

East Dunbartonshire Council  
Parking Management Plan  
Report of Consultation

## Contents

Executive summary .....	5
Introduction .....	6
Engagement methods .....	7
Publicising the Consultation.....	7
Council Website .....	7
Media .....	7
Social media .....	8
Online sessions.....	10
Survey.....	11
Engagement findings .....	11
Who responded to the consultation?.....	11
Findings .....	16
Rail stations.....	16
Question 1: travel behaviours.....	17
Question 2: parking behaviours .....	18
Question 3: car parks .....	19
Rail stations policies, comments, Council response and changes .....	20
Schools .....	22
Question 4: general schools question.....	22
Question 5: what schools are represented?.....	23
Question 6: Schools Access Hierarchy .....	23
Question 7: traffic-free schools .....	24
Question 8: specific issues .....	25
Question 9: expanding on previous answer .....	26
Baldernock PS – 0 responses .....	26
Baljaffray PS – 2 responses .....	26
Balmuildy PS – 25 responses.....	26
Bearsden Academy – 22 responses .....	27
Bearsden PS – 15 responses .....	27
Bishopbriggs Academy – 18 responses .....	28
Boclair Academy – 8 responses .....	28
Castlehill PS – 1 response.....	29
Clober PS – 6 responses .....	29
Colquhoun Park PS – 7 responses .....	29

Craigdhu PS – 7 responses .....	30
Craighead PS – 2 responses .....	30
Douglas Academy – 6 responses.....	31
Gartconner PS – 3 responses .....	31
Harestanes PS – no responses .....	32
Hillhead PS – no responses .....	32
Holy Family PS – 15 responses.....	32
Holy Trinity PS – no responses.....	32
Killermont PS – 16 responses.....	32
Kirkintilloch High – 3 responses .....	33
Lairdsland PS – 2 responses .....	33
Lennoxton PS – 2 responses.....	33
Lenzie Academy – 19 responses .....	34
Lenzie Meadow PS – 18 responses .....	34
Meadowburn PS – 13 responses.....	35
Millersneuk PS – 8 responses.....	36
Milngavie PS – 6 responses.....	36
Mosshead PS – 13 responses .....	37
Oxgang PS – 2 responses .....	37
St. Helen’s PS – 5 responses.....	37
St. Machan’s PS – no responses.....	38
St. Matthew’s PS – 8 responses .....	38
St. Nicholas’ PS – 6 responses.....	38
St. Ninian’s High – 6 responses .....	39
Thomas Muir PS – 14 responses .....	39
Torrance PS – 2 responses .....	40
Turnbull High – no responses .....	40
Wester Cleddens PS – 14 responses .....	40
Westerton PS – 2 responses .....	40
Summary of schools section .....	41
Schools policies, comments, Council responses and changes .....	42
General comments about the Draft Parking Management Plan .....	47
General comments, Council response and changes .....	47
Overarching policies, comments, Council responses and changes .....	49
Electric Vehicles policies, comments, Council responses and changes .....	50
Town centres policies, comments, Council responses and changes .....	53

Conclusions .....	56
Appendix .....	57
Appendix 1: results of questions 1, 2 and 3 by area .....	57
Appendix 2 .....	62
Appendix 3 .....	63
Appendix 4 .....	67

## Executive summary

This Report presents the findings of a survey consultation on the Draft Parking Management Plan (PMP), including a section of questions on how people's use of rail stations and associated car parking facilities will change following the pandemic.

A total of 274 survey responses were received, three of which came from groups. 148 respondents submitted either general comments about the Draft PMP or specific policies. Overall the comments received were supportive of the aims of the Plan and demonstrated that the Council's policies and actions across its transport policies do on the whole meet residents' needs. However, the comments also highlight the complexities and range of views regarding managing parking and transport in general.

Questions 1-3, rather than addressing specific policies in the Draft PMP, focused around rail and rail station car park use following the pandemic. The results indicate that rail use will recover but perhaps not to pre-pandemic levels. There was demand for increased parking capacity at rail stations.

Questions 6 and 7 asked about agreement with the schools access hierarchy and the principle of traffic free schools respectively. 58% of respondents agree with the schools access hierarchy and 67% agree with the principle of traffic-free schools. It is hoped that clarification of both areas based on comments from this consultation will further increase support for both of those sections of the Plan.

This Report of Consultation proposes the following changes to the Draft PMP based on comments received:

- Policy 16 amended to clarify Council support for all schemes that promote the use of active travel to and from schools.
- Remove 'Enforceable Restrictions' and 'Traffic-free Schools' from the schools access hierarchy. This allows the hierarchy to be focused on access to schools by sustainable modes and in a safe manner. The 'Traffic-free Schools' section is moved to the side of the hierarchy to illustrate its separation from the hierarchy and its ability to be implemented at any point if there is the need or demand at that particular school. The schools access hierarchy, following the removal of these two sections, is now focused solely on the Council's desired prioritisation of modes of transport to and from schools.
- Wording of Policy 17 to change, removing the word *more* to read: *encourage and promote responsible and safe parking in the vicinity of schools*. This change clarifies that no level of irresponsible or unsafe parking is acceptable.
- Policy 18 is changed to underline that traffic-free schools pilot schemes available for all schools given the need or the demand for them, based on the unique circumstances of the school.
- Action 18(a) is updated to provide more information on the implications of traffic-free schools schemes for local residents and those that need to access the vicinity of the school by car.

## Introduction

The Draft PMP was prepared in response to parking concerns raised through previous local transport consultations. The Draft PMP explains the Council's current approach to parking management and enforcement and a summary of the roles and responsibilities of groups involved. A range of legislation controls how parking is managed and the Council has an established approach to parking in town centres and communities. The Council brought this information together to set out a coordinated, operational plan for parking. It is intended that having all this information in one place will make it easier for residents and businesses to understand how and why parking is managed in East Dunbartonshire.

This document supports the Draft PMP for East Dunbartonshire by detailing the engagement activity from 5 October to 30 November 2021. This report presents the results of the consultation on the Draft Parking Management Plan; a short survey was carried out to gather views. This report also presents the range of publicity that was undertaken.

The Draft PMP consults on policies and actions for schools that intend to improve safety and encourage active travel to and from school. The consultation also sought views on travel behaviours related to rail travel and parking near stations and the effects of the pandemic on travel demand in these areas in the short- and long-term.

In addition to setting out the response to the consultation, this report also provides the Council's response and changes to be made to the Plan in order to produce the final PMP for East Dunbartonshire.

## Engagement methods

### Publicising the Consultation

In order to raise awareness of the consultation period and survey, communications activities relating to the Draft PMP included a consultation webpage, media releases and social media engagement.

### Council Website

The [consultation webpage](#) was live from **5 October 2021** until **30 November 2021**. During that time it received **2,401 views**.

The consultation was launched with a [media release](#) on **1 October 2021** which was viewed **260** times.

