Corporate Director's Report – Place

12:00, Thursday, 27 August 2026

Objections to Traffic Regulation Order TRO/25/57A Secure On-street Cycle Parking

Decision/scrutiny	**Decision**
Wards	**5 – Inverleith** **9 – Fountainbridge / Craiglockhart** **10 – Morningside** **11 – City Centre** **12 – Leith Walk** **13 – Leith** **15 – Southside / Newington**

1. Recommendations

1.1 To note the 23 objections received to the advertising of Traffic Regulation Order TRO/25/57A in relation to the proposed installation of 51 cycle hangars across 30 streets; and

1.2 To set aside the objections for the reasons described and make the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as advertised.

Gavin Brown

Service Director for Transport and Mobility

Contact: Jack Orso, Transport Officer

E-mail: Jack.Orso@edinburgh.gov.uk

EDINBVRGH
THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

Report

Objections to Traffic Regulation Order TRO/25/57A Secure On-street Cycle Parking

2. Executive Summary

2.1 Proposals to make changes to kerbside parking and waiting that would allow for the installation of a further 51 cycle hangars across 30 streets in Edinburgh were formally advertised to the public through Traffic Regulation Order TRO/25/57A over a three-week period in May and July 2026.

2.2 A total of 23 objections to specific locations were received, with no locations receiving more than six objections.

2.3 This report seeks to set aside the objections received as part of Traffic Regulation Order TRO/25/57A and to make the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as advertised.

3. Background

3.1 The Secure On-street Cycle Parking project aims to provide secure, on-street cycle storage options for residents of high-density housing, such as tenements and multi storey buildings, without access to private garages or gardens.

3.2 To date, 277 cycle hangars at 209 locations have been installed across the city as part of the project.

3.3 The project is part of the Council's City Mobility Plan Capital Investment Programme.

4. Main report

4.1 In accordance with legislative requirements relating to traffic orders, the Council carried out a consultation for TRO/25/57 with statutory consultees for three weeks from 6 March 2026. No objections were received from the statutory consultees.

4.2 TRO/25/57 was initially advertised between 1 to 22 May 2026. However, no letter notification took place.

4.3 The decision was made to re-advertise with a letter notification taking place with comments received from the initial TRO carried forward.

4.4 The draft TRO was subsequently readvertised as TRO/25/57A between 3 and 31 July 2026.

4.5 In total, the TRO received 38 representations, amounting to 23 objections to specific locations and 22 notes of support to specific locations. One general objection and two general notes of support were also received.

4.6 The table below provides a breakdown of representation type for each location.

Location	Representation type	
	Object	Support
All (general)	1	2
Balfour Street outside no. 31	1	1
Brunton Place outside no. 4	0	2
Brunton Terrace At end of bay outside no. 30	0	3
Bryson Road outside no. 30	1	0
Cambusnethan Street outside no. 16	2	0
Dalmeny Street outside no. 15	1	0
Duff Street at end of bay outside no.29	0	1
Duff Street outside no.23	0	1
Easter Road outside no. 309	1	0
Forbes Road outside no. 8	1	0
Gillespie Crescent opposite no. 22	3	2
Grange Loan opposite no. 40	0	1
Learmonth Grove outside no. 24	1	0
Montgomery Street outside no.100	0	1
Montgomery Street outside no.44	5	1
Polwarth Gardens outside no. 42 (John Ker Court)	5	5
Springwell Place outside no. 30	0	2
Wellington Place opposite no. 4	1	0
Total	**23**	**22**

4.7 The feedback categories submitted by the responder are summarised in the table below.

Category	Object	Support
Access	6	5
Disturbance	7	2
Environmental	4	7

Financial	1	2
Other	2	4
Parking	12	15
Safety	7	6
Traffic	3	2
No category selected	4	0

4.8 The main themes identified in the objections are summarised in the table below, along with the Council's responses.

Objection Theme	No. of mentions
Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced	9
Concerns over emergency vehicle access	8
Cycle hangars are noisy	6
Cycle hangars attract vandals or graffiti	5
Affect pavement access for residents with mobility issues	4
Local issue as located in front of retirement flats (Polwarth Gardens, John Ker Court)	4
Cars already park illegally	3
Cycle hangars are unattractive	3
Fly-tipping occurs	3
No one in the building wants a space	3
Road is already busy, constrained, or narrow	3
Unneeded as bikes can be stored on the street or within properties	3
Anti-social behaviour increases	2
Limited space already due to bins	2
Local parking issues due to match days at Hibernian FC stadium (Cambusnethan Street)	2
Loitering increases	2
Cycle hangars are not maintained	1
Cycle hangars will not be used	1
Inefficient use of parking spaces	1
Large street structure will take away from the character of the building - cat. B listed (Forbes Road Outside no. 8)	1
Limit access to bins	1
Reduce privacy	1
Safety concern for cyclists	1
War on motorists	1

4.9 The objection themes and Council responses can be found in Appendix 1, and the full objections found in Appendix 2.

4.10 Paragraph 86 of the 'Traffic' section of Appendix 6 of the Council's Scheme of Delegation to Officers delegates authority to the Corporate Director of Place to make traffic orders where there have been no more than six objections received from the public (or, where the order includes locations in different streets, no more than six objections per location) and where there have been no statutory objections.

