 20mph speed limits. Further work is ongoing in a number of areas on measures that would discourage rat-running.   |
| Increase parking spots for residents                      | I believe if the council wish to improve the situation they should be looking at creating more parking not restrictioning and removing the current spaces.<br>Please see this email as my formal objection to the proposed CPZ plan.  | 4              | Parking places have been provided where it is considered safe to do so. Changes are being proposed to increase those spaces, although the design has been predicated on the need to ensure enough space for permit holders.  |
| Sufficient public transport/EV instead e.g. park and ride | If your aim is to try and reduce car ownership and reduce commuters parking in residential streets, you must introduce a congestion charge as in London and use this to finance park and ride sites, public transport improvements including 7/7 bus lanes, and make decent infrastructure for walking and cycling.   | 1              | The Council not only has an ambitious Active Travel programme and extensive bus lanes on the majority of arterial routes, but is in the process of finalising details that will see the implementation of a Low Emission Zone.   |
| Pay and display/free for residents                        | Finally, and importantly, I believe that any changes imposed by the council to parking for residents that already have cars should be free of cost. In short, if a resident parks their car for free on the street as is, they should be given a permit for their area for free, as they only lose out by the parking restrictions being brought in. Any persons that subsequently move into the area with established parking charges etc would be expected to pay for these measures. | 1              | Controlled parking brings a range of benefits in terms of parking availability and accessibility. It has long been recognised that those who benefit from parking controls should contribute towards its cost. For that reason, permit charges currently cover approximately 50% of the total cost of operating, enforcing and maintaining the Councils controlled parking scheme. |

## Section 4

### Abbeyhill (N6);

| Theme   | No parking issues/worsens situation  |                |   |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme   | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
| No parking issues: current time/weekday proposals won't address problem / problems are in evening               | "Moreover, parking spaces are most difficult to find in the evening, when they are most likely to be occupied by residents. This indicates that those primarily occupying the spaces are in fact residents, rather than commuters or shoppers; a CPZ would therefore do nothing to improve the situation for residents." | 3              | The initial engagement asked respondents to indicate their preferred period of control, with 47% of the responses in support of the 8:30am-5:30pm option. Considering that these are the times when commuter parking, and parking for local shops and businesses is at levels of peak demand, this option was deemed the most appropriate for the area.   |
| No parking issues: existing parking is sufficient/ controls are not required                                    | "I have lived in Milton street for the past 20 years and I have never had problems with parking in my street."   | 19             | While there may not currently be parking problems in every street, areawide surveys indicated that parking pressures currently exist in the majority of the areas within Phase 1, with this proposal covering 5 of the ten areas where parking pressures were greatest. Abbeyhill was ranked 4 <sup>th</sup> out of 124 areas, with an average parking occupancy of 86%. 91% of all roads in this area were subject to High demand for parking.<br><br>Rather than address concerns individually and implement piecemeal restrictions, these proposals are partially to address existing issues and partially to mitigate against displacement from other areas |
| No parking issues: from commuters/visitors parking issues   | "I am not convinced there is an issue with commuters here. There are many spaces free during weekdays which then fill up at night. I have seen this out my window for many months. There is a good level of turnover"  | 4              |   |
| Worsen situation: Puts parking pressure on surrounding streets/ car parks/ colonies with differing restrictions | "Introduction of permit holder parking will force those who cannot afford to pay for a permit to relocate their parking location to the nearest available unrestricted on street parking, thereby unfairly congesting neighbouring areas."   | 15             | Ultimately, each resident will need to consider whether they need or want to buy a permit. The Council will be monitoring parking pressures in neighbouring areas so that action could be taken to mitigate against any migration of parking.   |



| Sub-theme   | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| Worsen situation: reduce spaces / no guarantee of a space | "You are trying to force us people to pay for parking but you are not providing enough spaces for us."   | 23             | While a space can never be guaranteed, the design of the proposed measures has been predicated on the basic premise that there should be sufficient space for all those who choose to purchase a permit.<br><br>Rather than having the indicated effect, the likelihood is that it will be easier to find a parking space, as competition from commuters is removed and permit issue is limited to two permits per household. |
| Worsen situation: safety/ traffic/ speed                  | "The proposals significantly reduce the available parking and will create additional pressures in surrounding areas, and I believe will substantially increase traffic, congestion and emissions, as people are forced to circle around in search for available spaces." | 4              |   |

| Theme                               | Congestion  |                |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                           | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
| Street used as rat run              | "Adding pay and display in to the mix will surely only add to this increase of traffic."  | 2              | Pay and display is provided on a limited basis, primarily in close proximity to shops and businesses, as a means of supporting their ongoing business needs. Shared-use parking, which is primarily there to meet residential demand, has the flexibility to be used by others, and supports visitors, tradesmen etc who have a need to visit the area.  |
| Traffic calming required            | "Our street is already used as a rat run for those that want to avoid the no-right turn at the top of easter road, and would definitely benefit from speed bumps."  | 1              | While outwith the scope of this consultation, these comments will be passed to colleagues responsible for traffic management.  |
| Widening road will increase traffic | "We as residents are always able to find parking in the area without much driving around. I believe designated parking areas will worsen the parking situation for everyone, decrease the amount of spaces available for everyone - especially for residents, and increase traffic and emissions due to people circling repeatedly to find available parking spaces." | 1              | <p>While a space can never be guaranteed, the design of the proposed measures has been predicated on the basic premise that there should be sufficient space for all those who choose to purchase a permit.</p> <p>Spaces have been allocated to locations where it is considered safe or appropriate to park, taking into account the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and the need to maintain the safe movement of all road users.</p> <p>Rather than having the indicated effect, the likelihood is that it will be easier to find a parking space, as competition from commuters is removed and permit issue is limited to two permits per household.</p> |

| Theme                                   | Visitor parking concern (permit) |                |  |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                               | Example Responses                | no. objections | Response   |
| Cost of permit will discourage visitors |                                  | 6              | <p>The visitor permit system is currently under review with the view to offer my flexibility with times and accessibility to obtain, such as apps like Ringo</p> <p>Visitor Permit prices are, however, set at a level lower than pay-and-display, with current Visitor Permits available at a rate of 2/3 of pay-and-display, but offering 50% more time.</p>   |
| Access for tradespeople/services        |                                  | 3              | <p>The Council currently operates a range of permits and offers a range of allowances to accommodate situations like this, recognising that parking controls need to support the servicing requirements of residents and businesses.</p> <p>The Trades Permit offers tradespeople monthly or annual permits that enable them to park without further charge and without limit within any part of the CPZ.</p> <p>There are specific allowances within the traffic order to enable loading and unloading, as well as more significant situations like house removals.</p> |

| Theme                   | Safety concern   |                |  |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme               | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| Longer walk to property | "Some of the female residents have voiced concern for their safety if they can't get parked and face a walk home in the dark." | 1              | <p>It is not the aim of this proposal to increase walking distances or to have any form of adverse impact on the safety of those who live, work or visit within any of the proposed new zones.</p> <p>Controlled parking is expected to have the impact of improving the availability of parking space, as competition from those who do not live in these areas is reduced.</p> |

| Theme   | Alt suggestions  |                |  |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme   | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
| Suggests CPZ times  | "Has the possibility of part time permitted hours been looked in to? I work up in Newington and a lot of the streets around there are permitted for example, between 11-3pm. This seems to stop people that don't live there leaving there cars there for a long period of time. " | 2              | Many of the areas involved in Phase 1 are not only densely residential, but also have a range of businesses, shops etc that mean that part time restrictions would only have limited impact. In areas where there is commuter parking, like Abbeyhill, approaches like Priority parking would do little to address those problems, and have little or no beneficial impact in reducing commuting by car or reducing congestion or improving air quality.                           |
| Provision of disabled bays                                | "This also affects wheel chair users in the area."   | 1              | Blue badge holders who are resident are entitled to free permits and can more generally park without charge in any shared-use of pay-and-display bay, as well as on any single or double yellow line.<br><br>The Council will be honouring any existing disabled bays and will investigate all requests for new bays.  |
| Implement traffic calming                                 | "It's almost impossible for residents to park in these streets already and if restrictions are not imposed as part of the above proposal, this situation will only be exacerbated as drivers try to find unrestricted areas to park."  | 4              | Traffic calming measures are outwith the scope of this proposal, but the Council has taken steps to improve road safety in residential areas through the implementation of 20mph speed limits. Further work is ongoing in a number of areas on measures that would discourage rat-running. Parking controls are expected to reduce the overall number of vehicles in areas such as Abbeyhill, as vehicles belonging to commuters are effectively prevented from parking on-street. |
| Increase parking spots for residents                      | "Will residents instead be given discounted public transport fares as a green and eco-friendly initiative instead of purchasing a parking permit for a personal vehicle?"  | 2              | As is presently the case, it will continue to be at each resident's discretion to make decisions as to the most appropriate form of travel for their needs. If residents do choose to use public transport in preference to a private vehicle, then that choice will help to make Edinburgh a cleaner and more sustainable place to live.  |
| Sufficient public transport/EV instead e.g. park and ride | "My suggestion, which will no doubt be ignored, would be to impose a hybrid pay and display/ permit parking on the whole of road network within the proposed area and supply permits free of charge to those who live and own cars adjacent to the area."                          | 1              | Edinburgh continues to have one of the best public transport services in the UK. Some commuters still choose to use their personal vehicle, which is why measures like parking controls are required.<br><br>The operation of any permit scheme, as well as enforcement of that scheme and maintenance of signs and lines incurs costs that are met in part by those who benefit from those schemes. Currently, permit holders contribute around 50% of that cost.                 |

|                                    |   |   |  |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Pay and display/free for residents | "Alva Place must be included with the rest of the Colonies in that it should have permits for residents only. It is already difficult enough to get a parking space on this street, and if measures are implemented that prohibit non-residents from parking in other Colony streets, this will only exacerbate the problem on Alva Place." | 3 | <b>See separate section on Abbeyhill Colonies.</b> |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|