### Media

The following articles were published in local newspapers in early October 2021.



Kirkintilloch Herald

5 October



Milngavie and Bearsden Herald

7 October

The consultation was publicised in the October 2021 edition of the Council's Local Development Plan newsletter. The full newsletter can be downloaded by following this [link](#).

### Draft Parking Management Plan

A dedicated Draft Parking Management Plan has been prepared in response to concerns about parking raised through previous consultations on the Local Transport Strategy 2020-2025.

A range of legislation controls how parking is managed and the Council has an established approach to parking in town centres and communities. The Council has brought this information together to set out a coordinated, operational plan for parking. It is intended that having all this information in one place will make it easier for residents and businesses to understand how and why parking is managed in East Dunbartonshire.

Residents of East Dunbartonshire are being given the opportunity to share their views on new actions relating to parking around schools. The Draft Parking Management Plan includes a pilot to deliver traffic-free schools at a small number of primary schools, at certain times of the day, to improve pedestrian safety, make areas more attractive for walking, cycling and wheeling and improve local air quality.

The Council also wants to hear how COVID-19 is affecting use of rail station car parks.

A two-month engagement period launches on Tuesday 5 October 2021 during which time two online sessions have been arranged for residents to find out what the Draft Parking Management Plan includes and to ask any questions.

For further information:

- Please visit our webpage at [www.eastdunbarton.gov.uk/draft-parking-management-plan-consultation](http://www.eastdunbarton.gov.uk/draft-parking-management-plan-consultation)
- Email [parkingconsultation@eastdunbarton.gov.uk](mailto:parkingconsultation@eastdunbarton.gov.uk)
- Call 0300 1234510 and ask for the Land Planning Policy Team.

### Social media

- There were **21** social media posts about the consultation
- Potential Twitter reach (number of people who could have viewed tweets): **279,600**
- Potential Facebook reach: **116,500**
- Total engagements (likes, comments, shares): **349**





---

*The Council is seeking your views on parking around schools. We are looking for your thoughts on proposed policies that are intended to improve safety and encourage active travel to and from school. Your opinions will help shape the Parking Management Plan.*

---

The Council is seeking your views on parking around schools. We are looking for your thoughts on proposed policies that are intended to improve safety and encourage active travel to and from school. Your opinions will help shape the Parking Management Plan  
<https://crowd.in/ILC8Ht>



The Facebook post above received 24 likes and 23 comments.



---

*The Council is seeking your views on parking in and near station car parks. Help us understand the effects of the pandemic on travel demand in the short and long term. Your opinions will help shape the Parking Management Plan.*

---

East Dun Council (@EDCouncil) Published by Haise Duffy 2 months ago  
The Council is seeking your views on parking in and near station car parks. Help us understand the effects of the pandemic on travel demand in the short and long term. Your opinions will help shape the Parking Management Plan  
<https://t.co/KCB1MJ31GE> <https://t.co/5LV4Vq4vG1>



#### Online sessions

There were two online sessions organised by the Council. These were attended by both members of the public and community groups. In order to maximise participation, the events were held on different days at different times of day. Details of when the sessions were held and number of attendees are recorded in the table below. These sessions, rather than being processes of consultation themselves, functioned as an opportunity for individuals and groups to ask questions and clarify doubts about the survey consultation.

When?	Number of participants who engaged in discussion with officers
Wednesday 20 October at 2pm	2
Thursday 28 October at 7pm	16
	<b>Total: 18</b>

The Council is monitoring the attendance rates of online events, which have been adopted in reaction to restrictions to in person events relating to the Covid-19 pandemic. Whilst for some consultation sessions held there has been less attendance than expected, other consultation sessions have had a good turnout. The nature of the consultation topic will have an impact on this. Online events have also allowed a wider demographic to attend, as not everyone is able to make

time to travel to an in-person event. In future, post COVID-19, a hybrid approach may be suitable to some consultations.

An officer also attended an online meeting of Milngavie Community Council (MCC) following an invitation from the group.

#### Survey

The survey was available on the consultation webpage and physical forms were available at local libraries. The survey on the Draft PMP enabled various stakeholders to express their views regarding both specific and general issues.

The survey was in three parts; the first focusing on travel habits and parking around rail stations after the pandemic, the second on parking around schools and the third section invited participants to voice general comments about either specific policies in the Draft Plan or the Draft Plan as a whole.

### Engagement findings

Who responded to the consultation?


271 members of the public and 2 organisations (BetterBriggs and Palmer Court Resident Association) responded to the survey.

MCC provided an email response to the consultation. Their responses are throughout the section in which specific responses to policies are recorded (pg. 43-47).

There were a total of 273 responses to the survey (274 including MCC). The results for each of the questions from the section of the survey entitled "General demographics and equalities" are available in the following graphs, charts and tables. Respondents could leave questions blank, in some instances the number of participants who did so was negligible so blank responses were grouped together with those who selected "prefer not to say".


Note that the BetterBriggs response is included within the blank section as they did not respond to the demographics question, while the Palmer Court RA respondent did provide demographic information (included below).

### Gender of participants




Gender	Number of participants
Female	166
Male	86
Other	1
Prefer not to say	9
Blank	11
Total	273

**Age of participants**



Age	Number
15 or under	0
16-24	2
25-44	131
45-64	102
65-74	16
75 or older	4
Prefer not to say/blank	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>273</b>


## Employment status of participants



Employment status	Number
Full-time	153
Part-time	65
Retired	21
Prefer not to say	14
Not working	8
Student	2
Blank	10
Total	273

Note that "seeking work" was an option but it was not selected by any participants.

### Number of participants by area



Area	Number of participants
Bearsden and Milngavie	108
Bishopbriggs, Torrance, Balmore and Bardowie	83
Kirkintilloch, Lenzie, Waterside and Twechar	63
Lennoxton, Milton of Campsie, Haughhead and Clachan of Campsie	7
Prefer not to say/blank	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>273</b>

#### Disability status

6% of respondents answered yes, they do have a disability while 83% responded no. 8% preferred not to disclose this information and 3% left the question blank.

Of those that have a disability, several specified that they have poor or very poor mobility and others mentioned visual and hearing impairments.

## Findings

The survey consultation requested engagement on three themes in three distinct sections; parking in and around rail stations, schools and a section where participants could voice general concerns about specific aspects of the Draft PMP and the Draft PMP as a whole.

### Rail stations


This section of the survey consulted participants on Policies 13, 14 and 15 which relate to parking in and around rail stations. The first two questions in this section focus on travel and parking behaviours. They ask participants to consider whether their use of rail travel and associated parking facilities will increase, decrease or remain about the same compared to behaviour prior to the pandemic. The third question, about car parks at rail stations, asks whether participants believe car parking capacity in and around rail stations should be more, less or remain about the same compared to pre-pandemic provision.