5. Next Steps

5.1 Set aside the objections received as part of Traffic Regulation Order TRO/25/57A and to make the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as advertised.

5.2 The residents who submitted objections will be contracted via email and advised about the decision.

6. Financial impact

6.1 The costs associated with the TRO will be covered by the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking budget.

7. Key Policies

Equality and Poverty

7.1 This project positively impacts cyclists through the increased provision of secure on-street storage options. Reducing barriers to cycling for everyday journeys will positively impact groups less likely to cycle, including women, minority ethnic people, older people, and disabled people as detailed in the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), see 9.5.

7.2 When scoring potential locations for this phase of the project, additional weighting was given for areas in SIMD deciles 1-3.

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 as 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 The impacts of this report have been considered in relation to the three elements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 Public Bodies Duties and the outcomes are summarised below. Relevant Council sustainable development policies have

been taken into account and are noted under Background Reading later in this report.

7.6 The proposals in this report are in line with the Council's Climate Emergency declaration and climate objectives because active travel measures remove barriers to walking and cycling for everyday journeys which in turn improves air quality and reduce carbon emissions. Those who choose to use these modes of transport will also benefit from the exercise which has a positive impact on their health.

7.7 The need to build resilience to climate change impacts is not relevant to the proposals in this report because there are no expected impacts related to this matter from the TRO statutory process.

7.8 The proposals related to the measures proposed under the TRO statutory process are in line with the Council's Nature Emergency declaration because these contribute to modal shift and reducing pollution levels across the city. Small improvements in air quality, at locations where traffic levels have decreased, align with the Council's Air Quality objectives.

7.9 The proposals in this report will help achieve a sustainable Edinburgh because the restrictions will increase sustainable everyday journeys by making them easier, their implementation will also generate short term green local employment opportunities. The better walking and cycling infrastructure will reduce fuel costs for those choosing these modes over motor vehicles.

7.10 Measures under this TRO align with Our Future Streets: Circulation Plan, the City Mobility Plan, and wider Council policies to meet net zero goals.

Housing Emergency

7.11 The measures stemming from the recommendations of this report are not considered to have any impacts related to the current housing emergency.

8. Risk, compliance, governance and community impact

8.1 The TRO was progressed through the statutory process in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999 and in line with the Road Traffic Act 1984, as amended. This includes statutory consultation and public consultation, which allowed for objections to be submitted.

8.2 The TRO was advertised in the press and on street. Additionally, notification letters were sent to residential addresses overlooking the planned locations.

8.3 Should the recommendations of this report not be followed, there is a reputational risk to The City of Edinburgh Council as the measures would have been advertised but then not implemented. There is also an expectation to continue with the delivery of this scheme.

8.4 It is deemed that the measures stemming from the recommendations of this report are averse in the context of the Council's risk appetite as any risks are related to

regulatory and legislative compliance and the activities recommended to be undertaken carry virtually no inherent risk.

9. Background reading/external references

9.1 City Mobility Plan, 2021-2030, Implementation Plan, Delivering Actions for Active Travel

9.2 City Mobility Plan – Capital Investment Programme Prioritisation Outputs – May 2025

9.3 City Mobility Plan Capital Investment Programme Update 2025/26 – September 2025

9.4 Our Future Streets – a circulation plan for Edinburgh – February 2024

9.5 Secure On-Street Cycle Parking Phase 2 Integrated Impact Assessment

10. Appendices

Appendix 1 – objection themes, occurrence, and response

Objection Theme	No. of mentions	Response
Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced	9	A standard cycle hangar takes up less space than one vehicle but provides six secure cycle parking spaces for residents. Where possible, we try reduce the impact on parking generally. However, we also try to balance locating cycle hangars proximate to where the requests come from. The Council aims to reduce car-dependency by making alternatives such as cycling more accessible. In the long run this should reduce congestion and pressure on parking while helping to reduce pollution.
Concerns over emergency vehicle access	8	The proposed locations are generally located within vehicle parking bays and therefore do not obstruct traffic flows or reduce access more than a parked car. A standard cycle hangar takes up less space than a parked car.
Cycle hangars are noisy	6	The hangars are designed with a gas sprung hinge that makes it difficult to slam the door.
Cycle hangars attract vandals or graffiti	5	Graffiti is illegal, and any graffiti on cycle hangars should be reported to the Council for removal.
Affect pavement access for residents with mobility issues	4	The proposed locations are generally located within vehicle parking bays. A standard cycle hangar takes up less space than a parked car but provides space for six bikes to be securely stored.
Local issue as located in front of retirement flats (Polwarth Gardens)	4	The two hangars located in the parking bays will take up less space than two parked cars and service the significant demand in the area.
Cars already park illegally	3	Objection not material to these proposals.
Cycle hangars are unattractive	3	The cycle hangars have a discreet design. They are smaller than the average car, and coloured dark green.
Fly-tipping occurs	3	Objection not material to these proposals.
No one in the building wants a space	3	Demand for cycle hangars is very high in Edinburgh. Occupancy has been consistently above 95% and most cycle hangars have a significant waiting list. Request and waitlist data is used within the selection criteria for sites to ensure hangars serve the areas they are placed in.
Road is already busy, constrained, or narrow	3	The proposed locations are generally located within vehicle parking bays. A standard cycle hangar takes up less space than a parked car but provides space for six bikes to be securely stored.