## Section 5

### Shandon (S5) and Craiglockhart/B8 (S7);

| Theme   | No parking issues/worsens situation   |                |  |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme   | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
| No parking issues: current time/weekday proposals won't address problem / problems are in evening               | <p>I have lived in the Shandon colonies for over 20 years and have had any issues parking during the day between 8am and 6pm, so see no need for this. There are still sufficient spaces in the colonies for work vans to come and park to perform tasks.</p> <p>There is an issue on parking at night in the colonies after 6pm, but not during the day, so I see no need for this at all.</p>   | 16             | <p>Areawide surveys indicated that parking pressures currently exist in the majority of the areas within Phase 1, with this proposal covering 5 of the ten areas where parking pressures were greatest. Shandon was ranked 3<sup>rd</sup>, with an average parking occupancy of 89%. 92% of all streets in this area were classed as experiencing High parking pressure.</p> <p>Shandon was one of three areas where petitions from residents led to the creation of the Strategic Review of Parking.</p> <p>Monitoring of surrounding areas will assist in determining whether there has been migration and will inform future decisions about any further measures required.</p> |
| No parking issues: existing parking is sufficient/ controls are not required                                    | <p>I have been a resident for over twenty years and I have never had a problem parking. I may have had to drive round looking for a space but there has always been one to find.</p> <p>If you look at the Merchiston area during the day time there are usually no cars parked there. You have driven them to park elsewhere.</p>  | 20             |  |
| No parking issues: from commuters/visitors parking issues   | <p>I recently moved to Harrison Gardens so I wasn't able to participate in previous consultations.</p> <p>Here are the reasons why I think this proposal is not going to improve the situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the majority of the cars parked in the Shandon area are not used for work commute but for family purposes, some cars are parked for weeks in the same spot and get mainly moved on weekends.</li> </ul>                    | 5              |  |
| Worsen situation: Puts parking pressure on surrounding streets/ car parks/ colonies with differing restrictions | <p>I have lived in the Shandon Colonies for over 20 years . I do not see that these proposals offer anything better than what we have already - indeed I believe that they will make the situation worse. There will be a large number of spaces lost to residents and visitors. This will lead to people parking outside the zones and just build up other problems.I believe that this is just a money making exercise and not part of a real transport strategy.</p> | 4              |  |

| Sub-theme   | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response   |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Worsen situation: reduce spaces / no guarantee of a space | <p><b>2) Capacity reduced to impracticable levels</b></p> <p>The current proposal, subject of the consultation running 22 October 2021 - 12 November 2021 will reduce parking spaces in Meggetland Terrace by more than 60% ,from 68 open spaces to c 27permit holders spaces. On a one car per household basis this would not be enough for all of the properties. There would be a serious deficit with the majority of residents unable to park on the street on which they live. Those who have not yet put in drives would, we assume, not be granted planning going forward if their house faced a zoned area. It is likely therefore that those who have not had the funds to put in a driveway will be much more disadvantaged than those with drives.</p> | 28             | <p>Parking spaces have been provided where it is considered safe or appropriate to allow parking. In this particular location we have had to make specific allowances for servicing requirements, which has meant that parking needs to be more closely managed.</p> <p>Controlled parking does not preclude either permitted development or development subject to planning consent. Applications should be made in the same way as before.</p> <p>Early engagement shows 47% of the responses for the preferred timeframes, were in support of the 8:30am-5:30pm option. This option was deemed the most appropriate for the area.</p> |
| Worsen situation: safety/ traffic/ speed                  | <p>I live on Harrison Road (plot 1864 on the map) and strongly object to the changes proposed.</p> <p>Harrison Road already has traffic congestion issues as it is used as a short cut route between Slateford Road and Polwarth Terrace, or as somewhere to park when Hearts are playing. Parking spaces are already sparse in this area.</p> <p>Allowing free parking on Harrison Road will only increase the traffic, noise and road pollution in the area as more cars will be looking to park here.</p>   | 3              | <p>Harrison Road is within the proposed S5 zone and partially within the existing S4 zone. During the controlled hours as proposed, all of this street would be subject to parking control, parking charges and limits of stay.</p>  |

| Theme                    | Congestion   |                |   |
|--------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
| Street used as rat run   | <p>I live on Harrison Road (plot 1864 on the map) and strongly object to the changes proposed.</p> <p>Harrison Road already has traffic congestion issues as it is used as a short cut route between Slateford Road and Polwarth Terrace, or as somewhere to park when Hearts are playing. Parking spaces are already sparse in this area.</p>                                       | 1              | <p>Traffic calming measures are outwith the scope of this proposal, but the Council has taken steps to improve road safety in residential areas through the implementation of 20mph speed limits. Further work is ongoing in a number of areas on measures that would discourage rat-running.</p>   |
| Traffic calming required | <p>Harrison Road already has traffic congestion issues as it is used as a short cut route between Slateford Road and Polwarth Terrace, or as somewhere to park when Hearts are playing. Parking spaces are already sparse in this area.</p>  | 1              |   |
| Matchday traffic         | <p>The parking provided is not nearly sufficient meaning cars are parked around the local area. The council have sought to protect those in the new housing complexes that surround by making all parking there residents only, however, that only results in further congestion on the main road and around the older housing where on street parking is all that is available.</p> | 2              | <p>The issue of match-day parking is being investigated separately, with further details of possible measures to be reported to this Committee later this year.</p> <p>While a space can never be guaranteed, the design of the proposed measures has been predicated on the basic premise that there should be sufficient space for all those who choose to purchase a permit.</p> |



| Theme                       | Commuter parking issues  |                   |  |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| Sub-theme                   | Example Responses  | no.<br>objections | Response   |
| Cars not used for commuting | <p>I recently moved to Harrison Gardens so I wasn't able to participate in previous consultations.</p> <p>Here are the reasons why I think this proposal is not going to improve the situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the majority of the cars parked in the Shandon area are not used for work commute but for family purposes, some cars are parked for weeks in the same spot and get mainly moved on weekends.</li> </ul> | 2                 | <p>The proposed measures will assist residents in being able to find spaces near to their homes. If vehicles are used infrequently, then there are other options available, with Car Club vehicles located within the Shandon area that offer an alternative to private car ownership.</p> |

| Theme                                | Unable/concerned about parking near home   |                |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme                            | Example Responses  | no. objections | Response  |
| Parking blocking driveway            | <p>Park and drive - I do not see as being a large problem. Maybe more so when the festival, football or rugby are on. Visitors and tradesman are a different issue. If they are not parked correctly they block the road or can take up 2 parking spaces. These issues are not on a daily basis thankfully.</p> <p>Also the disabled parking bay in the colonies. One is constantly used by people in Ashley Terrace [it was for a lady in Ashley Terrace but she has been dead for years] and different cars are parked in the space in Shaftsbury. Other spaces are also abused.</p> | 2              | <p>Parking controls will help to manage unsafe or inconsiderate parking practices, with action being able to be taken if vehicles are parked illegally or incorrectly.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we can only remove disabled parking spaces if the need to remove has been identified. We will investigate the need for existing spaces prior to any measures being implemented.</p>  |
| Too many cars for number of spaces   | The parking provided is not nearly sufficient meaning cars are parked around the local area. The council have sought to protect those in the new housing complexes that surround by making all parking there residents only, however, that only results in further congestion on the main road and around the older housing where on street parking is all that is available. We are frustrated by the current situation and now this proposal sets to make it even more challenging for local residents to park near their homes.   | 1              | <p>While a space can never be guaranteed, the design of the proposed measures has been predicated on the basic premise that there should be sufficient space for all those who choose to purchase a permit.</p> <p>The design of parking in new developments is primarily the responsibility of the developer, although recent changes to parking standards now limits the number of spaces within new development as a means of managing parking demand.</p> |
| Permit won't guarantee parking space | Going down the line of permits, in my view is not the answer. I would accept this proposal if I was guaranteed a parking space but that will never be the case. Families that have been here for years now have children, who once they reach 17 are driving, and car owners - more pressure on parking.   | 3              |   |