The responses have been analysed by location to explore how the pandemic is affecting rail use and demand for parking around rail stations differently in different parts of East Dunbartonshire. Conclusions from these findings are discussed in the report while graphs are located in Appendix 1.



Question 1: travel behaviours

To what extent will you revert back to using rail services the way you did prior to the pandemic?



Less than I did before	75
About the same	152
More than I did before	37


The above graph suggests that working from home will, in various forms and to varying degrees, outlast the pandemic and continue to have an effect on demand for rail services. That said, the amount of respondents for whom rail use will either remain the same or increase outweighs those who say they will use services less by more than two to one, 69% of participants responded “more than I did before” or “about the same” while 27% responded “less than I did before”.<sup>1</sup>

From analysis of local results (see Appendix 1), it is notable that over half of the total figure responding “more than I did before” are from the Milngavie and Bearsden local area (20 respondents). This indicates a more resilient demand for rail travel in that area.

<sup>1</sup> Percentage figures are rounded to the nearest whole number throughout the document unless written otherwise.

Question 2: parking behaviours

To what extent will you revert back to using parking facilities in and around rail stations the way you did prior to the pandemic?




Less than I did before	69
About the same	159
More than I did before	33

Similar to the results for the first question, participants mostly responded that their use of car parking facilities around rail stations would remain similar to prior to the pandemic (58% of participants). 25% of participants responded that they are likely to use rail station car parking facilities less after the pandemic compared to before while 12% responded that they will do so more than before.

As in the previous question, respondents from Milngavie and Bearsden are disproportionately represented amongst those answering “more than I did before”, indicating a slightly stronger demand for rail travel and associated parking than the rest of East Dunbartonshire.

Question 3: car parks

To what extent do you believe car park capacity should be increased at rail stations compared to what you believed prior to the pandemic



Less than I did before	26
About the same	89
More than I did before	146

The trend from the first two questions, with most people responding that their travel behaviour will not increase beyond pre-pandemic levels, is not repeated in the responses to question 3. Just 10% of participants said they believed less strongly that car park capacity at rail stations should be increased compared to before the pandemic. On the other hand, 53% felt more strongly on the issue and 33% felt about the same.

A range of comments were made on rail stations in questions that invited respondents to make comments on any aspect of the Draft PMP.

**East Dunbartonshire Council (EDC) Response:**

Overall, the Council’s view is that the responses to these questions support the Draft Parking Management Plan’s overall themes and highlight the need to consider how parking, particularly in and around rail stations, is approached following the pandemic due to changing commuting patterns and demand for rail.

The Council understands the importance of continued analysis of how commuting demand develops following the pandemic. The aim of Policy 15 is to make rail station car parks in East Dunbartonshire ready for an increase in use as commuting increases after the primary effects of the pandemic on reducing levels of commuting subside. However, changes to working arrangements may mean there is either a slow recovery in this demand or demand fails to fully reach pre-pandemic levels.

The Council is satisfied that the response to these questions is consistent with the aims of Policies 13, 14 and 15.

- The implementation of Policy 13, which aims to allow more people to access stations using active travel, will lead to increased car park capacity at stations in East Dunbartonshire as those who previously travelled to the station by car, occupying parking space, use active travel.
- The implementation of Policies 13, 14 and 15 would satisfy those who responded to question 3 in support of greater car parking capacity at rail stations. As stated above, if

more people use active travel to reach stations, pressure on car park capacity is eased. Policy 14 is intended to ensure the interests of residents and local businesses are taken into account as well as rail users.

**Changes:**

No changes to rail station Policies (13-15) are required as a result of responses to questions 1, 2 and 3 of the survey.

Rail stations policies, comments, Council response and changes

**Rail Stations**

**Policy 13:**

Support access to rail stations by active travel (pg. 37 of the Draft PMP)

Comments:

- Charges should be introduced for rail station carparks to ensure the promotion of active travel as part of longer journeys and another proposed linking Milngavie station to existing active travel infrastructure, noting that many short journeys to stations on that line are by car when active travel could be used.
- On-demand community transport is needed to connect rural areas with train stations and discourage car use.
- Improved cycling access to Milngavie station will reduce pressure on parking. An increasing number of community members are expressing a desire to cycle as their “normal” mode of transport, but the current infrastructure makes them feel unsafe. The respondent proposes extending the Bears Way to Milngavie station. Another two respondents agree suggesting that most journeys to Hillfoot station are short ones that could easily be walked or cycled.
- MCC notes the creation of groups such as ED Active Travel and Friends of Bearsway and the COP26 cycling event. They advocate the extension of Bearsway to Milngavie station, suggesting it would reduce pressure on parking.
- Segregated cycling infrastructure around all stations in order to reduce congestion and limit pollution (two respondents).
- The number of bikes parked at Lenzie station has significantly reduced over the course of the pandemic – necessary to promote sustainable/active travel.
- On Policy 13c, the respondent is concerned that the proposed railway car park as part of Bishopbriggs town centre regeneration will be used by people driving to Bishopbriggs town centre rather than using the rail service. They suggest an out-of-town park and ride or a town shuttle bus, BetterBriggs supports the idea of a Park and Ride in Westerhill serving Bishopbriggs station.

**EDC response:**

- The forthcoming Active Travel Strategy will explore how to improve active travel connectivity and infrastructure around stations and propose future actions. It will reassess the indicative routes identified for active travel action in the previous Active Travel Strategy 2015-2020 and propose new interventions where it is deemed necessary or advantageous for the promotion of active travel.
- Previous work consider transport options around Bishopbriggs ([A803-806 Corridor Study](#)) and the evidence base for the Local Transport Strategy 2020 has resulted in the actions for Bishopbriggs included in the Local Transport Strategy 2020. Transport provision in Bishopbriggs is also being considered through the Council’s [City Deal project](#) and is referred to in Action 11(c) of the Draft PMP.

**Changes:**

No changes required for this Policy.