Unneeded as bikes can be stored on the street or within properties	3	Providing secure cycle storage was identified as an important way to support residents to cycle more by the most recent Edinburgh Walking and Cycling Index. Many Edinburgh residents live in flats with no lift access, making it difficult to store bikes inside. Storing bikes in common stairs can cause an obstruction for other residents. Bikes stored outside are at risk of theft and rust and degrade more quickly.
Anti-social behaviour increases	2	Cycle hangars are placed where they will be overlooked to increase security through natural surveillance.
Limited space already due to bins	2	The proposed locations are generally located within vehicle parking bays. A standard cycle hangar takes up less space than a parked car but provides space for six bikes to be securely stored.
Local parking issues due to match days at Hibernian FC stadium (Cambusnethan Street)	2	The proposed locations are generally located within vehicle parking bays. A standard cycle hangar takes up less space than a parked car but provides space for six bikes to be securely stored.
Loitering increases	2	Cycle hangars are placed where they will be overlooked to increase security through natural surveillance. Spaces are kept to two per household so loitering whilst collecting or dropping off a bicycle should be kept to a minimum.
Cycle hangars are not maintained	1	Under the maintenance contract that the operator of the scheme holds with the Council, each cycle hangar will be serviced at least twice a year, and any maintenance queries will be resolved in three working days.
Cycle hangars will not be used	1	Demand for cycle hangars is very high in Edinburgh. Occupancy has been consistently above 95% and most cycle hangars have a significant waiting list.
Inefficient use of parking spaces	1	Where possible cycle hangars are orientated in-line with cars to reduce the impact on parking. Generally, one hangar removes less than one parking space, and two hangars remove less than two parking spaces. Where parking is perpendicular to the road hangars are located "hub-style" which removes 7.0m of vehicle parking and allows for 12 cycle parking spaces for residents.
Large street structure will take away from the character of the building - cat. B listed (Forbes Road Outside no. 8)	1	The cycle hangar will be located within vehicle parking bay but is smaller than the average parked car. They are also coloured dark green in a discrete design as agreed with Edinburgh World Heritage.
Limit access to bins	1	We have liaised with the Waste Team when designing this project to unsure there would be no impact on communal bins.
Reduce privacy	1	Where possible we locate cycle hangars away from windows that can be directly viewed from the street.
Safety concern for cyclists	1	Cycle hangars are accessed by the pavement or, when located hub-style, from within a protected area. When joining the carriageway, it is the cyclist's responsibility to do so safely.

War on motorists	1	Objection not material to these proposals.

Appendix 2 – redacted Reponses (see attached)

11. Approval

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Service Director for Transport and Mobility	Gavin Brown	Gavin N Brown	30.09.2026

