

Notice of meeting and agenda

Traffic Regulation Orders Sub-Committee

10.00am Tuesday, 17th March, 2026

Dean of Guild Court Room - City Chambers

This is a public meeting and members of the public are welcome to attend or watch the webcast live on the Council's website.

The law allows the Council to consider some issues in private. Any items under "Private Business" will not be published, although the decisions will be recorded in the minute.

Contacts

Email: natalie.carter@edinburgh.gov.uk / rachel.gentleman@edinburgh.gov.uk

1. Order of Business

- 1.1 Including any notices of motion and any other items of business submitted as urgent for consideration at the meeting.

2. Declaration of Interests

- 2.1 Members should declare any financial and non-financial interests they have in the items of business for consideration, identifying the relevant agenda item and the nature of their interest.

3. Minutes

- 3.1 Minute of Traffic Regulation Order Sub-Committee of 16 December 2025 – submitted for approval as a correct record 5 - 8

4. Reports

- 4.1 TRO/25/03 – Objection report – Communal Bin Review – Report by the Corporate Director of Place 9 - 32
- 4.2 TRO/24/30 – Objection Report, Proposed Priority Parking Area, Lockharton – Report by the Corporate Director of Place 33 - 64
- 4.3 TRO/25/01 – Objection Report, introduction and amendments of waiting and loading restrictions – Report by the Corporate Director of Place 65 - 80
- 4.4 TRO-24-18 West Craigs - Waiting Restrictions – Report by the Corporate Director of Place 81 - 108

Nick Smith

Proper Officer

Committee Members

Councillor Margaret Arma Graham (Convener), Councillor Denis Dixon, Councillor Phil Doggart, Councillor Neil Gardiner, Councillor Joan Griffiths, Councillor Kevin Lang, Councillor Kayleigh Kinross-O'Neill, Councillor Ross McKenzie and Councillor Hal Osler

Information about the Traffic Regulation Orders Sub-Committee

The Traffic Regulation Orders Sub-Committee consists of 9 Councillors and is appointed by the City of Edinburgh Council.

This meeting of the Traffic Regulation Orders Sub-Committee is being held in the City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh and virtually by Microsoft Teams.

Further information

If you have any questions about the agenda or meeting arrangements, please contact Natalie Carter-Osborne, Committee Services, City of Edinburgh Council, Business Centre 2.1, Waverley Court, 4 East Market Street, Edinburgh EH8 8BG, Tel , email natalie.carter@edinburgh.gov.uk / rachel.gentleman@edinburgh.gov.uk.

A copy of the agenda and papers for this meeting will be available for inspection prior to the meeting at the main reception office, City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh.

The agenda, minutes and public reports for this meeting and all the main Council committees can be viewed online by going to the Council's online [Committee Library](#).

Live and archived webcasts for this meeting and all main Council committees can be viewed online by going to the Council's [Webcast Portal](#).

Webcasting of Council meetings

Please note this meeting may be filmed for live and subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site – at the start of the meeting the Convener will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed.

The Council is a Data Controller under current Data Protection legislation. We broadcast Council meetings to fulfil our public task obligation to enable members of the public to observe the democratic process. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with the Council's published policy including, but not limited to, for the purpose of keeping historical records and making those records available via the Council's internet site.

Generally the public seating areas will not be filmed. However, by entering the Council Chamber and using the public seating area, individuals may be filmed and images and sound recordings captured of them will be used and stored for web casting and training purposes and for the purpose of keeping historical records and making those records available to the public.

Any information presented by individuals to the Council at a meeting, in a deputation or otherwise, in addition to forming part of a webcast that will be held as a historical record, will also be held and used by the Council in connection with the relevant matter

until that matter is decided or otherwise resolved (including any potential appeals and other connected processes). Thereafter, that information will continue to be held as part of the historical record in accordance with the paragraphs above.