| Theme                                   | Visitor parking concern (permit)  |                |  |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                               | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
| Cost of permit will discourage visitors | <p>9. You are penalising non-car-owners. The benefit to the area of households with no car is enormous – how much larger the parking problem would be if every household had a car. And what about non-car-owners? They will be disadvantaged by these proposals in several ways:</p> <p>a. If ever they need to park a hire car they will need to pay to park it.</p> <p>b. Under the current proposals the likelihood of being able to park a hire car near the house drops from something to nothing, as the side-streets in the Colonies are proposed to be permit-holders only, leaving the only option to be finding a place on Shaftesbury Park.</p> <p>c. They will need to pay for parking for any visitors, who also have no chance of parking on a side-street near the house rather than Shaftesbury Park.</p> <p>d. They will need to pay for parking for any tradespeople, or carers, who do not hold a permit, and again these people will have no chance of parking near the house.</p> | 2              | <p>The visitor permit system is currently under review with the view to offer my flexibility with times and accessibility to obtain, such as apps like Ringo.</p> <p>The price for visitor permits is also set at a much-reduced rate when compared to other forms of pay-and-display parking. These permits can be purchased by residents and are for use on any vehicle. They can be used to park in any permit parking place, shared-use parking place and permit parking area.</p> <p>While Visitor Permits can be used for Tradesmen, they can also make use of the Council's Trades Permit, which allows parking across the CPZ for a monthly or annual fee. This allows Tradespeople access to parking across all areas where parking controls apply, at no cost to the resident.</p> |
| Access for tradespeople/services        | Designating the streets around Shandon as permit holder only will not stop the problem as I don't expect the restrictions will be policed/enforced during the evening and households with multiple cars will be able to obtain multiple permits. What it will do is make it difficult for tradespeople and visitors to park anywhere near the houses they are visiting. During the time I have lived in Shandon I have never failed to find a parking space between 9am and 5pm.  | 8              | The visitor permit system is currently under review with the view to offer my flexibility with times and accessibility to obtain, such as apps like Ringo  |

| Theme                                | Inconsiderate parking   |                |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| Sub-theme                            | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response   |
| Business parking in residential area | Parking continues to be an issue in the local area but the main factors involved will not be addressed by the proposed changes. The single largest contributory factor to the challenges around parking in the area is the constant and continued illegal parking by staff and customers of the local take away food businesses. Not content with taking up local parking spots by the dozen these visitors park on pavements, across the entrance to roads, in bus lanes and cycle lanes and on double red lines with complete impunity as neither the council, the police or the council's parking attendants are remotely interested in tackling this blight of non resident law breakers. | 1              | <p>The introduction of wider parking controls will assist the Council in addressing issues like these. An increased presence by Parking Attendants will allow more enforcement action to be taken.</p> <p>The anticipated introduction of powers to enforce footway parking, even where there are no on-street restrictions, will help the Council tackle this dangerous and anti-social practice.</p> |

| Theme                 | Specific Issues   |                |   |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|---|
| Sub-theme             | Example Responses   | no. objections | Response  |
| Craiglockhart Terrace | "The Pavement to Nowhere" on the North-East side of Craiglockhart Terrace has not been addressed and will continue to exist. If this were removed then more parking for residents and visitors would be available and Craiglockhart Terrace would be significantly safer to negotiate for pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles; | 1              | The footway in question was provided as part of a Planning condition related to development within Craiglockhart Terrace. Removing or adjusting this footway is outwith the scope of the proposals as advertised. |

## Section 6

### Garage Services Permit

| Theme:             | Garage Services Permit   |  |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Sub-Theme          | Example Responses  | Response   |
| No Need for scheme | We are putting in writing our objections to the whole scheme on the following reasons. Nobody wants them in the street.  | <p>The proposed controls were instigated as a result of approaches to the Council, with residents concerned at the impact on parking as a result of non-residential vehicles. Surveys carried out confirmed that in the Leith Walk, Pilrig and wider Leith areas there were significant parking pressures - and that those pressures were of sufficient significance to warrant the introduction of parking controls.</p> <p>The Garage Services Permit was proposed after discussions between Council officials and individuals representing garage business. Those discussions resulted in the advertised proposals, a permit that has been designed to offer a solution to businesses carrying out servicing and repairs on vehicles that may not be owned by residents of the area. This is a new scheme and the Council will be monitoring the success of this new permit closely to ensure that it provides the intended benefits.</p> |
|                    | I object to the whole scheme.<br>As its totally unwanted, unnecessary, costly for no benefit, and will have a negative effect on your business as this whole scheme needs to be looked at by someone who totally understands the smaller businesses and how the motor trade works. |  |
|                    | I've run my business in North Leith since 1979 and have never been aware of parking difficulties anywhere in the area. The proposals are unnecessary, unwanted and will inevitably create spill-over parking problems in adjoining areas.  |  |
| Cost               | it's a way of introducing costs which hold no benefit to garages that in fact may inflict costs directly onto their customers which will make it even harder for garages to compete for work as it's hard enough with all roadworks/roads closed etc.                              | <p>Permit charges are a means of both managing demand and covering costs incurred by the Council of operating, maintaining and enforcing the restrictions. They are ultimately a means by which the Council can ensure that the service, and the benefits that it brings, can be delivered.</p>  |
|                    | As I am a single person garage business with a small turnover and would feel the effects of this stealth tax on my business  |  |

| Sub-Theme                  |  | Example Responses | Response  |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------|---|
| Permit availability        | As a vehicle repairer, I object to there being a five-day limit on Garage Services Parking Permits;  |                   | <p>While it is not proposed at this time to extend the period of usage beyond the proposed 5 days, there is scope within current operating procedures to accommodate exceptional circumstances by means of a specific dispensation. Should the proposal proceed, and the Order be brought into effect, garage businesses would be able to arrange such dispensations through the Council's parking dispensation service. Further details can be found at: <a href="https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/parking-spaces/dispensations-suspensions/1">https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/parking-spaces/dispensations-suspensions/1</a>.</p>  |
|                            | The permits must be useable for at least 15 days (or more) - a 5-day cut-off is far too short for problem vehicles.  |                   |   |
|                            | I would also require permits useable for at least 15 days , Also a 5 day cut off is to short for problem vehicles.   |                   |   |
|                            | One permit should be allocated to each garage's breakdown van/car and the 5 day cut off isn't going to work as sometimes problem vehicles which are left at door (e.g. 2-3 weeks waiting on parts). So we recommend at least 15 days.  |                   |   |
|                            | A significant number of vehicle repairs simply can't be completed in five days because of spare parts and other component supply delays and the difficulty of programming in unexpected major repairs. I request that the limit be increased to at least fifteen working days. |                   |   |
| Permits for other vehicles | I am writing to object to the whole controlled parking scheme, its unnecessary and certainly unwanted, it will have a negative effect on my business and customers,  |                   | <p>With regard to vehicles operated by the business, such as breakdown vehicles, it is not the aim of the proposed Garage Services Permit to provide parking for vehicles directly linked to the business, nor to provide permits to enable staff to commute.</p> <p>The permit is intended to provide parking opportunities for vehicles that belong to customers, in order to support the leaving of those vehicles prior to, and after, work has been carried out.</p> <p>However, the operation of the scheme will be kept under review, so that should a need to amend the permit scheme be identified, these changes could be brought forward under separate legal process.</p> |
|                            | I would at need the permanent permits for a works van/car to do breakdowns, call-outs, jump-starts, punctures, etc etc.  |                   |   |
|                            | If this scheme has to go ahead I would want one permit for my works van for parts pick up and breakdowns,  |                   |   |
|                            | I ask that a vehicle permit be permanently allocated for a works recovery vehicle for every-day events like attending breakdowns, lock-outs, replacing punctured tyres, jump-starting engines etc.   |                   |   |
|                            | One permit should be allocated to each garage's breakdown van/car  |                   |   |

| Sub-Theme    | Example Responses  | Response  |
|--------------|--|---|
| Other issues | <p>I refer to the above Proposals. I emphatically object to their implementation.</p> <p>I've seen the 'tiled' maps of the proposals which are so full of mistakes and omissions that I challenge the whole consultation process. The process is invalid because the information supplied is so defective as to be misleading. Tile 869 is typical with long lengths of kerbside space unattributed.</p>   | <p>The assertion that the plans are incorrect is misleading. The plans related to this proposal cover those areas where it is legally permissible for measures to be proposed and take further account of other projects, such as Tram and Leith Connections, both of which have been widely consulted upon in the wider Leith Walk and Leith Areas. All “omissions” referred to are where other proposals are being brought forward separately, or where the Council cannot currently introduce restrictions.</p> <p>The quoted tile number, 869, is indeed typical, as this map tile covers areas affected by Leith Connections, where it has not legally been possible to advertise restrictions in expectation of the advertising of measures linked to that project.</p>   |
|              | <p>I object to the proposed layout of Shared Use bays on Giles Street opposite my premises. There are no Garage Services Parking Places and I expect that my business and my neighbouring business, Kerr Automotive Ltd (employing six people and providing a vital local service) will be instantly unviable. Jane Street has approximately forty-five metres of dedicated Garage Services Parking Places, Arthur Street has over sixty. There are also dedicated places on Gordon Street, Manderston Street and Royal Park Terrace. I request that at least thirty metres of dedicated Garage Services Parking Places be allocated outside 90 Giles Street extending northwards round into the cul-de-sac behind The Vaults building where a tandem space could be situated.</p> | <p>The allocation of specific Garage Services Permit parking spaces has been based on a detailed assessment of anticipated demand for on-street space, taking into account number of properties, vehicle ownership levels and likely permit uptake. In some locations consideration has also had to be given to other parking demands, such as those of other local businesses.</p> <p>In the particular situation described, the level of parking demand in this area meant that it was considered not be possible to set aside space for a specific use, as this would have a significant impact on the ability of other users to park near to their homes or to their destination. However, it is possible to extend the number of shared-use parking places to which garage businesses in this location will have access. This change will be accommodated within the Order prior to "Making". <b>See Appendix 2.</b></p> |

## **Section 7**

### **Public/Private Issues**

This section covers instances where residents have indicated that they believe that the Council is incorrectly, or illegally, proposing parking controls on areas that are considered “private”, where residents have documentation indicating ownership of land and/or parking places that are included in the proposals.