OriginalFeedbackDate	ResponderType	FeedbackCategories	OrderSupport	FeedbackText	Objection themes
07/29/2026 18:39:37 +01:00	Resident	Safety,Access,Disturbance,Environmental	PartlyObject	I would like to object to the location of the cycle hangar outside 44 Montgomery Street. This is a relatively short bay near the corner. I am concerned about emergency access, disturbance to the flats which have front bedrooms and the potential for vandalism as other street furniture nearby is subject to graffiti. I think there would be better locations nearby for this hangar.	Concerns over emergency vehicle access; Cycle hangars are noisy; Cycle hangars attract vandals or graffiti
07/29/2026 16:51:30 +01:00	Visitor	Parking	PartlyObject	I object to any and all proposals for a parallel cycle hanger design within a transverse parking area namely Balfour Street, Easter Road, Dalmeny Street, Learmonth Grove. There is no reason why these hangers cannot match the parking design as has been done correctly in Iona Street. Hangers should be installed at the edge of the recessed area in a transverse style, opening up onto the side of the footway so as to remove only one parking space rather than multiple as would be the case with a parallel hanger in a transverse bay. Unless specific reasons can be provided for each of the above named streets, I expect alterations to be made to this proposal prior to approval being sought. Failure to do so will once again show Edinburgh City Council Officers and Councillors disregard of parking pressures faced by local, permit-paying, residents.	Inefficient use of parking spaces
07/25/2026 10:39:34 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Support	Please provide the new bike hangar storage on duff st	
07/21/2026 12:34:46 +01:00	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	While we support the addition of cycle storage, we suggest that some of the locations could be improved. Locally to us, we suggest that rather than locating the storage in Montgomery Street, it is located round the corner in the "lost" space in Brunswick Street. Please see attached marked up map 6 and photo of proposed location.	
07/17/2026 12:03:35 +01:00	Resident	Parking,Safety,Disturbance	PartlySupport	I live in [REDACTED]. The noise associated with opening and closing hangers would be disturbing and distressing to vulnerable people. The location will relace a number of car parking spaces, without reducing the demand for parking in this area. I wholeheartedly agree with encouraging bike use and don't want to be a NIMBY but feel that this location is not suitable. Has consideration been given to hanger spaces in the changes to the road layout expected to begin within the next year? I do not recall seeing provision.	
07/17/2026 10:50:27 +01:00	Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Access,Disturbance	Object	I wholly oppose this proposal on the following grounds: 1. The street is already contested with a number of businesses that double park over cars, bins and this would reduce parking further. 2. I am parking permit holder and the street does have enough spaces for all permit holders as it is which is an unfair disadvantage i am paying over other permit holders payers in the city. 3. Damage to cars from cyclists and other vehicles in the narrow street. 4. Parking in the area is already greatly effected regularly at the weekend due to Hibernian FC matches with no provision put in place for residents first. 4. Due to Guatams at the end of the street there is regular double parking once again leading to already access difficulties for me as a resident. 5. I also fear this will lead to an increase in anti social behaviour in the area with more people hanging around. We already see issues due to the Hoppy Pub and also regular e bike issues both involved in potential illegal activity and delivering takeaways the later which regularly cycle at speed down the road not aware of pedestrians and going down the wrong way of the street due to this being a one way road only. 6. Regular fly tipping on the street already prevents residents from parking in bays which they pay for. I have been required to report this issue many times, this will be in council records	Cars already park illegally; Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced; Local parking issues due to match days at Hibernian FC stadium (Cambusnethan Street); Anti-social behaviour increases; Fly-tipping occurs
07/17/2026 09:04:02 +01:00	Resident	Parking,Safety,Disturbance	Object	I reject this proposal on the following grounds 1. Parking is already very restricted on the street and as we pay for this this is grossly unfair to remove more and this not be immediately reflected in what we pay. 2. Parking in the area is already greatly effected regularly at the weekend due to Hibernian FC matches with no provision put in place for residents first. 3. Due to Guatams at the end of the street there is regular double parking once again leading to already access difficulties for me as a resident. 4. I also fear this will lead to an increase in anti social behaviour in the area with more people hanging around. We already see issues due to the Hoppy Pub and also regular e bike issues both involved in potential illegal activity and delivering takeaways the later which regularly cycle at speed down the road not aware of pedestrians and going down the wrong way of the street due to this being a one way road only. 5. Regular fly tipping on the street already prevents residents from parking in bays which they pay for. I have been required to report this issue many times, this will be in council records. Finally I believe a clear issue for Edinburgh before introducing more bikes to the city is getting on top of the chronic e-bike issue we are clearly facing. I also believe the issue facing Cambusnethan Street which should be addressed as a priority over this scheme is drivers illegally parking (double parking, parking over the bins both preventing access and collection, parking double yellow lines and driving through the no entry and the going down the wrong way of the street.	Cars already park illegally; Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced; Local parking issues due to match days at Hibernian FC stadium (Cambusnethan Street); Anti-social behaviour increases; Fly-tipping occurs
07/16/2026 18:19:21 +01:00	Resident	Parking,Environmental	Support	It's great to hear there's a proposal to install a bike rack outside our flat. I would definitely consider getting a bike if I could secure a space, and it would make getting around much easier. I think the bike rack would be well used, as the area has many tenement flats with very limited storage space for bicycles. It would also encourage more people to choose sustainable, active forms of travel, benefiting both residents and the wider community.	