<p><b>Policy 14:</b> Manage parking issues on streets near rail stations in line with the Parking Management Hierarchy (pg. 38)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads around Bearsden station are particularly dangerous and require yellow lines banning parking as cars cannot pass safely leading to incidents of road rage.</li> <li>- Residential permits to tackle issue of commuters parking on residential streets all day.</li> <li>- Around Bearsden station there is a problem of commuters parking in streets all day.</li> </ul>
<p><b>EDC response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 14, in implementing the processes of Policies 1 and 2 around rail stations, aims to reduce conflict between residents, local businesses and rail users over parking. Increased use of active travel to rail stations will significantly reduce pressure on rail station car parks.</li> <li>• Illegal parking is to be enforced in accordance with the parking management hierarchy, as detailed in Policies 1, 2 and 3.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> No changes required to this Policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy 15:</b> Maximise use of existing car parks and investigate opportunities for increasing capacity where appropriate (pg. 39)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong belief that railway carparks and parking in surrounding streets should not be free. Car park charges should subsidise rail and active travel.</li> <li>- More parking needed at stations to enable park and ride into Glasgow (three respondents).</li> <li>- A lack of space in rail station car parks means it is more convenient to drive whole journeys (two respondents).</li> <li>- Increase free parking at all train stations, saying that if the Council want to encourage the use of sustainable transport then free parking at train stations is an excellent way of doing so (two respondents).</li> <li>- Bishopbriggs station needs parking (four respondents), one of whom echoes the response to Policy 14 stating that residents in nearby streets suffer due to commuter parking.</li> <li>- More parking required at the station (five respondents, two of which proposed a multi-storey carpark).</li> <li>- Disagree with the mooted multi-storey carpark in a conservation area.</li> <li>- Disagree with the need for more parking as more people working from home means less demand for commuter rail services.</li> <li>- Lenzie station carpark should be converted into short-term, town centre parking (two respondents).</li> </ul>
<p><b>EDC response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council acknowledges the need for greater parking provision at some stations in East Dunbartonshire as Question 3 clearly shows a desire to increase capacity, particularly Bishopbriggs. Policy 15 is intended to investigate the opportunities to achieve this.</li> <li>• Greater use of active travel to rail stations in East Dunbartonshire would, as well as providing health and environmental benefits, ease pressure on car parks and allow those who have no option other than to drive to access spaces. As multiple comments for Policy 14 said, it is important that infrastructure and amenity is provided to facilitate a modal shift towards active travel, in turn increasing capacity in car parks.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> No changes required as the Policy broadly reflects the comments received.</p>

## Schools

This section of the survey consulted participants on policies 16, 17 and 18 relating to parking around local schools. Participants were asked what their relationship is to their local East Dunbartonshire school (whether they live close by, attend a school, have children who attend a school, work in a school or none of the above). Participants were asked how strongly they agree or disagree with the preferred order of priority for children, parents and carers to access local schools as set out within the hierarchy in the Draft Plan.

The second question asked participants how strongly they agree or disagree with the principle of traffic-free schools. Policy 18 proposes that schools are assessed for the suitability of restrictions on parking and traffic in line with the schools access hierarchy


The third question invites participants to expand on any other specific issues related to traffic-free schools they think the Council should consider.

The results of the questions in this section, when responses are analysed for each different school, aim to determine the appropriateness of implementing pilot traffic-free school schemes at schools.

### Question 4: general schools question

To help understand who is responding to the survey participants were asked whether they fell into any of the following categories;

- I live in close proximity to a school in East Dunbartonshire: 183 respondents
- I attend school as a pupil in East Dunbartonshire: 4 respondents
- I have children (or am an adult responsible for children) attending school in East Dunbartonshire: 155 respondents
- I work in a school in East Dunbartonshire: 13 respondents
- None of the above: 34 respondents





Question 5: what schools are represented?

If they had selected the first four options of the previous question, participants were asked to record the school to which they were referring. There were a total of 292 responses representing 33 schools in East Dunbartonshire (see Appendix 2 for breakdown of numbers for each school). The number of schools referenced is higher than the amount of respondents because numerous respondents selected multiple schools.

Question 6: Schools Access Hierarchy

Participants were asked to what extent they agree with the preferred order of priority for children, parents and carers to access local schools, set out in the proposed hierarchy.

**To what extent do you agree with the preferred order of priority for children, parents and carers to access local schools - set out within the hierarchy?**





	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the proposed hierarchy	73	86	19	19	58

Question 7: traffic-free schools

Participants were asked about the extent to which they agree with the overall principle of traffic-free schools.

**To what extent do you agree with the overall principle of traffic-free schools?**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools	135	49	37	26	18


The section entitled *Question 9: expanding on the previous answer* (pg. 26-40) analyses data from Questions 6, 7 and 8 and organises it by school.

Commented [JD1]: check



Question 8: specific issues

Participants were asked a yes or no question about whether they would like to raise any specific issues related to traffic-free schools for the Council to consider.



Of 273 participants, 168 responded “yes”, 90 responded “no” and 15 left the question blank.

The comments of those who answered “yes” are detailed and applied to the relevant school in the section beginning on page 26.

Question 9: expanding on previous answer

Those who responded 'yes' to question 8 were invited to expand on their answer. The responses have been sorted and analysed by school in order to better understand the unique circumstances and issues at each school. The number of participants from each school is listed and at the end of the report in Appendix 2.

Baldernock PS – 0 responses

There were no responses referencing Baldernock PS.

Baljaffray PS – 2 responses

One respondent agrees with the proposed hierarchy while the other respondent neither agrees nor disagrees.

Both respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools.

Of the two responses referencing Baljaffray PS, one expanded on their answer to question 8 and provided an account of specific issues relevant to the circumstances of the school.

The response says that congestion and unlawful parking on nearby streets will be made worse by road closures and the problem moved elsewhere. The response continues to state that child safety may improve but so will congestion and pollution.

Balmuildy PS – 25 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	15
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	9

60% of Balmuildy PS respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy while only 4% oppose. 36% neither agree nor disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	18
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	3

72% of Balmuildy PS respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools and 12% disagree.

Of the 25 responses referencing Balmuildy PS, 18 expanded on their responses to highlight issues relevant to the school's circumstances.

Several responses say that creative measures such as breakfast clubs and the reinstatement of crossing patrol personnel would encourage more people to walk to school. Others propose 'safe drop-off zones' as a means of ensuring pedestrian safety while also providing for people who must drive. Numerous responses cite a lack of parking enforcement as a major factor in a lack of pedestrian safety and increasing resident frustration.

Some responses criticise the dangerous behaviour of drivers (particularly pavement parking) around the school and another reminded the Council of campaigns to introduce traffic calming measures. Some of these responses warn of future incidents. In contrast, two respondents say closing roads will displace traffic to other areas. A respondent says that, under any traffic-free school measures, the adequate provision of disabled spaces should be taken into account.

Bearsden Academy – 22 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	14
Disagree or strongly disagree	3
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	5

64% of Bearsden Academy respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy while 14% disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	15
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	3

68% of Bearsden Academy respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 18% disagree.

Of the 22 responses that referenced Bearsden Academy, 18 expanded on their answer to question 8.

Several responses underlined the importance of road safety, particularly in terms of a sense of safety while walking or cycling and exposure to polluted air.

Others pointed out that many drivers park irresponsibly, causing danger to children. Some suggestions to rectify this included; greater enforcement, dedicated drop-off zones, fencing to restrict drop-offs. One response, reacting to the proposed hierarchy, summarises this sentiment suggesting that safe parking should be normal practice.

In terms of traffic-free schools, some are in favour of a pilot scheme while others oppose.

One respondent suggests public transport is provided between schools and local rail stations.

Bearsden PS – 15 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	10
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	4

67% of Bearsden PS respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy while 7% disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	10
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

67% of Bearsden PS respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 27% disagree.