Individual responses, on a location/development basis can be found in the table below. The following paragraphs set out the Council’s understanding of the general position in terms of ownership and the status of public roads within the legislative context.

The Council is “the owner” of relatively few roads. In most cases, the ownership of the road will lie with the owner of the adjacent property, where every property owner owns the land underneath the road, extending out to the centre line of the carriageway. Many newer developments will share ownership of the land on which the development sits, including the roads and landscaped areas etc between all individual property owners.

In terms of Roads legislation, when any person constructs a road, the act of creating a road immediately confers a responsibility, enshrined in law, upon the local roads authority. That responsibility extends to managing how roads are used and, in the case of adopted roads, to maintaining them.

This transfer of responsibility does not change ownership, but it does impact upon the rights of the property owner, as roads status does mean that the right to introduce parking restrictions, parking places and other forms of management (such as One Way streets, bus lanes etc) rests solely with the roads authority.

In terms of private roads, the roads authority can introduce measures (via legal processes if required) to manage how that road is used, as well as introducing restrictions designed to improve road safety. However, the introduction of parking places, and especially where there is to be a charge for that parking, is only possible on a private road where the person or persons responsible for the maintenance of that road has given their consent.

The proposals contained within the traffic order to which these objections have been received have been entirely confined to roads that the Council has formally adopted as public roads. This allows the introduction (again via legal processes such as this one) of parking places, parking charges, as well as measures designed to manage traffic flow or to allow for the safe passage of road users.

The following table addresses the objections received in regard of public/private issues.



| Theme: Public Private Issues |   |              |  |
|------------------------------|---|--------------|--|
| Area/Street                  | Example Comments/Objections   | Area / Zone  | Response   |
| Appin Place                  | Your proposal includes adding yellow lines on these sections of the street, which as you are not the owner, would not be legal, and would certainly not be enforceable. The same gone for all the parking within the street. The parking bays are separate to the 'adopted' roadway, and as I understand, were not adopted at the time, so again, these cannot be included into any parking restrictions. Any attempt to do so would not be legal and enforceable and would instead be preventing the owners i.e. the residents of Appin Place, to their legal right to access to their land. | Gorgie (S6)  | <p>The adoption certificate for this development, covering Appin Place and Appin Lane describes and shows the access roads and associated parking places as having been adopted as public road.</p> <p>The proposals as advertised cover only those areas where the road has been adopted.</p>     |
| Hermand Street               | I would like to formally reject the proposal of the Controlled Parking Zone at Hermand Street, Edinburgh. I live in a property here and require access to the private car park which is permit only. Each property is entitled to 2 parking spaces for this car park which would be lost if this were to be made a Controlled Parking Zone  | Shandon (S6) | The adoption certificate for this development describes and shows the access roads and associated parking places as having been adopted as public road.  |
|                              | I am currently a resident at Hermand street, EH11 1LR. I have recently received a letter about a Controlled Parking Zone and would like to formally reject this proposition. I require access late at night to the private car park which may not be possible if zoned parking were to be introduced, allowing anyone to park overnight.  |              | There are two car parks associated with developments in this area. Both are privately maintained roads, and neither are included in this proposal. The first of these is situated to the rear of Nos 11 to 16 Hermand St. The second is situated to the rear of 10 to 14 Hermand St.               |
|                              | Our title deeds state that we have 2 parking spaces allocated to us in the private car park to the rear of the property. How can you take these away from us to create 'zoned parking'?   |              | The proposals as advertised cover only those areas where the road has been adopted, with one exception. A recessed parking layby situated on the right as you enter the car park from Hermand Cres, has been incorrectly included. The proposals for this layby will be removed from the proposal. |
| Hermand Terrace              | According to my deeds the area looks to be private property. I have attached an image of tile 1921 on your website in which I have coloured in red and green the area that is part of the property according to the deed. I have literally just now bought another copy of the deeds on the ScotLIS website which confirms that.  | Shandon (S6) | <p>The adoption certificate for this development describes and shows the access roads and associated parking places as having been adopted as public road.</p> <p>The proposals as advertised cover only those areas where the road has been adopted.</p>  |

| Area/Street   | Example Comments/Objections   | Area / Zone | Response   |
|---------------|---|-------------|--|
| Balfour Place | <p>My deeds clearly show that I own this land, along with the other residents within the area, and it is therefore not within council scope of zoning. Critically, this also includes the access to the school which may take some negotiation re. placement of parking barrier on our (residents) part. If you look on street view, you'll see the area that is cobbled - if it's cobbled, it's private land, not council. Please confirm you agree with this once you look at your records and that you don't intend to zone this area of private land.</p>   | Pilrig (N7) | <p>The adoption certificate for this development describes and shows the access roads and associated parking places as having been adopted as public road.</p> <p>The proposals as advertised cover only those areas where the road has been adopted.</p> <p>In terms of the adoption process, the general process is that the developer constructs “Roads” under Road Construction Consent, indicating which of those Roads are considered to be “Prospectively Adoptable”, i.e. where there might be an expectation or intention that those roads will become part of the adopted road network.</p> <p>Having completed the roads construction, and completed the required maintenance period (during which defects are addressed), the person responsible for the maintenance of the road (typically the developer or their agent) will formally apply to the Council for the roads, or parts of the road network, to be formally adopted. This ultimately translates into an adoption record, showing which roads have been added to the Council’s List of Public Roads.</p> |
|               | <p>I am in process of selling my sister's flat at 16/5 Balfour Place and have always understood that the parking area of the development is part and parcel of the amenities belonging to the residents. The grounds are maintained by the factor, currently James Gibb and formerly LPM. As far as I am aware my sister never had any notification of adoption of any part of the area that was included in the development.</p>   |             |  |
|               | <p>I am emailing to advise that I object to the scheme that you are intending to adopt with trying to introduce paid parking to Balfour Place, where I live, which is private property and not owned by the council.</p>  |             |  |
| Balfour Place | <p>I was given this email address upon my request for help in understanding Balfour Place parking bays and the new “Controlled Parking Zone” scheme for Leith. Our owners have, until just now, been under the impression that the parking bays at Balfour Place are privately owned by the Residents. However, the Leith “Controlled Parking Zone” scheme has uncovered a discrepancy between the belief – held by the residents of Balfour Place – and the City Council. Council documentation indicates the parking bays have been “adopted” by the Council in addition to the footpaths and roadways in Balfour Place; this has been a rather shocking discovery. My questions for you are: how does the “adoption” process work and what documentation exists regarding Balfour Place? We’d like to better understand it and review the documentation related to “adoption” of the roads / footpaths / parking bays at Balfour Place. While we believe there is confusion about the parking bays – all owners believe we still own those – we certainly want to see what documentation exists related to this topic.</p> |             |  |

| Area/Street          | Example Comments/Objections   | Area / Zone | Response   |
|----------------------|---|-------------|--|
| Gordon Street        | <p>I have recently been made aware by a neighbour that the new CPZ coming into effect in Leith will be removing the private car park for the flats on Gordon Street. First of all I think it is atrocious that this was not included in any of the correspondence to us about the CPZ and seems extremely sly on your part. Secondly, I would like to enquire as to how the council believes removing our car park will make parking easier for local residents, as that does seem to be the tagline for this entire project. I would like to point out that the assumption that it is commuters who are taking up spaces in Leith is baseless and entirely incorrect. The hardest time to get a space is late at night when everyone is home. Who is commuting these days, are you in an office right now? Furthermore, my (and I would assume many others) car insurance is predicated on my car being in a locked car park over night so by taking away the car park you are both making it harder to park and more expensive for me. Where was the discussion with the local people on this matter? Again this reeks of yet another plan of Edinburgh Council's to pillage Leith for all it's worth while not actually caring about the area at all. I will be contacting my local councillor and MP about this as I find this blatant lack of actual interest in Leith in the face of gaining a wee bit extra money absolutely despicable.</p> | Leith (N7)  | <p>The proposals for the development lying to the north of Gordon Street include a small section of parking within Gordon Court (3 spaces), which reflects the adopted status of those spaces.</p> <p>There are currently 3 disabled persons parking places within this area. These will be retained under the current proposal.</p> <p>The remainder of the parking areas in this area are not proposed to be controlled, as they do not form part of the adopted road. No car parks are being controlled. No spaces will be lost.</p> <p>Gordon Street itself will be a mixture of parking places, with yellow lines at junctions.</p> |
| North Hillhousefield | <p>North Hillhousefield has parking bays for resident parking according to the proposed restrictions parking bays are going to have restricted hours parking. At a meeting a year ago we as residents if North Hillhousefield were assured that's we would not be affected. People who live here have a right park in a private estate. This is outrageous. To think you can place these restrictions on our parking bays. People work shifts and also may not use vehicles on a daily basis. These restrictions a year ago were not supposed to be affecting North Hillhousefield.</p>   | Leith (N8)  | <p>No parking places are proposed for this development. All parking bays are considered to be private road, which means that they were no included in our designs.</p>   |