07/16/2026 18:17:44 +01:00	Resident	Parking,Environmental	Support	Really pleased the Council is progressing this plan. There are currently no cycle hangers at all on our street and living in a tenement flat there is no space to securely store a bike. Will be of great benefit to a good number of residents and to other neighbours as cycling is proven to be one of the most accessible, sustainable and healthy ways to get around!	
07/13/2026 09:12:49 +01:00	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	I object to the proposal to replace permit holder parking spaces on Gillespie Crescent with cycle storage hangars. While I support secure cycle storage and measures to encourage active travel, I do not believe Gillespie Crescent is a suitable location. Key concerns: - Parking on Gillespie Crescent is already at full capacity, with residents regularly unable to find spaces. - Gillespie Crescent is a dead-end road with permit holder parking available on only one side of the street. The single yellow lines on the opposite side are already frequently used for overspill parking due to the lack of available spaces (see images). - Removing one or more permit bays is likely to increase parking on the yellow lines, further restricting access along an already constrained street. - This is a particular concern given the supported living facility opposite the flats, which requires regular emergency vehicle access. I have personally observed larger emergency vehicles, including fire engines, unable to access the street due to parked vehicles and the limited road width. - Residents already struggle to park near their homes despite paying for residential parking permits. Reducing parking capacity will only worsen an existing problem. I believe there is a more suitable alternative location in the unused area beside the telephone box at the end of Gillespie Crescent. This would allow cycle storage to be provided without removing permit holder parking spaces or increasing parking pressures. This is a double width pavement and placing the cycle storage hangars there would not impact accessibility (see image) I therefore ask that the proposal be reconsidered and that either this alternative location, or another nearby location with less constrained parking, be used instead.	Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced; Concerns over emergency vehicle access
07/11/2026 17:20:01 +01:00	Resident	Traffic,Safety,Access	Object	On the grounds of safety and access, I am very concerned about the installation of cycle hangars directly outside a block of retirement flats, as I believe it will increase potential hazards for the residents. All residents are elderly , many with compromised mobility, with hearing and eyesight defects and many use walking aids and motorised chairs. I believe the hangars often overhang the pavement kerbs and this is already a narrow pavement with a lot of foot traffic. Visibility is already compromised for vehicles leaving John Ker Court, and I suspect cycle hangars in the proposed location will exacerbate this. Because of the nature of the residents in this block, there is an increased presence of supermarket delivery vehicles, ambulances and taxis around the entrance, which are often forced to double park, or park on the yellow lines (which I assume will be unchanged). This is a busy area, with 2 bus stops, 2 bin sites, a zebra crossing and a roundabout. It seems to me a really stupid idea to add to the chaos, and I cannot understand why hangars aren't being placed in side streets, such as Mertoun Place, rather than on a main bus route.	Affect pavement access for residents with mobility issues; Concerns over emergency vehicle access; Road is already busy, constrained, or narrow
07/05/2026 14:25:47 +01:00	Resident	Parking, Safety, Access, Environmental	Support	Our stair is full of bikes kept right outside the flats, which clutters up the hallway, and means not all flats get to keep bikes as there isn't enough space for them inside or outside the flat. Having a bike locker right outside the flat would make owning a bike a much easier decision, and would be safer than keeping it in the stair, too. It would definitely encourage my partner and I to finally buy a pair of bikes and use them regularly for active travel! We don't drive or own cars so the reduction of parking space is a non-issue.	
07/05/2026 13:04:26 +01:00	Resident	Parking, Access, Environmental	Object	Car parking spaces are already very limited for residents and cycle hangers were take away even more. There is no space outside 4 Wellington Place for a cycle hanger as all the communal bins are there already. There is enough clutter on streets with all the bins we do need need more 'things'. Streets become less desirable when you make it harder to park your car. And when you have so much clutter (bins etc) right outside your front door.	Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced; Limited space already due to bins
07/05/2026 12:44:36 +01:00	Resident	Parking	PartlySupport	Thank you for the opportunity to reply to consultation TRO/25/57.I support the overall aim to increase secure cycle storage. However, reducing the resident parking on Brunton Place, which is already restricted by the "new" positioning of on street bins, restrictions to support the doctor surgery and loss of all parking on the west side of the road due to the cycle lane seems punitive. There is 20 metres of single yellow line restricted street front, that was formally the position of street bins, outside numbers 1 and 2 Brunton place that would seem a more practical position that would not reduce the parking provision and is readily available for cycle bins and would have no impact on the junction with Hillside Crescent.	
07/05/2026 10:57:54 +01:00	Resident	Parking, Other	PartlySupport	I am strongly in support of replacing one of the permit parking spaces with a cycle hangar. This street has a strong need for cycle parking as there are several tenements and residents struggle to store their bicycles safely. In our stair alone, two locked bikes have been stolen in the past 18 months. I would like to suggest that two cycle hangars are installed on this street instead of the proposed single one. The second hangar could be installed to the north-east of the permit holders parking marked 'L' which is currently a single yellow line.	
