

# North-West Locality Committee

6.30pm, Wednesday, 30 January 2019

## Parking in Bedford Court

Item number	8.7
Report number	
Executive/routine	Executive
Wards	5 – Inverleith
Council Commitments	<a href="#">18</a> and <a href="#">19</a>

### Executive Summary

---

Committee considered a report entitled [Parking in Bedford Court](#) on 14 November 2018 and agreed that officers would consult further with local elected members. This report updates Committee on those discussions.

## Parking in Bedford Court

### 1. Recommendations

---

- 1.1 It is recommended that the North-West Locality Committee:
  - 1.1.1 approves the start of the statutory procedure to introduce parking controls in the Bedford Court parking area.

### 2. Background

---

- 2.1 On 14 November 2018 Committee agreed that officers would have further discussion on potential parking options with local elected members. These discussions took place on 11 December 2018, and covered a range of parking approaches and the number and type of spaces proposed. This report updates Committee on the outcome of the discussions.

### 3. Main report

---

- 3.1 Discussion with elected members focused on a range of potential options to address the parking issues reported by residents in Bedford Court over a number of years, taking on board the consultation with residents detailed in the 14 November committee report.
- 3.2 Appendix 1 details the options, along with analysis on the pros and cons and likely outcomes of each.
- 3.3 Following discussion, it was agreed that the most practical solution likely to most benefit residents when managing parking demands in Bedford is Court is to include the car park area within the N3 Controlled Parking Zone. It is not expected that new permit holders within Bedford Court would be subject to the diesel surcharge.

#### **Recommendation**

- 3.4 The results of the resident consultations indicate a slight preference for the introduction of parking controls. Adding Bedford Court to the CPZ is the recommended option to address parking problems in these circumstances and to help residents park closer to their homes.
- 3.5 This approach addresses commuter and non-residential parking and protects spaces for residents during the day. A CPZ also provides opportunities for visitors and trades people to park using pay and display facilities.

- 3.6 The introduction of double yellow lines within the car park will also protect internal junctions and provide an area for loading and unloading. These areas can also be used as additional parking places by blue badge holders. However, should there be access problems with this arrangement, the introduction of additional loading prohibitions can be considered.
- 3.7 It is recognised through the consultation responses that some residents who favour the current arrangements, do so as they do not wish to pay for parking permits or alternatively they want the lock on the gate to be repaired. Housing have made it clear that this will not happen again. Indeed, the four respondents who strongly disagreed with the introduction of parking controls all stated their desire for the gate lock to be repaired or for a new entry system to be introduced.
- 3.8 Due to its close proximity to Stockbridge and the city centre, the absence of parking controls is likely to encourage commuter and non-residential parking in the area. This is not consistent with the aims of the Controlled Parking Zone and the Council's transport objectives of managing parking demands and reducing commuter parking opportunities in the city centre.
- 3.9 Furthermore, a number of residents in the area are already residents' permit holders and have requested additional parking opportunities near to their homes.
- 3.10 The presence of parking controls not only restricts long-term non-residential parking but it can also help to encourage more considerate parking where parking places and yellow lines are marked on-street.

## **4. Measures of success**

---

- 4.1 Residents will be able to park closer to their homes.
- 4.2 Reduction in commuter and non-residential parking in Bedford Court parking areas.
- 4.3 Improve parking opportunities for visitors, disabled people, carers and trades people.
- 4.4 Enhanced access for refuse and emergency service vehicles.

## **5. Financial impact**

---

- 4.5 The cost of implementing parking restrictions can be contained within departmental budgets.
- 4.6 Based on current permit prices and typical permit purchasing patterns, income from the purchase of residents' permits is estimated to be in the region of £2,000 per year.
- 4.7 The introduction of parking controls may increase public parking income as they prevent lost revenue from other areas as commuters and non-residents are currently able to park free of charge in the parking areas.

- 4.8 There may also be some revenue generated from the sale of visitors' parking permits.

## **6. Risk, policy, compliance and governance impact**

---

- 6.1 There are no known risk, policy compliance or governance impacts arising from this report.

## **7. Equalities impact**

---

- 7.1 The introduction of parking controls will have a positive impact on disabled people by ensuring that disabled persons' parking places are enforced. Currently, one disabled persons' parking place is located within the Bedford Court parking area but this is advisory only. Should parking controls be introduced, this space will become enforceable and be regularly monitored by Parking Attendants.
- 7.2 The removal of commuter parking will generally increase parking opportunities in the area and make parking more accessible for visitors and carers making domiciliary visits in the area much easier. This will have a positive impact on disabled people and support older people living in their own homes, as the parking spaces serve some sheltered accommodation at Bedford Court. Managed parking spaces will also help maintain access for emergency service vehicles throughout the day.

## **8. Sustainability impact**

---

- 8.1 The impacts of this report in relation to the three elements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 Public Bodies Duties have been considered, and the outcomes are summarised below.
- 8.2 There is expected to be a positive impact on reducing carbon emissions and tackling climate change by removing free parking for commuters in the city centre.
- 8.3 The proposals will help achieve a sustainable Edinburgh because removing commuter parking will improve the quality of life of local residents. Improving parking for carers and third sector workers will help to support people with additional support needs continue to live in their own homes.
- 8.4 Removing commuters will also prevent residents driving further to seek an available parking space and thus contributing to congestion and pollution. The introduction of permit charges and this being linked to the vehicle emissions will encourage residents to consider the environmental impact of their travel behaviours and their vehicle choice.