| Area/Street    | Example Comments/Objections  | Area / Zone | Response  |
|----------------|--|-------------|---|
| Hutchison Park | <p>Hutchison Park is a small estate of a variety of houses built in the mid 1980's. It is constructed in a square formation around the residents' car park. Homeowners purchase their property along with a parking space. It was made clear that as the car park at Hutchison Park was designated private property the Council were unable to deal with an untaxed car which had been abandoned in our car park. An email to this effect was accompanied by a map outlining the estate with the car park coloured yellow and clearly noted as private property!</p>   |             | <p>The car park referred to is clearly marked as being a privately maintained road. As such, there are no plans to include it in the current proposals. None of the plans produced show any measures in any part of that private road.</p>  |
| Hutchison Park | <p>We have a private car park which is surrounded by the Barret built houses. These spaces are all allocated to the residents and have been paid for when the houses were purchased. ( I have this with my title deeds).</p> <p>Unfortunately we never put up signs for private resident parking as basically it was not really necessary. However because of your intervention we are now getting an influx of people from the area starting to use our spaces. Because rather than pay your money grabbing exercise they are going to steal our spaces for nothing !! Also you have marked an area for no parking against No 13. There are 2 private spaces there according to my plans so look again.</p> | Gorgie (S6) | <p>No measures have been introduced. Any increase in the use of the private car park is unconnected with this proposal.</p> <p>The point in respect of the two parking spaces outside No 13 is, however, well made. These spaces are not shown as being part of the adopted road and will be removed from the proposal. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.</p> |

| Area/Street    | Example Comments/Objections   | Area / Zone | Response   |
|----------------|---|-------------|--|
| Pilrig Heights | In my street, Pilrig Heights, there is currently no requirement for controlled parking. We are well away from Pilrig St, and can control parking privately via the management company if necessary. We pay our factors to maintain parking spaces currently as well as for upkeep - I see no reason to also pay the council to park here too. Furthermore, I am not sure the spaces actually belong to the council.   | Pilrig (N7) | <p>There is an issue in terms of the proposals for Pilrig Heights, in that the proposals do include some areas that are shown as being privately maintained road.</p> <p>These areas are as follows:</p> <p>1) The area lying between Nos 8 and 10 Pilrig Heights, a stub road leading to parking places, is privately maintained road and will be removed from the proposal. The yellow lines will terminate at the extent of the adopted road and no restrictions would be applied beyond that point.</p> <p>2) The parking area accessed between Nos 35 and 37 is also privately maintained road and will be removed from the proposal. The yellow lines will terminate at the extent of the adopted road and no restrictions would be applied beyond that point.</p> <p>The remainder of the parking places and roads within the estate have, according to the adoption record, been adopted as part of the public road network.</p> |
| Pilrig Heights | I would be interested to know if Edinburgh City Council actually have adopted these parking bays as my understanding was that they were built as part of the private development at Pilrig Heights.   |             |  |
| Pilrig Heights | The areas highlighted in Pink should remain privately managed by the estate and the Factoring company (James Gibb). They are Monoblock paved and were created as part of the estate. We, as residents, don't not believe the council should take these over as this will cause a two-tier parking issue in the estate. Parking in the estate should remain under control of the Factors of the estate.  |             |  |
| Pilrig Heights | This is a private residential area and the parking within the estate is for the use of residents who pay a considerable amount in factor fees for the maintenance of these grounds and have done so for the last decade. It is utterly contemptable to now bring in charges for the use of our own parking bays in order to raise additional income for the council.  |             |  |
| Pilrig Heights | <p>Your proposals to introduce controlled parking on Sheets – 1044 and 1103 include car parking areas between Buildings – 6&amp; 10 and that adjacent to Building – 37. These areas of parking are NOT adopted by City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) and hence these areas are private and owned by owners of Pilrig Heights.</p> <p>Current proposals show conversion of part of existing mono-block parking areas into paid Permit Holder Parking. This proposal is objected to on the following grounds: Our development has circa 358 flats with a total parking provision of under 275 car parking spaces including spaces on surface parking areas and the car park. Owners have been sold flats and given the impression that all car parking spaces were privately owned by the development, and they have bought their properties under good faith.</p> |             |  |

| Area/Street       | Example Comments/Objections  | Area / Zone | Response   |
|-------------------|--|-------------|--|
| South Lorne Place | The occupants of 5/7 South Lorne Place formally and strongly object to your proposed plans as outlined on the website<br>They imply our parking space can be blocked and that our car park is not privately owned and monitored by an independent company.   | Pilrig (N7) | <p>The spaces referred to have not been adopted by the Council as part of the adopted road. Consequently, they do not form part of the current proposal and no measures have been shown on any plan that would imply that parking controls are proposed for these spaces.</p> <p>The access roads leading to these spaces are, however, adopted and, as such, are proposed to be controlled by means of yellow lines.</p> <p>It should be noted that, as private road, the parking spaces in this area are subject to the general requirements of legislation in that the right of management and/or control of those roads rests solely with the roads authority. Only the roads authority may legally control who is entitled to park in such areas, or take any enforcement action.</p> <p>The north to south section of South Lorne Place is adopted and has, therefore, been included within this proposal.</p> |
| South Lorne Place | We manage the Development that consists of 5 & 7 South Lorne Place, Edinburgh, EH6 8QN. The boundary of the Development has been plotted on the road adoption plan (see attached). We have been asked by the co-proprietors to seek assurances from you that the parking zone implementation will not include any of the parking spaces within the Development boundary, as these parking spaces are allocated to individual properties and therefore privately owned. Please provide these assurances by confirming that the parking spaces will not be considered in the new parking zone implementation.  |             |  |
| South Lorne Place | <p>I have both a specific objection to a detail of the proposed CPZ and an overall objection based on the proposal's aims.</p> <p>My specific objection relates to Tile 1046 as contained within the online plans. This covers South Lorne Place in Leith, where I live. At the end of South Lorne Place, in front of No 5, is a piece of private land which includes allocated parking spaces for each of the flats in No's 5 and 7, and access to those spaces. In the original plans which were made available for public viewing there was no indication of any proposed change to this piece of land. As it is privately owned, this would be correct. However, in the proposals contained within Tile 1046, I note that you now intend to double and single yellow line the access to the allocated parking spaces upon the piece of private land. I understand that this may be something to do with a belief that the Council has adopted the access to the parking spaces as a roadway. I think that if you check your records you will find that this is not the case.</p> |             |  |
| Spey Street Lane  | Regarding the proposals for Spey Street Lane, I would advise that this is a Private Lane which City of Edinburgh Council have no authority over.   | Pilrig (N7) | Spey Street Lane is, according to the Council's records, an adopted road.  |

| Area/Street  | Example Comments/Objections  | Area / Zone | Response  |
|--------------|--|-------------|---|
| Springfield  | <p>The spaces marked in your consultation diagrams in PINK with shading show that the mono block spaces on the development I own my property on as 'permit holder' spaces are not adopted by the council and only the roads have been.</p> <p>The above spaces are private land and are owned by the development and are classed as private land.</p> <p>These spaces are managed by our factor. I've owned on the development since it was constructed and these mono block spaces have NEVER been owned or adopted by the council.</p> | Pilrig      | <p>The adoption certificate for this development describes and shows the access roads and associated parking places as having been adopted as public road.</p> <p>The proposals as advertised cover only those areas where the road has been adopted.</p> <p>During the review process, one discrepancy was identified, where a parking layby lying to the east of nos 61 to 69 Springfield had been incorrectly identified as being part of the adopted road. This error has now been amended on the Council's List of Roads and the proposals for this layby are now proposed to be removed prior to the potential making of the Traffic Order.</p> <p>The remainder of the proposals for the Springfield estate cover only those areas that records show as having been adopted.</p> |
| Springfield  | I live in Springfield and saw that numbers 5-10 Springfield were to be subject to the CZP measures. I explained to the person in attendance that these car spaces are in fact all private parking spaces as evidenced in the Title Deeds and are therefore should not be part of the CZP plan.   | Pilrig      |   |
| Springfield  | The spaces you have in pinky/purple indicating permit space are private parking spaces. My parents live at number XX. The space outside their house is their private parking space and is on the deeds to their house as such. When this estate was built by Whimpey, each house was sold with a private parking space.  | Pilrig      |   |
| Springfield  | I would be extremely disappointed if this proposal means I would then need to purchase a council permit to guarantee a parking space when I already pay for my private permit through my factoring fees.   | Leith       |   |
| Springfield? | I formally object to the proposal in Springfield EH6 5SE. Every house and flat paid for a private parking space (it's in our missives). The plan in your map is incorrect, at least 7 houses are showing on your map as being parking spaces that you want to make permit or pay and display?  | Pilrig      |   |
| Springfield  | I do object to the proposal of confiscating the privately owned parking space as it is part of my property. The city of Edinburgh Council has maybe adopted the road Springfield but not my parking space which registered in the Register of Scotland as an integral part of my property.   | Pilrig      |   |