07/04/2026 15:48:14 +01:00	Resident	Parking, Safety, Access, Other	PartlyObject	Reference clarification: The letter received appears to refer to TRO/25/57, whereas the public notice / consultation material refers to TRO/25/57A. This objection relates to the proposed cycle hangar immediately outside 8 Forbes Road, EH10 4EE, under whichever reference is correct. Please confirm the correct reference and ensure this response is recorded against the relevant Forbes Road proposal. I object to the part of TRO/25/57A proposing a cycle hangar immediately outside 8 Forbes Road, EH10 4EE. I do not object to cycle hangars in principle, but I object to this specific location because it would affect access for a resident with mobility issues, remove already limited kerbside space, and is unsupported by demand from residents of 8 Forbes Road. I am a resident of [REDACTED]. The building contains eight flats. I have checked with the residents of the building and can confirm that no resident of 8 Forbes Road has requested a cycle hangar at this location. I can also confirm that no resident is likely to use one there. Given the confirmed lack of demand at 8 Forbes Road, I ask the Council to explain the evidence of demand used to select this location. If a request for a hangar came from another address, then the hangar should be sited closer to that address or to the area where demand has actually arisen. It does not seem reasonable to place the hangar immediately outside a building where no resident has requested it, and no resident is likely to use it. The proposed location would create a particular access issue for our building. One resident of 8 Forbes Road has significant mobility difficulties and regularly requires taxi access with carers, using either a wheelchair or walking sticks. The kerbside space immediately outside the building is important for safe pick-up and drop-off. Replacing part of that kerbside space with a cycle hangar would make access more difficult and could create unnecessary risk for a mobility-impaired resident and their carers. This is also a busy location close to a junction. Forbes Road already experiences pressure from resident parking, passing vehicles, taxis, deliveries and short-stay stopping. The nursery directly opposite and the nearby medical practice add further pressure from drop-offs, collections, taxis and visitors. Removing kerbside space immediately outside 8 Forbes Road would make an already-constrained situation worse, particularly for residents and visitors who need close access to the building. In my experience, any visible cycle demand in this immediate area tends to be closer to the medical practice rather than outside 8 Forbes Road. If the observed demand is connected to visitors to the medical practice, short-stay cycle stands closer to that destination may be more appropriate than a residential long-stay cycle hangar outside our building. The proposal also appears poorly suited to the character and layout of this particular section of Forbes Road. Apart from 8 Forbes Road, much of the immediate	No one in the building wants a space; Affect pavement access for residents with mobility issues; Road is already busy, constrained, or narrow; Large street structure will takeaway from the character of the building - cat. B listed (Forbes Road Outside no. 8)
07/03/2026 14:12:44 +01:00	Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	Proposed bike shelter in permit bay - I am in support of the street having bike shelters, however, strongly object to the loss of permit parking as this is already very limited on the street. There are many single yellow line areas where this could be installed without loss of any spaces. Notably next to the bins at the start of the street on the southside, alongside the pay and display spaces there are large gaps where cars park out of hours outwith the bays, and at the end of the street there is a large turning area. You could also put alongside the bins just before the turn into the residential home as this is large and blank space. None of these areas are currently in use and would not result in loss of parking spaces. As a community nurse i need my car for work and spaces are limited as it is.	Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced
07/03/2026 13:58:32 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Support	I live on Gillespie Crescent and cycle. I would 100% support bicycle hangars on the street. We are badly in need of improved cycle infrastructure and currently have no secure storage. There are many parking spaces and the street is dominated by these. Giving a small amount of these up to improve cycling storage would help people use more active forms of transport. My only criticism is that residents bays are being proposed as for removal for cycling hangars. Why not reduce the pay and display spots instead? These are primarily used by visitors who drive and park on Gillespie Crescent to access nearby shops and cafes. Removing pay and display spots for the bicycle hangers would have less of a negative impact on actual residents of the street some of whom need cars. And instead place the impact on non residents - and also encourage more people to visit our local area by public transport (which is very good considering we are off a main road!) or via active forms of transport. Win win.	
07/03/2026 13:52:14 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Object	I object to the cycle parking hangar proposed outside 22 Gillespie Crescent. Parking is difficult enough without parking spaces being taken away. I need my car for my job. There is enough space in hallways to park cycles in them and they can also use their rear gardens, put a bicycle hut up for extra bikes. We pay for parking spaces which are in short supply. Why not put it in Ringo spaces?	Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced; Unneeded as bikes can be stored on the street or within properties
07/03/2026 13:01:07 +01:00	Resident	Parking, Other	PartlySupport	I think bike storage is a good idea and should cost a lot less than parking a car. Households should be allowed a max of 1 permit pee household: this would ease pressure on parking.	
07/03/2026 12:48:03 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Object	Parking spaces are already severely limited in the immediate area, which leads to illegal parking 'out of hours' and lack of available spaces in the evening. This is to the detriment of people paying the council money for a parking permit, who are already not getting value for what they pay for. Further to this, unless the use of cycle hangars becomes mandatory and enforced, cycles will continue to clog up the communal areas in stairs as they will continue to do even with the hangars.	Cars already park illegally; Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced
05/22/2026 01:28:15 +01:00	Resident	Traffic, Safety, Disturbance, Environmental, Other	Object	Resident Comments Formal Objection to Proposed Cycle Hub / Hangar – Montgomery Street, TRO/25/57 Dear Sir/Madam, I write to formally object to the proposed installation of a cycle hub/cycle hangar outside my home on Montgomery Street under reference TRO/25/57. My objection is based primarily on the unacceptable impact this proposal would have on residential amenity, cumulative environmental disturbance, and the suitability of this specific location. I do not object to the overall principal or scheme of having cycle hangers. For many years residents at this specific location have already experienced significant disruption associated with the communal bin facilities situated nearby. These facilities have generated persistent problems including noise at all hours, mess, disturbance, and repeated impacts on the quality of life of neighbouring residents. The bin hub attracts regular fly-tipping. I have to regularly report fly-tipping to the council, as if it is not removed promptly, it just attracts more rubbish been dumped. In addition to the communal residential waste, we also have a blue NWH commercial waste bin placed outside our property from one of the nearby businesses down the nearby lane to be emptied. We have a green telecoms box outside the property which regularly gets covered in graffiti, and as this is not council owned, the council historically have not taken responsibility for it, and it is really time consuming and challenging to get the graffiti painted over. In addition, the telecoms box regularly attracts fly posters which look unsightly or people congregating and resting around it using their phones, the conversations of which you can hear in the properties. The trees on the corner of Montgomery and Brunswick street overgrow on the roots with bushes, which attracts people throwing their dog poop bags in and other rubbish and the pavement around the trees is uneven and cracked which looks unsightly and is also a concern as there are nearby pipes underground. The introduction of an additional public street installation directly outside these residential properties would further intensify these existing problems and place a disproportionate burden on the households immediately affected. I believe that there should be a balance of positioning and the impact of such street furniture should be fair across the whole street and not all congested in one place. In particular, I object on the following grounds: 1. Unacceptable impact on residential amenity The proposed cycle hub would create additional activity, noise, and disturbance directly outside residential windows and entrances for residents living immediately adjacent to the site.	Limited space already due to bins; Fly-tipping occurs; Cycle hangars attract vandals or graffiti; Cycle hangars are noisy; Loitering increases; Safety concern for cyclists; Concerns over emergency vehicle access; Cycle hangars are unattractive; Cycle hangars attract vandals or graffiti
05/21/2026 22:26:40 +01:00	Resident	Parking, Disturbance	Object	I wholly object to the proposal for a bike hangar on Montgomery Street. Parking space is already stretched in this area and this will cause more noise pollution. Many bedrooms at 44 Montgomery Street are road-facing and we do not want this extra source of noise pollution and disturbance. There are already plenty of places for bike storage including the back yards of every tenement in this street. Firm no.	Cycle hangars are noisy; Unneeded as bikes can be stored on the street or within properties
05/21/2026 17:15:04 +01:00	Resident	Parking, Safety, Access, Disturbance	Object	I strongly oppose to the proposal of permanent bicycle hangar to be placed at Montgomery Street. This facility is not helping residents of the street in any way. Quite the opposite - it will cause noise (opening and closing the bike hangar at any times day or night), it will have graffiti on it in no time which less than pleasant appearance for the local residents,, reducing parking spaces, limiting access to the bins for the residents, blocking fire exit/emergency entrance for residents of 44 Montgomery street,	Cycle hangars are noisy; Cycle hangars attract vandals or graffiti; Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced; Limit access to bins; Concerns over emergency vehicle access
05/16/2026 20:15:15 +01:00	Resident	Disturbance	Object	I am objecting to this proposal on the grounds that I am the owner/occupier of one of the ground floor flats directly opposite the proposed location of the bike rack. My bedroom faces onto the street and I have no option of relocating my bedroom to the quieter rear side of the property. The windows are single glazed, meaning that noise from outside is already clearly audible within the room. The installation of a bike hanger directly outside my bedroom window would create significant additional disturbance and negatively affect my residential amenity. As the facility can be accessed at any time of day or night, I am concerned about repeated noise from users unlocking, opening and closing the structure, manoeuvring bicycles, conversations, and general activity associated with its use, particularly during early morning and late evening hours. In addition to noise concerns, I am also worried about safety and security issues. A bike rack positioned directly outside a ground floor bedroom window may encourage loitering and increase anti-social behaviour in close proximity to residential properties. The proposal would also reduce the sense of privacy and security for residents living at street level. Furthermore, I believe the bike hanger would add unnecessary street clutter and have a detrimental visual impact in what is primarily a residential setting. The structure would obstruct the outlook from my property and alter the character of the immediate streetscape. While I support sustainable transport and cycling infrastructure in principle, I do not believe this particular location is appropriate due to the direct and disproportionate impact it would have on neighbouring residents, especially those living at ground floor level. I therefore respectfully request that the proposal be reconsidered and that alternative locations be explored.	Cycle hangars are noisy; Loitering increases; Reduce privacy; Cycle hangars are unattractive
05/09/2026 08:58:12 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Support	TRO/25/57. More safe bike parking is urgently needed and will encourage more cycling and less driving. Tenement flats do not traditionally have space for bike storage leading to unsafe storage and bike theft.	
05/09/2026 08:29:17 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Support	I support the bike hanger	
05/03/2026 22:01:14 +01:00	Resident	Access	Support	The new hangars honestly can't come soon enough, they'll make a huge difference for me living on a top-floor tenement flat and cycling to get to work etc. Please crack on! Most people in my ward (Sighthill and Gorgie) don't even have access to a car, so it's crazy how much space is given over to cars in comparison to other, more accessible forms of transport.	