If you have any queries regarding this, and, in particular, if you believe that use and/or storage of any particular information would cause, or be likely to cause, substantial damage or distress to any individual, please contact Committee Services (committee.services@edinburgh.gov.uk).

Traffic Regulation Orders Sub-Committee

10.00am, Tuesday, 17 March 2026

TRO/25/01 – Objection Report, introduction and amendments of waiting and loading restrictions

Decision/Scrutiny	Decision
Wards	2 – Pentland Hills
	3 – Drum Brae/Gyle
	4 - Forth
	6 - Corstorphine/Murrayfield
	14 – Craigentenny/Duddingston
	17 – Portobello/Craigmillar

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 It is recommended that the Traffic Regulation Orders Sub-Committee:
 - 1.1.1 Notes the comments and objections received in response to the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) TRO/25/01 and the Council’s responses to the points that were raised.
 - 1.1.2 Approves setting aside the objections to TRO/25/01 and approves the making of the full TRO as advertised.

Gareth Barwell

Corporate Director of Place

Contact: Gavin Graham, Parking & Traffic Regulation Manager

E-mail: Gavin.Graham@edinburgh.gov.uk



Report

TRO/25/01 – Objection Report, introduction and amendments of waiting and loading restrictions

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) TRO/25/01 proposing the introduction of waiting and loading restrictions at twenty locations and was advertised in November and December 2025 at which point those interested in the proposals were invited to make their views known to the Council.
- 2.2 This report details the outcome of the advertisement of the TRO, including details and consideration of all comments received.
- 2.3 This report seeks the authority to set aside the objections make the TRO as advertised.

3. Background

- 3.1 TRO/25/01 was initiated by the Council in response to requests from stakeholders and members of the public for waiting and/or loading restrictions. Each of the twenty locations included in the TRO was investigated and inspected prior to proposals being developed and the TRO being advertised.
- 3.2 TRO/25/01 proposes waiting, loading, and unloading restrictions to improve road safety and to help ensure that larger vehicles (such as emergency service vehicles, waste collection vehicles and buses) can access and service the affected streets. Proposed restrictions support the Council's City Mobility Plan as described in section 8 of this report.
- 3.3 In accordance with legislative requirements, the draft TRO was advertised to the public over a three-week period between [November and December 2025 \(TRO/25/01\)](#). The TRO was proposed under powers granted to local road authorities by the 'Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984'.
- 3.4 Paragraph 86 of Appendix 6 of the Council's Scheme of Delegation to Officers delegates authority to the Coporate Director of Place to make traffic orders where there have been no more than six objections received from the public to one single location and where there have been no statutory objections. In all other circumstances, objections are referred to the relevant Committee for a decision on how to proceed.

4. Main report

Reponses Received and Consideration of Objections

- 4.1 A total of twenty-nine responses were received during the advertisement of TRO/25/01. This report details the points raised by respondents and sets out the Council's response to each point of objection in turn, where appropriate.
- 4.2 The content of the objections and the Council's responses are detailed in Appendix 1. This appendix also details any suggestions which were noted from comments and objections to the advertised proposal.
- 4.3 Of the twenty locations included within the TRO, eighteen objections and partial objections have been received in relation to the following locations: Roseburn Cliff, Pinkhill, Northfield Drive, Lixmount Avenue, and Parkgrove Terrace.
- 4.4 Proposals for Roseburn Cliff received a total of thirteen responses indicating either full or partial objections.
- 4.5 Officers have considered each of the responses and believe that the waiting and loading restrictions proposed for Roseburn Cliff are appropriate to ensure visibility is improved for all road users, particularly pedestrians. The measure should ensure that vehicles have adequate space to manoeuvre safely around the turning area and be able to navigate the southerly part of the street safely.
- 4.6 Pinkhill received two objections and other locations Northfield Drive, Lixmount Avenue, and Parkgrove Terrace all received one objection to the introduction of waiting restrictions at junctions.

