

Report authorised by Executive Director of Place under Delegated Powers

20 May 2026

TRO/25/52 Proposed Introduction of Disabled Persons Parking Places (DPPP) Consideration of Objections Received

Routine

Wards: 1 Pentland Hills, 2 Drum Brae/Gyle, 3 Sighthill/Gorgie, 4 Leith Walk, 5 Liberton/Gilmerton, 6 Portobello/Craigmillar, 7 Southside/Newington, 8 Almond, 9 Corstorphine/Murrayfield, 10 Inverleith

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 Note the comments and objections received in response to the advertisement of draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) TRO/25/52 and the Council's responses to the points that were raised.
- 1.2 Approve the removal of the proposal for new Disabled Persons Parking Place (DPPP) at St Alban's Road ahead of the order being 'made' in response to recent communications with residents and surveys which highlight the DPPP no longer required.
- 1.3 Approve the setting aside of the four objections to TRO/25/52 and the making of the order with the remaining locations as advertised.

Gavin N Brown

Gavin Brown

Service Director, Operational Services

Contact: Gavin Graham, Parking and Traffic Regulation Manager

E-mail: gavin.graham@edinburgh.gov.uk

• EDINBURGH •
THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

Report

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) TRO/25/52 proposed the introduction new Disabled Person's Parking Places (DPPP) and sought to formalise existing advisory DPPP to enable enforcement at twenty-four locations. The TRO was advertised in [April and May 2026](#), at this 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.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Council, having received requests from the public and considered its duties under the terms of The Disabled Persons Parking Places (Scotland) Act 2009 Act, identified locations where new, or the formalisation of existing advisory, Disabled Person's Parking Places are required.
- 3.3 This report fulfils the Council's legal obligation to show that any comments received, including objections to the draft TRO have been fully considered prior to a decision being taken on the future of said proposals.
- 3.4 Paragraph 86 of Appendix 6 of the Council's Scheme of Delegation to Officers delegates authority to the Executive 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

Responses Received and Consideration of Objections

- 4.1 Four responses were received during the advertisement of TRO/25/52. This report details the points raised by respondents and sets out the Council's responses to each point of objection in turn, where appropriate.
- 4.2 The content of the objections received, and the Council's responses to those objections, are detailed in Appendix 1. This appendix also details any suggestions or comments received as part of the advertised proposal.
- 4.3 Of the twenty-four locations included within the draft TRO advertisement, four comments indicating objections including partial objections were received in relation

to the following two locations: Burgess Road (South Queensferry) and Almondside (Kirkliston).

- 4.4 One objection was received in response to the Burgess Road proposal and a further two objections were received to the DPPP proposal in Almondside (Kirkliston). There was also another sole objection received which was unrelated to TRO/25/52 and all responses can be found in Appendix 1.
- 4.5 After the advertising period of the draft TRO had ended officers became aware of a location that should not proceed as advertised. Whilst no objections were received to the St Alban's Road proposal, the DPPP should not be installed as advertised and should be removed as surveys and resident communications have indicated the DPPP is no longer required.

Conclusion

- 4.6 For the reasons provided in response to comments raised in Appendix 1 and as outlined in this report above, Officers are satisfied that TRO/25/52 should be 'made' pending the removal of proposal at St Alban's Road location as described above.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 If approved all parties who commented on the proposals during the advertisement stage will be contacted via email and advised about this decision.
- 5.2 The legal process will be concluded, with TRO/25/52 being "made" and the changes will be reflected on street.

6. Financial impact

- 6.1 All costs associated in providing the required add or change road markings and signage will be met from the existing budget contained within Parking Controls team.

7. Key Policies

- 7.1 In addition to complying with its duties under the 1984 Act and 1999 Regulations, in determining the TRO and RSO, Officers' 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:
 - 7.1.1 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.

Climate and Nature Emergencies

- 7.2 As a public body, the Council has statutory duties relating to climate emissions and biodiversity. The Council:
- 7.2.1 “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
 - 7.2.2 “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)
- 7.3 The City of Edinburgh Council declared a Climate Emergency in 2019 and committed to work towards a target of net zero 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

- 7.4 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.

Housing Emergency

- 7.5 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.
- 7.6 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/25/52 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.
- 8.2.1 Policy measure Movement 17 within the CMP focused on waiting and loading restrictions. ‘Review, apply, and enforce parking, waiting and loading restrictions whilst balancing the needs of local businesses and residents and people with mobility difficulties.’
 - 8.2.2 Policy measure 34 within 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.'