05/03/2026 12:10:25 +01:00	Resident	Parking, Traffic, Safety, Access, Disturbance, Financial, Environmental, Other	Support	I completely support this proposal.And in fact, id like you to go further- there should be far more cycle hangers and far less car storage of any kind.	
05/03/2026 08:08:48 +01:00	Other	Parking, Financial, Environmental	Object	Iomega many others, I am sick and tired of this council wasting money on ill conceived active travel / wheel and walk projects. These cycle shelters will become another eyesore on our streets, I don't believe they will be used, because of concerns about theft, they will be vandalised, the council will not maintain they, in the same way they have not maintained ed the week filled planters that are now scattered around various neighbourhoods. The council Complains about being underfunded, and get finds money for these schemes which consistently fail, the people of this city want our roads fixed. I also object to the council Waging war on the motorist. Travel and parking in the city is becoming more and more difficult, yet there is no data to show this is having any material affect on reducing car journeys, this is because the wheel and walk strategy is fundamentally flawed. Modern life dictates the use of vehicles by the majority of city residents, it's time to acknowledge that and start implementing policies which promote cleaner vehicles. Edinburgh is a Northern European destination, With inclement weather, hills, etc, yet the council continues to following the myopic and flawed doctrine pedalled by spokes and sustrans, organisations staffed by zealots who in no way represent the people of this city and aren't qualified or capable of a balanced viewpoint.	Cycle hangars will not be used; Cycle hangars are unattractive; Cycle hangars are not maintained; Cycle hangars attract vandals or graffiti; War on motorists
05/02/2026 18:17:01 +01:00	Commuter	Safety, Access, Environmental	Support	Excellent to install more cycle storage, current available storage are concentrated in small area of the city, good to see plans for expansion. Secure parking will result in more cycle journeys, so health benefits as well as environmental benefits. Can I suggest also expansion to more hangars in Northfield area, few hangars there and all that are available are full with waitinglist	
05/02/2026 16:33:41 +01:00	Resident	Parking	Support	I'd lease two bike hangar spaces in Polwarth gardens if they were available for my wife and I.	
05/02/2026 16:23:42 +01:00	Commuter	Parking, Traffic, Safety, Access, Financial, Environmental	Support	Fully support proposal. In fact, I think it should be expanded to include more secure bike storage in more areas.	
05/01/2026 13:29:58 +01:00	Resident	Safety, Environmental, Other	Support	Very glad to see the plans for installing additional cycle hangars in the Polwarth Area. these are desperately needed in an area with very high density of tenement dwellers. I have been on a waiting list for several years and am eager to get a spot. Please don't delay implementation. I hope to see plans for even more!	
BLANK	BLANK	BLANK	Object	42 Polwarth Gdns . Just been informed about a Cycle Hangar. This building is a retirement complex, where the residents are mostly in their 70,s. Space outside on the road is essential for visiting doctors, ambulances and carers. Car parking on the street, bins on both sides of the street, 20 mile an hour speed limit which is NOT always adhered too, so I must object to this Cycle Hangar..	Local issue as located in front of retirement flats (Polwarth Gardens); Concerns over emergency vehicle access; Affect pavement access for residents with mobility issues; Road is already busy, constrained, or narrow
BLANK	BLANK	BLANK	Object	This is retirement flats for men over 65 and ladies over 60 We do not want this outside our window with metal doors being slammed at all times People with bikes are further down the street past 46 Polwarth Gardens and on the other side of the road Taking away parking spaces that people pay for to put in bike storage who's owners do not pay anything towards i.e. road tax or insurance	Local issue as located Infront of retirement flats (Polwarth Gardens); Cycle hangars are noisy; Resident (permit) parking should not be reduced
BLANK	BLANK	BLANK	Object	Please note that I do not want a cycle han ligar in front of our building. I believe that a couple newly moved into the building have requested one, without consulting with the other residents, as things are normally decided by majority vote. All residents in number 42 are over 60. Mostly in their late 70's and some in their 80's and even a few in their 90's. None of us need a cycle hanger. What we need is parking spaces for those getting taxis, to enable parking near the entrance for those that can only manage to walk short distances. There is private parking at the back of the building and anyone with a cycle can park it there. I have been unable to get into your consultation website after many attempts. I tried giving feedback on your website but it was only for people wanting bicycle hangers or who have bikes. This is my 4th attempt at contacting you by email. There is no phone number, no address and a consultation website that does not operate, and an email address that takes several attempts before reaching this project. Please let me know when you receive my email and that my vote against has been recorded.	Local issue as located in front of retirement flats (Polwarth Gardens); Concerns over emergency vehicle access; No one in the building wants a space; Unneeded as bikes can be stored on the street or within properties
BLANK	BLANK	BLANK	Object	It seems that someone has requested that a cycle hangar be placed outside 42 Polwarth Gardens, Edinburgh EH11 1LN I wish to object to this proposal on the following grounds:- 1 This building exclusively houses retirement flats occupied by men of at least 60 years of age and women of at least 55. Consequently, there would be a very low demand for cycle storage from dwellers in the building. 2 The space outside the building is frequently used by ambulances, doctors' cars and other health support vehicles due to the age of most residents. 3 Easy access to the entrance of the building is needed by taxi drivers who are required to take residents with restricted mobility to clinics, hospital appointments etc 4 Access is also required by supermarket delivery vans used by residents whose poor mobility makes them unable to visit shops. 5 The probable low uptake means it would be a poor economic investment by a cash-strapped council.	Local issue as located Infront of retirement flats (Polwarth Gardens); Concerns over emergency vehicle access; Affect pavement access for residents with mobility issues; No one in the building wants a space