One respondent flags the issue of traffic-free schools moving congestion elsewhere. Two other responses urge the Council to consider the impact on local residents. Another response urges immediate action on traffic-free schools, this response (among others) warns of incidents and injuries occurring due to traffic and pavement parking. A lack of enforcement of those who break parking restrictions is cited as an issue.

Responses propose ideas such as alternative transport (buses and walking groups) and pedestrian infrastructure (safe pedestrian crossings).

Bishopbriggs Academy – 18 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	14
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	3

78% of Bishopbriggs Academy respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy while 6% disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	16
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

89% of Bishopbriggs Academy respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 6% disagree.

Of the 18 responses that referenced Bishopbriggs Academy, 11 offered to expand on their answer to question 8 and provide specific issues relevant to the circumstances of the school.

There is support from parents and local residents for restricting traffic around Bishopbriggs Academy. Several responses view child safety as the main issue, with some saying that the current situation is dangerous and others cite that congestion is a problem.

Local residents identify Thrums Avenue as being a particular area of conflict. The issue is between residents and parking associated with the school and between pedestrians and vehicular traffic. A resident from Wester Cleddens Road reports that school parking occurs in residents areas.

Finally, there is support for improved cycling infrastructure and the use of active travel to get to and from school, one respondent proposing that only those who must drive to school do so. Another respondent highlights the importance of free bus travel for young people.

Boclair Academy – 8 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

63% of Boclair Academy respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy while 25% disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	4
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	0

50% of Boclair Academy respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools and 50% disagree.

Of the 8 responses that referenced Boclair Academy, 6 offered to expand on their answer to question 8 and provide specific issues relevant to the circumstances of the school.

One respondent is unhappy with the expensive bus service and lack of an active travel alternative due to a lack of infrastructure. Another highlights that despite any traffic-free school schemes, there will be students who need to be driven due to various circumstances.

Some raise issues with resident access following traffic restrictions while others suggest the current situation is an accident waiting to happen due to busy traffic and a lack of enforcement. A different response proposes parking restrictions during peak times outside the school.

Castlehill PS – 1 response

The respondent for Castlehill PS agrees with the proposed hierarchy and strongly agrees with the principle of traffic-free school.

The respondent supports parking and traffic flow restrictions around the school as long as residents are not hindered.

Clober PS – 6 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	3
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

50% of Clober respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy while 33% disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	4
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

67% of Clober respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools and 33% disagree.

Of the six responses, four expanded on their answers. Three of those supported traffic-free school measures. One suggests pavements be widened to avert what another respondent calls an accident waiting to happen on streets adjacent to the school.

The other respondents suggest a dedicated drop-off zone and greater respect for residents' right to park.

Colquhoun Park PS – 7 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

All the Colquhoun Park PS respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy except two who neither agree nor disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

All the Colquhoun Park PS respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools except two who neither agree nor disagree.

Of the seven responses referencing Colquhoun Park PS, five expanded on their answers.

One respondent brings up the inadequacy of the pavements and multiple respondents raise the issue of speeding, fast traffic and associated dangers.

Multiple respondents claim that current parking restrictions lack utility without enforcement.

Finally, a respondent reminds the Council of requests for signage, traffic calming and speed reduction measures on Annan Drive.

Craigdhu PS – 7 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

Five of the seven Craigdhu PS respondents were in favour of the proposed hierarchy while two neither agreed nor disagreed.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Five of the seven Craigdhu PS respondents were in favour of the principle of traffic-free schools, one disagreed and one neither agreed nor disagreed.

Five of the seven respondents who referenced Craigdhu PS expanded on their responses.

One resident lamented a lack of parking as well as inconsiderate parking causing inconvenience. Another respondent suggested a drop-off system to counter this.

A resident warned of dangers of congestion and speeding for children, citing multiple incidents they have witnessed involving children.

Finally, two respondents agreed strongly with the principle of traffic-free schools and one pointed out that Craigdhu would be particularly good place to pilot a scheme. Both respondents emphasised the current dangers children face on roads around the school.

Craighead PS – 2 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	0
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	0

The two Craighead PS respondents disagree with the proposed hierarchy.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	0
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	0

The two Craighead PS respondents disagree with the principle of traffic-free schools.

Both respondents expanded on their previous responses, underlining their desire to maintain current drop-off arrangements due to disabled access and parents' needs.

Douglas Academy – 6 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	3
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	3

50% of Douglas Academy respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy and 50% neither agree nor disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	4
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

67% of Douglas Academy respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools and 17% opposed.

Of the 6 responses that referenced Douglas Academy, 5 expanded on their answer to question 8 and provided detailed accounts of specific issues relevant to the circumstances of the school.

The responses raise pertinent points for and against the introduction of a traffic-free schools pilot. Different responses raise the idea of walking buses, as well as other creative ways parents and schools can support one another to use alternative means of transport, as a way to combat current dangers of traffic and congestion. Another response underlines that safety is essential for journeys to and from school to be made actively and that they have witnessed near misses around the school.

One respondent raise questions of residential access where traffic-free school schemes are imposed. Another asks the Council to consider unintended consequences of moving traffic away from schools, saying that it could move traffic to other areas.

Gartconner PS – 3 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	2
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Of three respondents, two agree with the proposed hierarchy, nobody disagrees and one neither agrees nor disagrees.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	1
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	0

Two respondents disagree with the principle of traffic-free schools while one agrees.

Two of the three Gartconner PS respondents chose to expand on their answers.

One highlights that poor weather is a barrier to using active travel to drop off and pick up children.

The other respondent is in favour of enforcement of parking restrictions but does not support closing roads. The respondent outlines concerns with traffic-free schools but also suggests that research about the impacts of measures, consultation with parents and limited pilots could be beneficial.

Harestanes PS – no responses

There were no responses from Harestanes PS.

Hillhead PS – no responses

There were no responses from Hillhead PS.

Holy Family PS – 15 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	8
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	7

53% of respondents from Holy Family PS agree with the proposed hierarchy while 47% disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	10
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

67% of respondents from Holy Family PS agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 27% disagree.

Of the 15 respondents from Holy Family PS, 12 expanded on their answers.

Three respondents raise the issue of affordable school buses. One of those responses says that current positioning of bus stops creates safety concerns while the other says students coming from outwith the catchment and local authority areas are largely being driven and would benefit from access to buses.

Several respondents highlight that current traffic and parking near the school creates a dangerous environment for students. Two other respondents suggest implementing restrictions on traffic will move the issue of congestion elsewhere.

Finally, two respondents say enforcement of parking restrictions is needed to help protect students walking and cycling to school.

Holy Trinity PS – no responses

There were no responses referencing Holy Trinity PS.

Killermont PS – 16 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	12
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

75% of respondents from Killermont PS agree with the proposed hierarchy. 13% both disagree and neither agree nor disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	10
Disagree or strongly disagree	6
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	0



63% of respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 38% disagree.