## 9. Consultation and engagement

---

9.1 As noted in previous report.

## 10. Background reading/external references

---

10.1 None.

### **Paul Lawrence**

Executive Director of Place

Contact: Ewan Kennedy, Service Manager – Transport Networks

E-mail: [ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk) | Tel: 0131 469 3575

## 11. Appendices

---

Appendix 1 – Analysis of Parking Options

## Appendix 1 – Analysis of Parking Options

This appendix discusses different parking options that were considered when investigating the possible introduction of parking controls in Bedford Court.

Control Measure	Benefits	Drawbacks	Outcome
Do-nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Free parking for residents and their visitors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attracts commuter and long-term non-residential parking</li> <li>Does not protect disabled bays</li> <li>Poor accessibility for emergency services</li> <li>Few spaces available for residents</li> </ul>	This is not considered an appropriate approach as it will do nothing to tackle the parking issues raised.
Gate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protects space for residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locks break and vandalism concerns</li> <li>High implementation and maintenance costs</li> <li>Unique admin system for key distribution required</li> <li>No Council control over use of keys and thus car park</li> <li>Poor accessibility for emergency and waste services</li> <li>Problems for disabled users</li> <li>Safety concerns with physical barriers</li> </ul>	The use of a gate is not considered to be appropriate. It is likely that current problems would persist and high costs administering and managing such a system would need to be passed on to residents.
Single Yellow Lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tackles commuter and non-residential parking during the day</li> <li>Protects space for disabled persons' blue badge holders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No parking places available for residents</li> <li>No parking available for genuine visitors or trades people.</li> </ul>	This is not a practical solution as it does not help residents park closer to their homes.

Control Measure	Benefits	Drawbacks	Outcome
Double Yellow Lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tackles commuter and non-residential parking at all times</li> <li>• Protects space for disabled persons' blue badge holders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No parking places available for residents</li> <li>• No parking available for genuine visitors or trades people.</li> </ul>	This is not a practical solution as it does not help residents park closer to their homes.
Priority Parking Area (Some areas of kerbside controlled for 90 minutes Mon-Fri)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tackles commuter and non-residential parking for 90 minutes each day</li> <li>• Provides limited protection for residents during the day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not suitable for areas of high demand</li> <li>• May not provide sufficient space for residents.</li> <li>• Attracts commuters and non-residents to park outwith controlled hours</li> <li>• Commuters paying for 90 minutes would be able to park all-day, i.e. no turnover of space</li> <li>• Fewer opportunities for genuine visitors and trades people</li> <li>• Counter to transport policy to manage spaces close to city</li> </ul>	This is not considered a suitable option; Priority Parking works best in less densely populated, stand-alone areas further from the city centre. Bedford Court is surrounded by CPZ, making any less intrusive form of control an attractive place for commuters to park. Thus, PPA is unlikely to address commuter and non-residential parking problems during the day. Residents paying for parking permits may not see any improvement in parking opportunities, as short-term controls still attract commuters to park here due to its proximity to Stockbridge.
Controlled Parking Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protects space for residents</li> <li>• Addresses commuter and non-residential parking during the day</li> <li>• Provides parking opportunities for visitors and trades people</li> <li>• Provides pay and display parking for all road users</li> <li>• Loading and unloading opportunities are available</li> <li>• Manages where vehicles park, i.e. park in marked bays</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents need to pay for parking</li> <li>• Pay and display for visitors</li> <li>• Each block of parking places needs to be marked and signed individually</li> </ul>	This is the best available option and is recommended in this instance. CPZ helps residents park closer to their homes, tackles commuter parking and provides sufficient flexibility for other road users, i.e. visitors, to also find a parking space. This form of control manages all of the available space, encouraging turnover via pay and display, whilst preventing all day, non-residential parking. The main concern is likely to be permit costs for residents, but this option will provide them with the greatest benefit.

Control Measure	Benefits	Drawbacks	Outcome
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved access for emergency and waste services</li> </ul>		
Controlled Parking Zone - Mews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protects space for residents living in Bedford Court only</li> <li>• Fewer road markings and signs required</li> <li>• Tackles commuter and non-residential parking during the day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No ability to introduce disabled persons' parking places</li> <li>• No parking places for visitors</li> <li>• Visitors' permits cannot be used in mews areas</li> <li>• No loading and unloading facilities</li> <li>• No control over manner of standing, i.e. to prevent poor parking</li> </ul>	<p>While there is some benefit in considering a mews area, the inability to mark disabled spaces and the absence of visitor parking are considerable drawbacks. While mews parking is used where there is limited or no option to provide marked spaces, this area has been designed as a car park and the introduction of traditional controls, parking places and yellow lines, is appropriate. Mews controls could also result in drivers parking on corners within the area, restricting access for emergency services, with the Council having no powers to address these issues.</p>