| Area/Street   | Example Comments/Objections  | Area / Zone | Response   |
|---------------|--|-------------|--|
| Tower Wynd    | Having looked at Plots 811 and 752 (the areas surrounding my property) the proposals appear to encroach on private land - this land belonging to co-proprietors of multiple private residential developments in the area. I am sure the drafter of the proposals has made an error here and this matter will be revisited if a CPZ is ultimately introduced. | Leith       | The accuracy of the proposals in this area have been double checked. One instance referred to relates to Tower Place (above). A second instance of yellow lines encroaching onto private road has been identified in Tower Street Lane. While these lines are potentially required to allow access and to improve road safety, the basic premise behind this proposal has been to avoid restrictions on any private road. For that reason these lines will be removed. |
| Waverley Park | Tile 1401 waverley park terrace, there are parking spaces with no colouring, this area has been questioned before and i was under impression this area had been adopted by the council, therefore should be included in the plans. Can you confirm if its council adopted land or still belongs to development.  | Abbeyhill   | Waverley Park Terrace is adopted. The proposals do include this street, placing yellow lines and parking places on those parts that are public road (and excluding an adjacent privately maintained parking layby).  |



| Area/Street  | Example Comments/Objections   | Area / Zone | Response   |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| Elsie Inglis Way<br>Jex Blake Drive<br>and Stanley Place | <p>I'd like to formally object to the implementation of parking controls in my area.</p> <p>These changes could cause significant disruption and inconvenience to residents in my development. Elsie Inglis Way and Jex Blake Drive are new streets in a recent development which included various parking spaces. We were informed at the time of purchase that these parking spots could not be marked and policed as "residents only" as the council would not allow this. As a result we already have several non residents such as commuters and customers of local businesses parking in areas which should be for residents only.</p> <p>Residents frequently have to leave our streets and parking area to park elsewhere due to this.</p> <p>The plans I've seen for this area show no change to the restrictions on Elsie Inglis Way or Jez Blake drive (so no restrictions at all as per current situation) which means that if implemented we would face even more difficulty finding a spot to park as all other streets around us would have new controls in place. We would be the only area available for commuters and other non residents to park free of charge.</p> <p>I don't particularly want parking controls in my area in any case but the situation would not be as problematic if our development could be marked as residents only similar to other older developments in Edinburgh.</p> | Abbeyhill   | <p>These are two examples, representing a number of comments/objections received from residents of Elsie Inglis Way, Jex Blake Drive and Stanley Place.</p> <p>At the time of proposing Phase 1 of the Review, these roads had not been formally adopted. At the time of writing, they remain under private maintenance.</p> <p>While it would be possible, and also the preferred approach, to include these roads within the CPZ should they become part of the adopted road, there are no plans to propose controls on these roads at the present time.</p> |
|  | <p>I'm resident and owner at X Elsie Inglis Way. We just received news of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) measures to address parking pressures in the Abbeyhill area.</p> <p>Checking the proposed layout I'd like to express heavy concerns and objections to the parking spots in Elsie Inglis Way and Jax Black Drive not being included in the proposal as permit holders only parking.</p> <p>I can't stress enough that this area is already suffering from heavy parking pressure now, in particular from non-residential vehicles. If the current proposal goes through as is, parking will be more restricted everywhere else, leaving our immediate area extremely difficult to find parking as a resident. Given that the aim of the proposal is to reduce these issues I find it surprising and concerning that this area of parking would be neglected from the proposal.</p>   | Abbeyhill   | <p>This situation will be kept under review, so that steps could be taken if the adoption status changes. Should there be a desire to add these streets to the CPZ, that would necessitate a further traffic order process.</p>  |

## Section 8

### Abbeyhill Colonies

| Theme:  | Abbeyhill Colonies |   |
|---|--------------------|---|
| Example Comments  |                    | Response  |
| <p>I wish to formally oppose the proposed CPZ for Alva Place in the Abbeyhill colonies. Alva Place must be included with the rest of the Colonies in that it should have permits for residents only. It is already difficult enough to get a parking space on this street, and if measures are implemented that prohibit non-residents from parking in other Colony streets, this will only exacerbate the problem on Alva Place.</p>   |                    | <p>Traffic Orders can be complicated. The variation order covering the proposals for Phase 1 of the Review runs to around 70 pages, which can make it difficult to find the detail needed.</p>  |
| <p>We live on East Norton Place which is directly across from the Abbeyhill Colonies and located on a single yellow line. With the current proposal, all the colony streets will be made unavailable for us to park with the exception of Maryfield and Alva Place. These two streets will be in direct competition for parking with East Norton Place, top of Easter Road, residents on the tenement side of Maryfield colony residents, colony residents, and paid parking where applicable.</p>  |                    | <p>The detail covering these points is in that Order, however, with the Council recognising that looking at situations in isolation is not the way to address parking pressures or deliver true benefits, and that we need to provide the right mixture of parking opportunities for the range of users that will have need of the available space.</p>   |
| <p>I appreciate that the colonies are a conservation area (as is East Norton Place being in the New Town Conservation area), however, we are residents of Abbeyhill and should be able to park in Abbeyhill unrestricted. I believe that reserving all but two streets for Colony residents is going to leave an uneven ratio of available parking. We have endured years of terrible parking and to now have the available streets narrowed to just two is an unfair burden.</p>   |                    | <p>The proposal (and draft Order) therefore recognises the challenges in finding a solution that meets the needs and expectations of residents not only in the colonies, but also on London Road, East Norton Place and Cadzow Place, as well as making provision for parking that serves the many businesses on the London Road corridor.</p>  |
| <p>To make matters worse, we have been made aware that the Abbeyhill Colony Association is petitioning to have Alva Place and Maryfield included in colony resident only parking. As I have friends who reside in the colonies, I know that this is not the general consensus of residents in the colonies and would be a further step in the wrong direction. I am advocating for a better solution for all residents in the general area of the colonies. Once the CPZ is in place, there will be sufficient parking for everyone in the area so long as either the colonies are opened up for Abbeyhill Residents (N6) or residents on the periphery of the colonies are granted access to park in the colonies.</p> |                    | <p>In terms of permits, therefore, and recognising the limited availability of parking for residents of London Road, East Norton Place and Cadzow Place, the Order will allow residents of these streets to buy permits that allow them to use not only general permit space within the zone, but also allows them access to the Permit Parking Area covering the colonies.</p> <p>The same applies to residents of Maryfield, Maryfield Place and Alva Place – they too will be entitled to permits that allow them access to the maximum space, including the Permit parking Area. This recognises the limited availability of space in this area, especially for those on London Road. (Continues)</p> |

| Example Comments  | Response   |
|---|--|
| <p>I am a resident of Maryfield. Finding a parking place here during the day is extremely difficult as well as in Maryfield place and Alva place. So where do we park? Other colony streets, Rossie Place, Brunton Gardens, Elgin Place or Montgomery street.</p> <p>Why do you have to split colonies? Why should our 3 streets become part of Meadowbank in new Zone N6?</p> <p>Like I said, parking in our 3 streets is very difficult now, the parking proposal we are after should ease this situation, but this plan will make our situation worse by putting extreme pressure on parking in these two streets.</p> <p>So, if I cannot find space in my Maryfield or Maryfield and Alva places, where shall I park my car? in Meadowbank area? A very long way from my house. And I am 66 years old I think your proposal needs to be reviewed.</p>   | <p>(continued)</p> <p><i>For the first comment box (opposite) see answers on previous page.</i></p> <p>The basic premise behind the proposals was to provide an improvement over the current, uncontrolled situation. Controlled parking isn't just about residents, however, as we do need to consider the needs of businesses and other users. The proposals went through several iterations, each of which had their pluses and minuses in terms of how they impacted and improved parking. Ultimately, creating a larger Permit Parking Area (PPA) was the best way of ensuring the needs of residents throughout the colonies and surrounding streets were met and a means of ensuring that we were not significantly limiting legitimate access to space based on the address of the permit holder.</p>  |
| <p>While I welcome the parking controls in general, I am most concerned Alva Place (upper colonies), Maryfield Place and the east side of Maryfield are not to be included in the Permit Parking Area, along with the rest of the Colonies.</p> <p>I really do not understand the Council's thinking behind introducing two different kinds of parking in the Colonies. I understand the proposed Permit Parking Area is to allow for reduced street markings and associated parking furniture in the Conservation Area. But all of the Colonies are within the Conservation Area, including Alva Place, Maryfield Place and Maryfield. If this proposal is implemented, there would be several line markings on the above streets, not to mention some kind of parking meter, presumably. Given how narrow the pavements are, where on earth are these going to go without making the pavement even narrower?</p> <p>To add insult to injury, all of Rossie Place and Norton Park have been given PPA status! Why? They are not part of the Conservation Area. I understand that there will be a need for both Zone and shared parking. However, surely this should be on Rossie Place and Norton Park? There could be some PPA on the Colony side of Rossie Place but the rest should be Zone and shared parking.</p> | <p>It is worth saying that even if Rossie Place had been excluded from the PPA, they would still have been entitled to permits to park within it. Extending the PPA was a means of retaining additional flexibility, in situations where the marking of bays would have resulted in an overall loss of space. That clearly would not have been in the interests of anyone within the area.</p> <p>In terms of the proposed status of Maryfield and Mayfield Place, these streets are those that are in the closest proximity to local shops and businesses. While there is some P&amp;D parking on Montrose Terrace, the PPA status meant that we had to identify some local opportunities for P&amp;D that would address not only the needs of businesses, but also of visitors to the area. While there is an option to use visitor permits, there also needs to be an opportunity for ad-hoc or unplanned visits to any area, with those occasions being supported by either P&amp;D or shared-use parking. It was considered an essential part of the PPA status to provide these opportunities, improving flexibility of provision in a situation that would otherwise have been so inflexible as to have negatively impacted on residents, businesses and visitors.</p> <p>(continues)</p> |