Conclusion

- 4.7 Whilst Officers note the points raised in the objections to the proposed TRO, and understand there are concerns about reducing parking opportunities in some streets, the restrictions proposed aim to allow safer access for larger service vehicles and more generally improve road safety for all road users, particularly pedestrians.
- 4.8 It is recommended that the Committee approve the full making of TRO/25/01 as advertised.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 Should the TRO Sub-Committee approve the report recommendations TRO/25/01 will be formally made, with the necessary changes then being implemented on street. All objectors to the relevant TRO will be contacted to advise them of the Council's decision.

6. Financial impact

- 6.1 The costs involved in providing the required changes to road markings and signs will be met from existing budgets contained within the Parking and Traffic Regulation service area.

7. Key Policies

Equality and Poverty

- 7.1 In addition to complying with its duties under the 1984 Act and 1999 Regulations, in determining the TRO and RSO, Committee must have due regard to the Council's public sector equality duty, in terms of section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010, to the need to: Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act.
- 7.1.2 Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- 7.1.3 Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 7.2 The relevant protected characteristics are age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation.

Climate and Nature Emergencies

- 7.3 As a public body, the Council has statutory duties relating to climate emissions and biodiversity. The Council:
- 7.3.1 "must, in exercising its functions, act in the way best calculated to contribute to the delivery of emissions reduction targets" (Climate Change (Emissions Reductions Targets) (Scotland) Act 2019), and
- 7.3.2 "In exercising any functions, to further the conservation of biodiversity so far it is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions" (Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004)
- 7.4 The City of Edinburgh Council declared a Climate Emergency in 2019 and committed to work towards a target of net zero emissions by 2030 for both city and corporate emissions and embedded this as a core priority of the Council Business Plan 2023-27. The Council also declared a Nature Emergency in 2023.

Environmental Impacts

- 7.5 As part of the City Mobility Plan a Strategic Environmental Assessment was carried out, which concluded that the cumulative impacts of managing private car use and reducing commuting by private car travel, informed through parking controls proposed in this report, would have a positive impact on reducing environmental impact and responding to climate change.
- 7.6 The outcome of this TRO will allow proposals to progress and continue to be

implemented which in turn is intended to positively support environmental and climate change requirements

Housing Emergency

- 7.7 The Council declared a housing emergency in November 2023. The Housing Emergency Action Plan (HEAP) was considered by the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on 25 February 2025.
- 7.8 This report is anticipated to have no negative impacts on the housing emergency or on the HEAP.

8. Risk, compliance, governance and community impact

City Mobility Plan (CMP)

- 8.1 The amendments promoted by TRO/25/01 are aligned to the recent parking policy and support the Council's City Mobility Plan.
- 8.2 The CMP sets out Edinburgh's strategic framework for achieving sustainable and effective mobility across the city.
- 8.3 Policy measure Movement 17 within the CMP is focused on waiting and loading restrictions: 'Review, apply, and enforce parking, waiting and loading restriction whilst balancing the needs of local businesses and residents and people with mobility difficulties.'
- 8.4 Policy measure Movement 34 within the CMP is focused on parking controls: 'Extend the coverage and operational period of parking controls in the city to manage parking availability for the benefit of local residents and people with mobility difficulties.'
- 8.5 TROs are required to enable enforcement of parking restrictions, alongside appropriate road markings with accompanying signage if required. This process includes a pre-TRO consultation period, followed by a statutory consultation period.

Traffic Regulation Process - Legal Process

- 8.6 TRO advertisements are communicated online and via local press, the adverts explain how individuals or organisations can object to or support the relevant proposals.
- 8.7 All comments received are taken into consideration before determining whether to proceed, modify or abandon any proposals.
- 8.8 Ahead of the statutory TRO consultation commencement street notices were erected on street lighting at the entrance to all proposed locations.
- 8.9 There is no requirement to send letters to individual property owners as part of the TRO process.