Of the 16 responses from Killermont PS, 6 expanded on their answers.

Three responses say current enforcement of idling and pavement parking is inadequate, one of whom says the pedestrian infrastructure is in poor condition and enables unsafe parking. Another of these responses singles out Rannoch Drive, Durness Avenue and Aviemore Gardens as requiring improved pedestrian infrastructure.

Three responses urge the Council to engage with and consider local residents before implementing new measures. One of these responses highlights the necessity of some to use cars and that cars make travelling in adverse weather easier.

Kirkintilloch High – 3 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	1
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

Of three respondents, one agrees with the proposed hierarchy, nobody disagrees and two neither agree nor disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	2
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	0

Two respondents strongly agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while one disagrees.

One respondent suggests only those who can walk to school should go to that school. Another suggests the main issue is a lack of enforcement of parking regulations, they say that their mobility is made difficult and dangerous due to pavement parking as they have to enter the road on their mobility scooter. They lament the lack of enforcement of restrictions they campaigned to introduce. They strongly support traffic-free schools for the health and safety of local children.

Lairdsland PS – 2 responses

Of the two respondents from Lairdsland PS, one left both questions blank and the other neither agreed nor disagreed with the hierarchy and disagreed with the principle of traffic-free schools.

One respondent says resident access to closed school streets must not be restricted. The other respondent says that inadequate staff parking means that staff must park on surrounding streets.

Lennoxton PS – 2 responses

Of the two respondents from Lennoxton PS, one disagrees with the proposed hierarchy and the principle of traffic-free schools while the other strongly agrees with the proposed hierarchy and the principle of traffic-free schools.

One respondent supports extending no parking zones from around schools to neighbouring streets while the other underlines the importance of access for students with disabilities.

Lenzie Academy – 19 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	14
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	5

74% of Lenzie Academy respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy. Nobody disagrees.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	13
Disagree or strongly disagree	5
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

68% of Lenzie Academy respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 26% disagree.

Of the 19 responses that referenced Lenzie Academy, 17 expanded on their answer to question 8 and provided detailed accounts of specific issues relevant to the circumstances of the school.

Multiple respondents raise safety concerns with the current state of parking around schools in East Dunbartonshire. Some single out pavement parking as particularly dangerous while another respondent makes the point that any parking around schools will decrease safety of children travelling actively to school. Frustration with a lack of enforcement leading to a lack of safety is a theme that arises from several responses.

One respondent records frustration at a lack of active travel infrastructure meaning that demand to travel to school actively is not met. Two respondents disagree with the organisation of the proposed hierarchy, saying that the Council does not go far enough by retaining safe parking as part of the hierarchy, they, along with over two thirds of respondents for Lenzie Academy, support rolling out traffic-free school measures. Another respondent said that circumstances require them to use a car and the school (in partnership with the Council) should explore creative solutions to encourage active travel (walking buses, encouraging parents/carers to walk together and staggered start times).

Two respondents raise the point that bus use should be encouraged and facilitated, particularly when free bus travel for young people is introduced.

One respondent says that students with heavy equipment have no alternative but to be driven and, finally, another raises the issue of resident access during times of traffic-free school restrictions.

Lenzie Meadow PS – 18 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	9
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	5

50% of Lenzie Meadow respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, 28% neither agree nor disagree and 22% disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	16
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

89% of Lenzie Meadow respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while one respondent disagrees. Notably, of those who agree, 94% strongly agree.

Of the 18 responses that referenced Lenzie Meadow, 12 expanded on their answer to question 8 and provided detailed accounts of specific issues relevant to the circumstances of the school.

In a respondent for another local school's response, they comment that the paths to Lenzie Meadow PS are heavily used but require an upgrade. Another respondent agrees, stating that active travel infrastructure must be a priority. A different respondent takes this a step further, requesting the removal of "safe parking" from the hierarchy, saying that radical change is the only way to encourage modal shift and reduce the amount of journeys to school by car.

Several responses flag the danger and congestion associated with the current situation around the school. Another, supportive of traffic-free schools, warns of unintended consequences elsewhere.

A respondent, unable to travel actively to school, encourages schools and the Council to work in partnership to deliver creative solutions such as walking buses.

Different respondents highlight the importance of the promotion of sustainable and public transport, one underlining the importance of upcoming free bus travel for young people.

#### Meadowburn PS – 13 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	4

38% of Meadowburn respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, 31% neither agreed nor disagreed and the same figure disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	7
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

54% of Meadowburn respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 31% of respondents disagreed. Two respondents neither agree nor disagree.

Of the 13 responses referencing Meadowburn PS, 10 expanded on the above answers to provide accounts of the unique circumstances affecting the school.

One respondent says current parking restrictions have not had an impact on dangerous parking and that current levels of encouragement of and provision for active travel are insufficient. The response strongly supports a pilot scheme for the school in order to ensure children can move safely around school.

A response proposes a hierarchy that encompasses safe drop-offs (another respondent suggests adopting an 'American-style' one way drop-off system) and parking, acknowledging changes in the typical work day. A respondent reports that parking restrictions would mean they would be consistently late for work and a drop-off zone would solve that issue.

Two respondents raise the issue of drivers ignoring bans on pavement parking and parking restrictions creating the conditions for future accidents involving children. Different respondents support introducing infrastructure that discourages driving (particularly dangerous driving) such as speed

bumps and wider pavements. One respondent of another school notes that they can recall several incidents (close calls with no injuries sustained) near Meadowburn PS.

Millersneuk PS – 8 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	1
Disagree or strongly disagree	3
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	4

50% of Millersneuk respondents neither agree nor disagree with the proposed hierarchy (one of whom left the question blank), three respondents disagree and one agrees.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	6
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	0

75% of Millersneuk respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 25% of respondents disagree.

Of the 8 responses referencing Millersneuk PS, 5 expanded on the above answers.

One response advocates treating schools on a case-by-case basis considering the impact on residents. Another suggests a safe drop-off zone.

A teacher responded, saying that they support traffic-free schools and always travel actively to school to improve access for all. Another respondent suggests only those who live within walking distance should go to that school. Finally, a respondent flags the problem of travelling actively to school in poor weather.

Milngavie PS – 6 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	4
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

67% of Milngavie PS respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, one disagrees and another neither agrees nor disagrees.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	2
Disagree or strongly disagree	3
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Half of Milngavie PS respondents disagree with the principle of traffic-free schools while a third of respondents agree with the principle.

Of the responses referencing Milngavie PS, three expanded on the above answers to provide accounts of the unique circumstances affecting the school. Two, while supportive of the principle of traffic-free schools, flag concerns about the impact on local residents. The other respondent says that car owners should not face any parking restrictions.

Mosshead PS – 13 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	8
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	5

57% of Mosshead respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, 36% neither agreed nor disagreed and one participant (7%) disagreed.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	7
Disagree or strongly disagree	5
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

50% of Mosshead respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 36% of respondents disagree. 14% of respondents neither agree nor disagree.