| Example Comments   | Response   |
|--|--|
| <p>I have an objection to the CPZ for Edinburgh area N6.</p> <p>I believe that the Maryfield and Mayfield place/ Alva place parking arrangements should be the same as all other colonies and Rossie Place. If this is not the case, many problems will be created (as opposed to solved) for people living here. These streets cannot be used for passing on other problems, particularly as Maryfield place/ Alva place has become a rat run for people to turn down to get onto Easter Road.</p>  | <p>(Continued)</p> <p>See above paragraphs for an explanation of the reasoning behind the proposed layout.</p>   |
| <p>I genuinely hope that my concerns are considered. As I mentioned we have endured terrible parking for years. We were so thrilled about the CPZ, but it appears that we might be worse off.</p>  | <p>This comment was related to concerns in terms of limiting access to the colonies to residents of East Norton Place. It is a point well made, though, as the aim of these proposals is to improve parking for all residents of Abbeyhill. That means that we have to take a broader look at the parking provision and make decisions based on how to best provide parking options that meet the needs of all residents and those of local businesses.</p>  |
| <p>I would like to formally object to the proposed parking permit reconfiguration in the N1 and N6 areas. It is not an opposition to the reconfiguration generally but an opposition to how the top of Easter Road is being reallocated. We believe the current solution does not work and unfairly and unnecessarily impacts us, other residents on Easter Road, and the Colonies.</p> <p>I do not understand why the permit boundary line needs to be amended for Easter Road residents (please refer to tile 1282). There are more than enough parking spaces in the N1 zone for everyone as I have never been unable to find a space during my time living here. In comparison, I used to live in the colonies and parking was very difficult. Relocating Easter Road residents to the Colonies N6 parking zone will only exacerbate this issue. Furthermore, my understanding is that my postcode will only be allowed to park on two minor streets in the colonies as the remaining streets around the colonies will be reserved for Colony residents only. This in practice will mean there will be extremely few parking spaces available, and if no space can be found the only alternative will be to park significantly further away.</p> <p>If my parking zone changes from Zone N1 to N6 I will no longer be able to see my car from my flat which I can see at the moment. This gives me peace of mind, especially before and after football matches and at night.</p> | <p>Having considered this point it is now proposed to retain the current permit boundary, allowing residents of Easter Road continued access to Zone N1.</p> <p>This will not only have the effect of addressing the points made opposite, but will also address some concerns intimated by residents of the Colonies, reducing the overall number of residents who would have access to parking within the Permit parking Area.</p> <p>We know that boundaries of the CPZ can lead to situations where CPZ residents choose to park for free across the boundary. While there is no firm evidence that Easter Road or other N1 residents park in the colonies, there is a distinct likelihood that this is the case. Retaining the boundary along the east side of Easter Road would reduce potential pressure in the Colonies.</p> |

| Example Comments  | Response   |
|---|--|
| <p>I do not see any evidence in the proposal, to suggest that number of vehicle owners in this area has been considered.</p> <p>Living on Maryfield Place, i know that all of the residents in the colonies and residents on rossie place, Maryfield, montrose terrace, easter road and east norton place use our street for parking. I also know that businesses in this area also use our streets for parking.</p> <p>I don't believe that grouping our street in with the proposed N6 area would fix, help or benefit this issue. I think it would mean a lot of the residents would have to park much further away from their home which is inconvenient and worries me about the safety of my car.</p> <p>Looking at the proposed permit maps, i see very little areas where we would be able to park. Removing our access to park in the other colonies seems ridiculous to me.</p> | <p>The preparation of the proposals has involved an assessment of likely permit uptake, based on our experience elsewhere in the CPZ. That assessment has indicated that the proposed designs allow sufficient parking in most areas for the anticipated uptake.</p> <p>A number of comments have indicated that residents of London Road etc park in the colonies. This clearly reflects the limited availability of parking space (none on London Road and limited space on Montrose Terrace, for example). Given that the Council's responsibility extends to offering the same opportunities to anyone resident within the proposed zones, these allowances have to be retained, otherwise we would be significantly reducing the available parking options for a number of residents who have few other places to park.</p> <p>The proposals themselves will leave parking in most parts of the colonies unchanged, with parking able to take place in the same locations that it does now. Some additional yellow lines have been proposed in conjunction with the Communal Bin Review, but the aim of the general proposal has been to retain the flexibility of parking that currently exists, whilst protecting the use of the colonies and restricting their use to residents of the immediate area.</p> <p>See also the initial response in this section, which explains how access will be retained to all colonies parking by all residents in this immediate area.</p> |
| <p>Has the possibility of part time permitted hours been looked in to? I work up in Newington and a lot of the streets around there are permitted for example, between 11-3pm. This seems to stop people that don't live there leaving there cars there for a long period of time.</p>  | <p>This type of approach is unlikely to work in areas where there are a range of competing demands, especially where there are shops and other businesses. Given the ability to park for free at certain times of the working day, visitors would concentrate their visits on those times, potentially exacerbating present issues rather than solving them.</p>   |

| Example Comments  | Response  |
|---|---|
| <p>While I welcome the parking controls in general, I am most concerned that the Colonies are to be part of the new Zone N6 and not an extension of Zone N1.</p> <p>Logically, the Abbeyhill Colonies, along with Rossie Place, Edina Place, Bothwell Street and the tenements on the east side of Easter Road should be part of Zone N1. They are the final corner of the Leith Central Community Council as well as being in Leith Walk Ward and Edinburgh Northern and Leith constituency, unlike the rest of Abbeyhill and Meadowbank where Zone N6 is proposed.</p> <p>There is no vehicular or pedestrian access to these other parts of the proposed Zone N6. If parking wasn't available within our small area, it would be necessary to drive back to Easter Road then along London Road to the wider Abbeyhill area or Meadowbank. This would then involve a long walk back home which, if at night, could be a safety issue. I am a woman in my late 60s and would not like to walk home alone later in the evening.</p> | <p>As has been discussed in earlier responses to points made in respect of the proposed parking layout, the proposal has been designed to take account of the wider requirements of residents, businesses and visitors.</p> <p>It has always been the case that these proposals stood separate from the existing zones and that they primarily added new zones. As a zone N1 already stretches across a significant area. As with other existing Zones, they are of a size that would not support further extension. Managing the size of zones is a key part of ensuring that it is not possible to easily commute (using a permit) from one part a zone to another, either to work or for other purposes. Inter-zone commuting has the potential to significantly impact parking opportunities for bona-fide residents of the zone.</p> <p>There are wider implications that supported the creation of a new zone for Abbeyhill. With parking provision already limited in Montrose Terrace and London Road, moving the colonies into N1 would have the added effect of significantly reducing parking options and opportunities for many residents, some of whom have commented within this consultation of their need to continue to be allowed to park in the colonies.</p> <p>The concessions and arrangements outlined in this Section of Appendix 1 will act to protect colonies residents, removing parking that may currently take place by N1 residents unwilling to purchase permits and ensuring that access to the colonies is by those who live there, or in immediately adjacent streets.</p> <p>There is little evidence to show that this view, that the colonies should be part of N1 rather than in the proposed N6, is widely held.</p> <p>It should also be noted that it is not legally possible to make such a change without a further legal process. It is, therefore, recommended that, if it decided that Phase 1 of the Review is to be implemented as proposed, including the new N6 zone as advertised, the situation with regard to permit numbers and availability of space be carefully monitored in this area to ensure that there is sufficient space available for permit holders. That process of monitoring and review should result in consideration of whether there is any further need to consider changes to zone boundaries. That review would also consider in greater detail the wider implications for residents not only in the colonies, but in neighbouring areas as well.</p> |