Integrated Impact Assessment

- 8.10 The 2019 CMP had an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) undertaken, and in June 2023 a waiting and loading restrictions IIA was undertaken as part drafting the Parking Action Plan. The CMP and the copies of IIAs are published and publicly available on the Council's website. The waiting and loading restrictions IIA identified the following impacts, which are directly enabled through TRO/25/01:
- 8.11.1 The ability to keep streets clear of hazardous parking enabling the safe flow of traffic.
 - 8.11.2 Waiting or loading restrictions can help discourage private car use while encouraging the use of public transport as well as walking, wheeling and cycling. Improved air quality resulting from parking restrictions/management within Edinburgh make the city a more pleasant place to work and live.
 - 8.11.3 Improved air quality also greatly helps children and young people, as poor air quality can damage lung development and can result in breathing conditions such as asthma.
- 8.12 Potential negative impacts to disabled people were identified in the waiting and loading restriction IIA associated with parking restrictions, however, these are offset by the Council enabling Blue Badge holders to park free of charge and without time limit on yellow lines as long as they are not causing an obstruction to vehicle flow at that location or parking where loading prohibitions are in place at specified times. The recommendations of this report are deemed to protect our most vulnerable road users.
- 8.13 In the context of the approved City Mobility Plan, vulnerable road users are placed at the top of the transport hierarchy and as such should be afforded appropriate protection. As part of this pavement parking review, it was not considered appropriate to allow vehicles to drive on and obstruct the pavement.

9. Background reading/external references

- 9.1 [TRO/25/01 Originating YL Report \(2024\)](#)

10. Appendices

Appendix 1 - TRO/25/01: Comments received and the Council's response.

Appendix 1 – TRO/25/01 Correspondence received and the Council’s response

Appendix 1 summarises the comments received during Traffic Regulation Order (TRO/25/01) process and is split into three parts.

Part One - sets out the objections and partial objections received as part of TRO/25/01, identified by proposal location and shows the number of instances that each similar comment 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 and how many times the comment has come up. The objections have been split into distinct areas, reflecting issues that warranted detailed consideration or responses.

Part Two - sets out notes of support received

Part Three - sets out comments or suggestions received

Part One – Objections and partial objections received to TRO/25/01

Objection Theme or Element:		Roseburn Cliff	
Point No	Objection Detail	No. of comments	Response
1.	<p>I am wholly opposed to the additional yellow lines at the top cul-de-sac turning area of Roseburn Cliff, I have lived here for many years and there has never been a problem in this section of the street.</p> <p>There is no need to extend the existing double yellow line outside number 6 which will remove a 5m section of carriageway taking away a single vehicle space. There is already an adequate turning circle in place.</p>	8	<p>This location within Roseburn Cliff has been identified as a location where it is not safe or appropriate to park, and parking here has a negative impact on safety for road users. While this area may not be subject to congestion, these restrictions are considered to be necessary to reduce the likelihood of accidents and to generally improve road safety.</p> <p>Proposals to prevent parking in locations where it is not appropriate to park are an important part of the Council’s City Mobility Plan, supporting a number of key policy objectives.</p> <p>The extension of the existing restrictions at the cul-de-sac end will assist with vehicles utilising the turning area and stop repeated damage to local properties which has been reported by residents.</p>
2.	<p>There is no need to install double yellow lines outside number 18 and 19 and the entrance to the Water of Leith which will remove 15m (three vehicle spaces).</p> <p>The opening to the Water of Leith is very busy with walkers, dog walkers, children going to and from school or on school trips, tourists unfamiliar with the route as well as nature enthusiasts. I have walked the Water of Leith most days for many years I know how busy it is.</p>	8	<p>The new 24-hour double yellow line waiting restrictions at the entrance to the Water of Leith in Roseburn Cliff are required as this area of carriageway has been identified as a location where it is not safe or appropriate to park with these restrictions considered necessary to reduce the likelihood of accidents and to generally improve road safety in the street.</p> <p>Parking at the corner forcing vehicles to mount the only footpath at this location is unacceptable and the proposal will reduce the likelihood of accidents and to generally improve road safety by keeping the area outside 18 and 19 as well as the Water of Leith entrance clear of vehicles.</p>