Of the 14 responses referencing Mosshead PS, 9 expanded on the above answers to provide accounts of the unique circumstances affecting the school.

Two responses say traffic-free schools will simply move the problem of congested, dangerous streets elsewhere. Others underline the importance of roads being open for commuting, dropping off children and to provide mobility for those with medical conditions. One suggests a drop off area near the school. One response laments the difficulty to reduce car dependency due to inadequate public transport amenity. Responses residents are critical of those who wait in cars for extended periods by the school. A respondent suggests school crossing patrol personnel could help.

Oxgang PS – 2 responses

The two respondents both agree with the proposed hierarchy and the principle of traffic-free schools.

One response elaborated on this, saying that local areas are congested.

St. Helen's PS – 5 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	2
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Two of St. Helen's PS respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, another two disagree and one neither agrees nor disagrees.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	1
Disagree or strongly disagree	3
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

One St. Helen's respondent agrees with the principle of traffic-free schools, three disagree and another neither agrees nor disagrees.

The single comment expanding on the question of traffic-free schools was in strong support of the idea, suggesting traffic-free space and active travel wardens as well as walking and bike buses.

St. Machan's PS – no responses

There were no responses referencing St. Machan's PS.

St. Matthew's PS – 8 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	3

Five of eight respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, one respondent disagrees and three neither agreed nor disagreed.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	3
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Five of eight respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools, three disagree and one respondent neither agrees nor disagrees.

Of the eight respondents, six expanded on their answers to the previous questions and provided additional feedback considering the circumstances of St. Matthew's.

Two responses raise the issue of enforcement, stating that parking around the school is often irresponsible. Where idling and pavement parking is banned, according to one respondent, those bans should be enforced.

Four respondents support sustainable transport as a solution. One proposes increased school bus services, another proposes cycle lanes and another suggests that all schools should have pilots as circumstances differ for each school. This response highlights that children suffer the worst of the effects of pollution and climate change and must be protected through establishing school streets and creating a culture of active travel.

Finally, a respondent underlined the importance of consultation with residents about any changes to parking suggesting that motorists associated with the school are a hindrance to residents and children.

St. Nicholas' PS – 6 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	4
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Four of six respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, one disagrees and one respondent neither agrees nor disagrees.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	3
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Three of six respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools, two disagree and one respondent neither agreed nor disagreed.

Of the six respondents referencing St Nicholas' PS, four expanded on their answers. Two responses underlined the importance of catering for those who need to use a car to take children to school. The other two proposed increased enforcement of parking restrictions, either through officers or infrastructural change, and said that current parking arrangements were unsafe for children.

St. Ninian's High – 6 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Five of six respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, nobody disagrees and one respondent neither agrees nor disagrees.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	5
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	1

Five of six respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools, nobody disagrees and one respondent neither agrees nor disagrees.

Of the responses referencing St. Ninian's High, four elaborated on their responses.

One respondent said that residents should not have to experience danger and grievance due to reallocated parking, this respondent also supported traffic calming measures to ensure school traffic does not impede residents. A respondent calls for adequate provision of buses rather than the closure of roads around schools.

Finally, a respondent argues that traffic-free schools should be higher in the hierarchy, above park and stride. They believe safe streets must be the aim in order to encourage walking to school. This respondent also flags a lack of enforcement of pavement parking as an issue.

Thomas Muir PS – 14 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	10
Disagree or strongly disagree	1
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	3

71% of Thomas Muir respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy, 21% neither agree nor disagree and 7% disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	12
Disagree or strongly disagree	2
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	0

86% of Thomas Muir respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 14% of respondents disagree.

Of the 14 respondents referencing Thomas Muir PS, 7 expanded on their answers.

Several respondents support traffic-free schools due to increased safety for children and reduced disruption and congestion for residents.

Two respondents question how this policy could be enforced, short of highly visible traffic officers. A respondent says free bus travel for children and young people should be strongly encouraged. Finally, two respondents highlight the necessity for some people (the elderly and those with time constraints) to use a car to travel to school

Torrance PS – 2 responses

Both of the respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy and the principle of traffic-free schools (one respondent strongly agrees with both propositions).

One of the two respondents elaborated on their answers, claiming that picking up and dropping off at the school is difficult.

Turnbull High – no responses

There were no responses referencing Turnbull High.

Wester Cleddens PS – 14 responses

Agreement with the proposed hierarchy:

Agree or strongly agree	7
Disagree or strongly disagree	0
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	7

50% of Wester Cleddens respondents agree with the proposed hierarchy and 50% neither agree nor disagree.

Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools:

Agree or strongly agree	8
Disagree or strongly disagree	4
Neither agree nor disagree/blank	2

57% of Wester Cleddens respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 28% of respondents disagree.

11 of the 14 respondents for Wester Cleddens PS expanded on their answers.

There is some concern about traffic-free areas leading to complications for residents and congestion moving elsewhere. There is support for enhanced enforcement to prevent inconsiderate and obstructive parking. Alternative measures to promote active travel (such as walking buses) are mentioned.

Two respondents support traffic-free measures citing safety concerns for children on streets around the school. Two respondents highlight the importance of traffic wardens.

Three respondents underlined that using a car to travel to school is essential due to their circumstances.

Westerton PS – 2 responses

Both respondents for Westerton PS neither agree nor disagree with the proposed hierarchy and both respondents agree with the principle of traffic-free schools.

One response highlights potential points of congestion (Henderland Rd, Maxwell Ave) should streets surrounding the school be closed. The other response supports enforcement of ban on idling.



Summary of schools section

A majority of respondents and schools support the proposed schools access hierarchy, though a significant proportion (21%) neither agree nor disagree.

A majority of respondents and schools support the principle of traffic-free schools, though a significant proportion (23%) disagree.

Respondents from following schools support the principle of traffic-free schools more strongly than the average across all schools (67%) and have a sample size of over five respondents;

- |                      |                    |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Balmuildy PS         | Douglas Academy    |
| Bearsden Academy     | Holy Family PS     |
| Bearsden PS          | Lenzie Academy     |
| Bishopbriggs Academy | Lenzie Meadow PS   |
| Clober PS            | Millersneuk PS     |
| Colquhoun Park PS    | St. Ninian's High  |
| Craigdhu PS          | Thomas Muir PS     |
|                      | Wester Cleddens PS |

Only five schools recorded a majority disagreeing with the principle of traffic-free schools and those schools all had a sample size of five responses or under (Craighead PS, Gartconner PS, Lairdsland PS, Milngavie PS and St. Helen's PS).

## Organisations

Three community organisations, not affiliated with particular schools, provided general views on the schools access hierarchy and traffic-free schools. These organisation’s views on the plan as a whole are available in the *General* section, where responses are organised by policy.