## Section 9

### Portland Street

| Theme:   | Portland Street |  |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Example Comments   |                 | Response   |
| <p>I am writing to strongly object to the Council's proposals for parking in Madeira St and Portland St and other parts of the North Leith controlled parking zone. I have no idea why you think that it would be in the interests of residents to remove dozens or scores of parking places in the zone and then charge us for policing it. Your leaflet sets out the benefits of CPZs, but this is disingenuous if you are simultaneously creating pressure on parking spaces by painting double yellow lines on hundreds of metres of roadside that are not restricted at present.</p> <p>According to map tile 808, in Madeira St between Prince Regent St and Portland St, it is proposed to remove many metres of parking by painting double yellow lines. For example, it is proposed to paint double yellow lines in front of numbers 50 to 56. There is no indication of the warehouse entrance between numbers 56 and 68, so the map doesn't even show how little parking would be left if these proposals were implemented.</p> <p>At the Portland end of Madeira St there are long stretches of double yellow lines that remove parking spaces unnecessarily. Removing the parking spaces in front of the garden of 69 Madeira St will have no effect on sightlines in Madeira St or Portland St.</p> <p>In particular the removal of so much parking from Portland St is completely unnecessary and will create pressure on the parking spaces that are left, including in Madeira St. It will also have the disbenefit of increasing speeds on Portland St. At the moment, drivers have to drive slowly and negotiate their progress with drivers coming the opposite direction. It's not a bad thing that drivers have to slow down.</p> <p>The effect of the introduction of the CPZ in Madeira St will be to charge us for parking when previously we weren't charged and to reduce the availability of parking. Of course, it will have the benefit of removing from the street vehicles not belonging to residents that can sit there for months and even years, but if that gain is offset by the loss of parking spaces indicated on the map, all that we will be left with is a new cost. Given that a potential commuter intent on using our area for parking and then catching a bus into town would have to drive through heavy traffic from whichever direction to get here, it seems to me likely that most of the cars parked in the area belong to residents, so that is who the removal of spaces will have an impact on.</p> <p>I would therefore be grateful if you would revise your maps for Madeira St and Portland St with the aim of maximising and not minimising the parking available to residents and visitors.</p> |                 | <p>This consultation response is one of many (approx. 25) that raised the issue of lost parking on the south-east side of Portland Street, as well as issues associated with that loss.</p> <p>Based on the number of objections received on this issue, it is now proposed to reinstate as much parking provision as it is considered safe and appropriate to do so on the south-east side of Portland Street.</p> <p>The yellow lines that these changes will replace were proposed in recognition of the narrowness of Portland Street and the access needs of the Housing-maintained end-on parking on the north-west side of the street.</p> <p>Those needs do need to be balanced with the need to provide sufficient parking for residents and visitors, as well as recognising that parked vehicles can act beneficially in terms of reducing traffic speeds and making streets less attractive as short cuts.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2 for details of the proposed changes.</p> |

## **Appendix 2 – Proposed Amendments to the Advertised Order**

This appendix details the changes that are proposed to the Order that was advertised in October 2021.

This appendix is split into two sections:

- 1) General amendments to take account of design changes
- 2) specific amendments being made in response to objections received.



## Section 1

### General or Consequential Amendments

This section outlines the type of changes being made in order to accommodate minor amendments to the design of the proposed measures.

In line with the legislative requirements, modifications can be made to an advertised order where the effect of the modification does not make a restriction or a provision within the advertised order more onerous. Changes that increase a restriction, or are more prohibitive, cannot be accommodated in this way.

The following table sets out examples of the scenarios and impact of those changes. In this table the letters:

- **DYL** denote Double Yellow Line
- **SYL** denote Single Yellow Line
- **DPPP** denote Disabled Person's Parking Place.

Table 1

| No | Description  | Change Required   | Net result   | Conclusion  |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 1  | A proposed bin hub location is to be re-sited within proposed parking places to take account of feedback received.                       | The DYL supporting the bin hub moves and the adjacent parking places are adjusted to accommodate the move.              | No net loss or gain in terms of overall parking provision. Change is not more onerous.   | Change can be accommodated, and the proposal will be amended within this legal process. |
| 2  | A proposed bin hub location is to be adjusted to take account of feedback received. The hub moves into an area where a DYL was proposed. | The DYL supporting the bin hub moves and the adjacent parking place is extended to occupy the space vacated by the hub. | Net increase in parking provision. Change makes the Order less onerous at that location.   | Change can be accommodated, and the proposal will be amended within this legal process. |
| 3  | An existing DPPP has been identified and confirmed as being no longer required.  | The DPPP will be removed and the adjacent parking place extended to occupy the resulting space.                         | The adjacent parking place is of a type that is less restrictive (i.e. allows a wider group of users to park) and is therefore less onerous. | Change can be accommodated, and the proposal will be amended within this legal process. |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 4 | An existing DPPP has been identified and confirmed as being no longer required.  | The DPPP will be removed and an SYL marked in its place.           | An SYL allows loading and parking outside of controlled hours. This change is, therefore, less onerous. | Change can be accommodated, and the proposal will be amended within this legal process. |
| 5 | A proposed DYL is now proposed to be changed to SYL. None of these changes are proposed where DYL was originally proposed for road safety reasons. | The DYL will be removed and, in its place, a SYL will be provided. | An SYL operates for only part of the day and is therefore less onerous than a DYL.                      | Change can be accommodated, and the proposal will be amended within this legal process. |

## Section 2

### Specific Amendments

This section outlines the type of changes being made in order to accommodate minor amendments to the design of the proposed measures. The following table sets out examples of the scenarios and impact of those changes.

In line with the legislative requirements, modifications can be made to an advertised order where the effect of the modification does not make a restriction or a provision within the advertised order more onerous. Changes that increase a restriction, or are more prohibitive, cannot be accommodated in this way.

| No. | Description/Location   | Change Required   | More/Less Onerous? | Conclusion  |
|-----|--|---|--------------------|---|
| 1   | Clockmill Lane. Yellow lines shown in private lane   | Remove yellow lines from advertised Order.  | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to “Making” of Traffic Order. |
| 2   | Public/Private issue. Springfield Estate, Pilrig. Concern that the proposal extends into private parking places. | Minor amendment following review of Council adoption records to remove a block of permit holder parking to the East of Nos. 61 to 69 Springfield. | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to “Making” of Traffic Order. |
| 3   | Giles Street. Insufficient allocation of space for garage businesses   | Extend entitlement to use Services Garage Permits in additional parking places in the vicinity of garage businesses in this street                | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to “Making” of Traffic Order. |
| 4   | Portland Street. Insufficient space provided for residents and visitors. Yellow lines too extensive.             | Remove yellow lines on south-east side and replace with permit holder or shared-use parking places  | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to “Making” of Traffic Order. |
| 5   | Wheatfield Road. Extent of pay-and-display parking.  | Transfer 1/3 of pay-and-display to shared use parking places.   | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to “Making” of Traffic Order. |

| No. | Description/Location   | Change Required  | More/Less Onerous? | Conclusion   |
|-----|--|--|--------------------|--|
| 6   | Wardlaw Terrace/Stewart Terrace  | Reduce DYL so that it extends approx. 30m east of steps from Slateford Road. Remainder heading east to be turned into shared-use or permit holder parking places                           | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to "Making" of Traffic Order.                |
| 7   | Shandon. Shaftesbury Park Colonies. Disabled bays no longer required.                            | Investigate need for bays. Identify any bays no longer required and remove bays from draft Order. Where possible, transfer any space to either Shared-Use or permit holder parking places. | Less               | Proceed to make any potential amendments prior to "Making" of Traffic Order. |
| 8   | Hutchison Park. Two private spaces opposite No 13.   | Remove proposed yellow lines from private spaces and amend design to show yellow line crossing in front of these spaces.   | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to "Making" of Traffic Order.                |
| 9   | Pilrig Heights. Private parking areas included in error. Remove.                                 | Remove all proposals from privately maintained roads.  | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to "Making" of Traffic Order.                |
| 10  | Hermand Crescent. Private parking layby shown with permit holder parking. Bays to be removed.    | Remove bays from layby and run an SYL across the front.  | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to "Making" of Traffic Order.                |
| 11  | Tower Place. Permit holder spaces identified in correspondence as being mainly used by visitors. | Transfer approx. 30 to 40% of Permit holder parking to shared-use.   | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to "Making" of Traffic Order.                |
| 12  | Constitution Place. Yellow lines extend onto privately maintained road.                          | Remove yellow lines from all privately maintained roads (car park area at NW end).   | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to "Making" of Traffic Order.                |
| 13  | Tower Street Lane. Yellow lines extend onto privately maintained road.                           | Remove yellow lines from all privately maintained roads.   | Less               | Proceed to make amendment prior to "Making" of Traffic Order.                |

| No. | Description/Location  | Change Required  | More/Less Onerous?    | Conclusion  |
|-----|---|--|-----------------------|---|
| 14  | Easter Road. Zone boundary proposed to move to centre of Easter Road. | Retain boundary along East side of Easter Road, meaning that Easter Road residents will continue to be eligible for N1 permits, rather than moving some to the proposed N6 Zone. Amendments required to Map Tiles and to Schedule 3 of the advertised Order. | Less                  | Proceed to make amendment prior to “Making” of Traffic Order. |
| 15  | Cowan Road  | Removal of existing disabled bays that were previously identified as being no longer required. Replace with either shared-use bays, permit holder bays or single yellow line as required.  | Less                  | Proceed to make amendment prior to “Making” of Traffic Order. |
| 16  | Gordon Court  | Removal of existing disabled bay that has been identified as being no longer required. Replace with double yellow line to match surrounding restriction.   | Neither More nor Less | Proceed to make amendment prior to “Making” of Traffic Order. |