<p>3.</p>	<p>The stationary cars, parked at the entrance to the Water of Leith and outside properties 18 and 19 have caused no issue over the years, and to remove them would cause faster approaches by incoming vehicles both into the Cliff and back down the street.</p> <p>It is important to keep this road as safe as possible to pedestrians, residents, drivers, visitors to the water of Leith and children and removing the spaces at the Water of Leith entrance does not achieve this.</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>The Council as Roads Authority has a duty placed upon it by national legislation to have regard for, and to take steps to improve the safety of roads for all road users.</p> <p>Proposals support the recommendations in the City Mobility Plan, particularly those related to supporting increased walking, wheeling and cycling. They also support the Plan by promoting improved safety for these more vulnerable road users and by tackling inconsiderate parking. The Actions supported are Movement 14, 22, 24 and 37.</p> <p>Waiting restrictions generally do not increase vehicle speed; in fact, they are often used as a traffic management tool to improve safety and promote more consistent, lower speeds.</p> <p>Improved Traffic Flow: By removing parked cars, waiting restrictions reduce the need for vehicles to constantly stop, start, and overtake, which can lead to a more consistent, controlled speed rather than high-speed bursts.</p> <p>Safety Improvements: In areas where parking is allowed, it can actually act as "informal traffic calming" by forcing drivers to navigate narrow spaces slowly.</p> <p>Increased Visibility: By removing parked cars, drivers can see hazards better, allowing them to slow down in time.</p> <p>In summary, while removing parked cars allows for better flow, it is not intended to encourage speeding; rather, it makes the traffic flow safer, more predictable, and easier to manage.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>There are disabled residents in the street and some need 24-hour care and parking spaces are essential for his carers.</p> <p>For the elderly, disabled and families with young children loss of parking spaces up Roseburn Cliff will be particularly challenging.</p> <p>This parking problem is exacerbated because several of Roseburn Cliff are elderly and/or retired and need to park close to home.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>The introduction of restrictions will improve the ability of those more vulnerable road users to safely use our road network which is a key part of making places more liveable, more accessible and safer to use.</p> <p>There is one Disabled Persons Parking Place 'Place' within the street, and this will remain in place.</p> <p>All double yellow waiting restrictions will remain available for Blue Badge parking for unrestricted periods of time provided no obstruction is caused. Loading can also take place by non-badge holders for up to thirty minutes should continual loading be observed.</p>

<p>5.</p>	<p>All spaces proposed for removal were occupied by cars when ambulances have been called to the street previously and caused no problem and left the street with no problem at all. Large delivery vans navigate the street easily.</p> <p>There is a weekly refuse collection using a full-size vehicle which is able to access the street. The vehicle is able to pass the parked cars reversing up the street. Ambulances, delivery vans and other vehicles are able to pass up the street at an appropriate and safe speed.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Council Waste colleagues have advised in January 2026 that servicing Roseburn Cliff has proven extremely difficult over the last years which has resulted in delayed/missed collections on occasion.</p> <p>The team have made efforts to deploy an 18t vehicle which is smaller than the normal 26t vehicles normally deployed to other collection areas.</p> <p>The 18t refuse vehicle often must mount the kerb when reversing up Roseburn Cliff and the Council's street cleansing team are often sent to service the street as they operate a 3.5t vehicle, but it is not always available.</p> <p>No vehicles should be required to mount the kerb to navigate the street. The Council has approved an approach to aim for zero road deaths by 2030. The protection of footpath space is considered a positive step in this commitment and should make our roads safer for all road users</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Residents require these spaces as there are already not enough vehicle spaces for the number of properties on the street.</p> <p>Removal of these spaces will also cause extra parking pressure on neighbouring streets. Roseburn Cliff has functioned positively and organically for many years with the current set up.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The locations where changes are proposed are not considered appropriate for parking to take place. Inspections have identified that parking restrictions are now required.</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that there is a loss of parking opportunity, proposals support wider hierarchical transport policies and objectives discussed throughout this report</p> <p>There are, however, other parking opportunities within this vicinity including free parking opportunity in neighbouring streets such Murrayfield Place.</p> <p>Roseburn Cliff is currently situated within Priority Parking Area B9 with all resident spaces operational Mon-Fri 13:30-15:30pm.</p> <p>Officers propose to engage with residents of Roseburn Cliff to see if the remaining spaces within Roseburn Cliff should be proposed as resident parking spaces as part of B9. This would mean the remaining spaces would remain exclusive to Roseburn Cliff residents during controlled hours and allow eligible Roseburn Cliff residents to park in resident bays in neighbouring streets.</p>