- 8.3 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

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

Integrated Impact Assessment

- 8.8 In 2019 CMP had an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) undertaken, and in June 2023 further IIAs related to parking and DPPP were 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](#).

9. Background reading/external references

- 9.1 [TRO-25-52 TRO Advertisement April-May 2026](#)

10. Appendices

Appendix 1 – TRO/25/52 Correspondence received and the Council's response

Appendix 1 – TRO/25/52 Correspondence received and the Council's response

This appendix provides details of the responses received to the advertising of the above Order. It further sets out the Council's response to the points made, as well as outlining or detailing any changes proposed to the Order as advertised or changes that are proposed to be delivered under a separate legal process.

This appendix splits the responses received by location and is split into the following parts:

Part A – Almondside (Kirkliston)

Part B – Burgess Road (South Queensferry)

Part C – Objections which are unrelated to TRO/25/52

Each part, covering a specific location, will detail all of the responses received, whether:

- a) Objections
- b) Indications of support
- c) Comments or suggestions

Where multiple responses have made similar points, each part will include details of the number of persons who made similar points, comments or suggestions.

Part A		Location:	Almondside (Kirkliston)
Point No	Objection Detail	No. of Comments	Response
1.	"I object as this Disabled Persons Parking Place (DPPP) is being abused by one family" "My disabled visitor can't get a space"	2	These comments have been investigated. The purpose of this TRO is to ensure that the existing advisory DPPP outside 20 becomes legally enforceable and can only be used only by Blue Badge holders. Records confirm that there are multiple Blue Badge Holders in the vicinity and this bay should remain in place. Monitoring will take place to establish if further DPPP would be of benefit. Officers will investigate to see if another DPPP is required.
Point No	Support Detail	No. of Comments	Response
2.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Point No	Comments or suggestions	No. of Comments	Response
3.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Part B		Location:	Burgess Road (South Queensferry)
Point No	Objection Detail	No. of Comments	Response
1.	"Parking on Burgess Road is already a nightmare. Most houses don't have driveways so we are already competing for the limited spaces available." "There are already a number of disabled parking spaces on the road so adding more is going to make the situation even worse."	1	These comments have been investigated, and it has been confirmed that the Council are not adding more DPPP in Burgess Road. The purpose of this TRO is to ensure that the existing advisory DPPP outside 11 becomes legally enforceable and can only be used only by Blue Badge holders. No additional DPPP are being added at this location.
Point No	Support Detail	No. of Comments	Response
2.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Point No	Comments or suggestions	No. of Comments	Response
3.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Part C		Location:	Objections which are unrelated to TRO/25/52	
Point No	Objection Detail	No. of Comments	Response	
1.	"In response to your proposal for metered parking bays on Stenhouse Crescent, although I'm sure you have received complaints about parking in this area over the years. The parking problems only occur at weekends and evenings, most traffic problems in this area are in actual fact caused by over use of the nearby Saughton Park, which has inadequate parking for the volume of visitors, there by causing park goers to use the surrounding streets. Also Saughton Park is one of the last areas in the vicinity where parking is still free in the North Gorgie area, therefore only pushing traffic and parking problems further out not addressing the problems in any way. The nearby Murrayfield stadium and Tynecastle Park, also add to congestion problems, which in the east side of Stenhouse Crescent is the more pressing problem, not day time parking at all. As you will well be aware of, Rugby, football and events take place at weekends and evenings, thus making your suggestions for day time restrictions redundant! A more sensible approach would be to be to have residents parking restrictions, similar to the schemes at the Baird Drive areas on the days that large events are held near by. This whole proposal had been badly organised, and has not been properly investigated whatsoever, there has not been any consultation with the local residents or for that matter with the local Stenhouse, Saughton Mains and Whitson Community Council or any of the local councillors, a few of whom live locally and are very much more aware of the congestion problems than yourselves. These proposed parking bays in Stenhouse Crescent are completely unnecessary and will ultimately only cause the local residents, problems, which at the moment only exist outwith permit parking time limits."	1	This objection is not within the scope of TRO/25/52, we are formalising an existing Disabled Person's Parking Place at 132 Stenhouse Crescent. We are not introducing a Controlled Parking Zone at this location. TRO/25/52 does not propose pay and display parking.	
Point No	Support Detail	No. of Comments	Response	
2.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Point No	Comments or suggestions	No. of Comments	Response	
3.	N/A	N/A	N/A	