Objection Theme or Element: Pinkhill			
Point No	Objection Detail	No. of comments	Response
1.	A coffee shop and joinery business are in the process of starting up in the property directly outside where the restrictions are proposed. This is not good for business and parking charges are additional costs which were not considered when renovating the building.	2	The Council are not implementing a Controlled Parking Zone or any type of pay & display parking at this location. 24-hour waiting restrictions are being added to protect sight lines on the southeast kerb lines to protect lines of sight for road users and pedestrians.
2.	The zoo is nearby and this area is ideal for families with young children to park without additional costs.	1	Double yellow line restrictions will not add additional costs as there is still plentiful free unrestricted parking nearby.
3.	Who is directly affected by the parking on this road and why you feel you need to apply restrictions?	1	The 90 degree bend at Pinkhill has been identified as a location where it is not safe or appropriate to park, and where parking other than could have a negative impact on safety for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. While this area may not be subject to congestion, these restrictions are considered to be necessary to reduce the likelihood of accidents and to generally improve road safety.

Objection Theme or Element: Northfield Drive			
Point No	Objection Detail	No. of comments	Response
1.	This would cause excess parking problems in the surrounding streets.	1	No migration to other streets in the area is expected, restrictions are only being added to junctions for safety and parking opportunity in the local area will not be affected.

Objection Theme or Element: Lixmount Avenue			
Point No	Objection Detail	No. of comments	Response
1.	It seems that staff at nearby Trinity Academy are parking in streets near to the school because of an absence of a staff parking facility. I am not aware of particular pressure regarding parking or potential safety issues in relation to vehicles for Lixmount Avenue.	1	Proposals support the recommendations in the City Mobility Plan, particularly those related to supporting increased walking, wheeling and cycling. They also support the Plan by promoting improved safety for these more vulnerable road users and by tackling inconsiderate parking. The Actions supported are Movement 14, 22, 24 and 37.

			The issue of school staff parking in the local area is not within scope of this TRO however if any vehicles are seen parking on existing restrictions, then enforcement action will be taken by Parking Attendants.
--	--	--	---

Objection Theme or Element: Parkgrove Terrace			
Point No	Objection Detail	No. of comments	Response
1.	These parking restrictions right on the corners of a busy area close to the church and Parkgrove shopping. It is already tight to find areas to park when required, by limiting this even further, I feel would not be beneficial to the area	1	<p>The locations where changes are proposed are not considered appropriate for parking to take place. There are, however, other parking opportunities within this vicinity which will remain free of charge.</p> <p>Proposals support the recommendations in the City Mobility Plan, particularly those related to supporting increased walking, wheeling and cycling. They also support the Plan by promoting improved safety for these more vulnerable road users and by tackling inconsiderate parking.</p>

Part Two – Supportive responses received to TRO/25/01

Supportive Theme or Element:		Roseburn Cliff	
Point No	Supportive Theme or Element	No. of comments	Response
1.	I support this proposal as there are challenges in the street with vehicles attempting to pass parked vehicles on the bend at the Water of Leith Entrance	6	This supportive comment is noted.
2.	Support the proposed extension of existing restriction on the east side of the top of Roseburn Cliff as this will support better access into and out of the turning circle and prevent damage to properties when larger vehicles are trying to manoeuvre between properties and a parked vehicle.	5	This supportive comment is noted.

Supportive Theme or Element:		Northfield Drive	
Point No	Supportive Theme or Element	No. of comments	Response
1.	I very much support TRO/25/01, specifically the parts related to Duddingston parking restrictions which should positively influence the overall traffic flow, as well as pedestrian and cyclists' safety through extended sightlines.	2	This supportive comment is noted.

Supportive Theme or Element:		Durham Drive	
Point No	Supportive Theme or Element	No. of comments	Response
1.	Happy for something to be tried.	1	This supportive comment is noted.
2.	This is an excellent proposal and something I have thought necessary since moving to the area six months ago.	1	This supportive comment is noted.

Supportive Theme or Element: Baberton Park			
Point No	Supportive Theme or Element	No. of comments	Response
1.	I strongly support double yellow lines at the corner of Baberton Park and Baberton Avenue. There are always cars/ vans parked at and around the junction as yellow lines would provide a clear view for pedestrians. This also applies to people with prams or wheelchair users.	1	This supportive comment is noted.

Part Three – Comments and suggestions received to TRO/25/01

Suggestions and Comments:		Roseburn Cliff	
Point No	Suggestions	No. of comments	Response
1.	More patrols are required by the Council's parking attendants to enforce the existing restrictions at the turning circle	4	Officers have contacted the Council's Parking Attendants and asked if more frequent patrols could be undertaken including evening and weekends.
2.	Do not remove the restrictions proposed to be removed at the bottom of the street outside Papes Cottage, these should be maintained	3	Restrictions are not being removed at the entrance to Roseburn Cliff with existing restrictions on the west side of Roseburn Cliff outside Papes Cottage leading to the Water of Leith entrance being upgraded from a no waiting double yellow restriction to a no loading at any time restriction.

Suggestions and Comments:		Durham Drive	
Point No	Suggestions	No. of comments	Response
1.	Restrictions should be added at St Johns and Hamiltons streets near the school. Cars are just abandoned on school run, buses struggle to pass, visibility is impacted when trying to exit with vehicles parked up to and on corners.	1	This supportive comment is noted, and officers will conduct required surveys to establish if further restrictions are required.
2.	The junctions on Mountcastle Drive North, Duddingston Avenue and Duddingston Road/Drive should be turned into a 1-way system.	1	This comment has been noted and will be passed to the appropriate transport team.
3.	Please send Parking Wardens as cars park on the double yellows that are already there at the top of the road/Milton Road	1	Officers have contacted the Council's Parking Attendants and asked if more frequent patrols could be undertaken.

Suggestions and Comments:		Baberton Park	
Point No	Suggestions	No. of comments	Response
1.	If the double yellow lines go ahead there would probably be more cars parked in Baberton Park, as cars would be displaced and drivers park there when using shops on Lanark Road. I would therefore request white lines painted at dropped	1	Residents are able to apply for an Access Protection marking via our the Council's website Access protection markings – The City of Edinburgh Council

	kerbs in front of driveways to prevent driveways becoming blocked.		
--	--	--	--

Suggestions and Comments:		Unrelated or Unspecified Objections	
Point No	Suggestions	No. of comments	Response
1.	Two comments were received by a resident of Roseburn Terrace regarding resident permit eligibility and future CPZ expansion.	1	CPZ permit eligibility is out with the scope of the TRO however officers will follow up with the resident separately.
2.	One comment criticised the quality of the paving stones on Princess Street and how the Council wastes money.	1	Not relevant or within the scope of TRO/25/01 but comments have been passed to the relevant roads team for their attention.