The organisations represented were Milngavie Community Council, BetterBriggs and Palmer Court Residents’ Association.

## Summary by Area

As the responses for some schools have small sample sizes (less than 10 responses), the responses to questions 6 and 7 have been analysed by area.

These responses (see Appendix 3 for full results and tables) indicate that there is support across different areas of East Dunbartonshire for both the proposed hierarchy of access to schools and the principle of traffic-free schools. Though all areas broadly agreed with both proposals, agreement for the principle of traffic-free schools is stronger. Numbers of those who neither agree nor disagree are consistently higher in response to the proposed schools access hierarchy, this trend is evident in all areas with a significant number of respondents, notably in Kirkintilloch, Lenzie, Waterside and Twechar where neither agree nor disagree receives the most responses for that question.

Schools policies, comments, Council responses and changes

Schools
<p><b>Policy 16:</b> Encourage and promote more journeys to be made to school by active and sustainable modes in line with the schools access hierarchy (pg. 40)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Support and would go further to discourage car use. Another respondent agrees proposing “draconian” anti-car policies so that schools can be examples of the benefits of active travel. Another respondent describes promotion of active travel as a priority. MCC also support active travel’s position at the top of the Schools Access Hierarchy.</li><li>- Support but timings of the school day are not conducive to using active travel to get to school.</li><li>- Policy should consider families who are unable to use active travel. Another respondent urges consideration of those with disabilities who cannot use active travel.</li><li>- School buses are too expensive (two respondents).</li><li>- Traffic wardens around schools would make roads safer.</li><li>- BetterBriggs supports the Schools Access Hierarchy in principle (Policy16) but they believe the uppermost priorities (i.e. 1. Walk and cycle; 2. Public transport/school bus; 3. Park and Stride) have all been tried and are not working. Similarly, priority 4 (safe parking) is not being achieved by existing methods of education and promotion.</li><li>- Current driving behaviours (idling, dangerous driving) are an accident waiting to happen (four respondents).</li><li>- One respondent proposes a barrier at Palmer Court due to levels of conflict between parents and residents. Another respondent suggests that both parents who walk their children to school and residents around schools are being ignored.</li><li>- Traffic calming around schools required to tackle dangerous parking and driving (two respondents).</li><li>- Due to circumstances, some need to drive.</li></ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For Policy 16 to be successful, there needs to be an active travel network that feels safe even when it is dark as, currently, canal and park paths feel unsafe and cannot be used in hours of darkness.</li> <li>- Policy 16 requires infrastructure that will promote behaviour change, otherwise people will take the car, even for short journeys (four respondents).</li> <li>- Disagree with hierarchy, should be reversed with traffic-free schools being the first priority. Respondent raises question around Safe Walking Routes Assessment, is this to be implemented as part of the plan?</li> <li>- Support as numbers of parents driving to school needs to be reduced (three respondents). One respondent suggests surrounding streets have temporary traffic restrictions as well as those adjacent to schools.</li> <li>- One respondent: school is within walking distance but circumstances mean they must drive.</li> <li>- Support for 'park and stride' – needs more infrastructure and guidance as well as making better use of local amenities to support this e.g. Lenzie Rugby Club.</li> <li>- An electric school shuttle bus.</li> <li>- Staff parking must be addressed; if there was sufficient staff parking there would not be such a problem with on-street parking around schools. Some staff have to drive due to circumstances.</li> </ul>
<p><b>EDC response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is investigating the feasibility of pilot traffic-free school schemes at various locations in accordance with the results of this consultation among other factors. It is important to underline that these measures do not constitute a ban on driving to school but rather temporary closure of limited streets adjacent to schools in order to promote safe walking and cycling to school and limit dangerous parking around schools.</li> <li>• The Council acknowledges that numerous responses proposed creative solutions to the issue of congestion and road danger around schools. These responses included walking buses, cooperation between local groups/organisations/businesses and schools to facilitate park and stride schemes and traffic wardens. Policy 16 notes the Council is committed to working with partners on a range of projects to encourage and promote more sustainable journeys to school. The schools access hierarchy sets out the overarching modes in terms of accessing schools, such projects will facilitate use of sustainable modes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b>  “Delivering this policy” section updated to include reference to and Council support for all schemes that promote the use of active travel to and from schools.</p>
<p><b>Policy 17:</b>  Encourage and promote more responsible and safe parking in the vicinity of schools (pg. 42)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roads around Killermont PS require enforcement. Lots of pavement parking on Aviemore Gardens, Kinnaird Cres forces children to walk in the road. Recently installed yellow crossings and keep clear signage ignored.</li> <li>- Parking should be removed from all schools and all children should walk to school (two respondents).</li> <li>- On “eye-catching banners” to raise awareness of the dangers of inconsiderate parking, the respondent’s children believe they don’t make a difference. Despite communication from the headteacher, the issue persists. Enforcement of inconsiderate parking necessary in order to reduce emissions and make safer streets around schools.</li> <li>- Pavement parking ban needs enforcement around schools.</li> <li>- Traffic wardens to help children walk safely.</li> <li>- Safe drop-off zones (as in new build schools), (two respondents).</li> <li>- Enforcement and signage required to stop; idling, parking on double yellow lines (two respondents).</li> </ul>

- Policy focuses too much on parking and needs to consider dangerous driving, distracted drivers and poor driving around active travellers. Parking is part of a wider problem.
- The enforcement of safe parking should mean no need for traffic-free schools.

**EDC response:**

- As detailed in responses to policies about parking management, restrictions on pavement parking are not yet in place or enforceable. The pavement parking prohibitions, as set out in Part 6 of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019, will come into force following further regulations being set by Scottish Ministers. The Council will carry out all duties required to implement and enforce the new provisions once these regulations have been set. Currently, it is the responsibility of Police Scotland to enforce dangerous and obstructive parking. The Council emphasises that the success of parking policy requires cooperation from the public, personal responsibility from road users and an understanding that these policies are for the safety of all, particularly children.
- Safety and environmental concerns about drivers around schools requires, in accordance with the Schools Access Hierarchy, consideration of traffic-free school measures in order to improve child safety and encourage the use of active travel to and from school.
- Investment in “safe drop-off zones” would, in contrast to traffic-free schools measures, encourage the use of cars to take children to and from school even for short journeys. This principle is in contrast to the schools access hierarchy, the sustainable transport aims of the Local Transport Strategy and the Scottish Government’s ambitions to reduce car mileage by 20% by 2030.<sup>2</sup>

**Changes:**

Wording of Policy 17 to change, removing the word “more” to read: “encourage and promote responsible and safe parking in the vicinity of schools.” This change clarifies that no level of irresponsible or unsafe parking is acceptable.

**Policy 18:**

Consider parking restrictions in place at each school on an individual basis and assess the requirements for further enforceable restrictions in line with the schools access and parking management hierarchies (pg. 43)

**Comments:**

- Traffic-free schools should be the default rather than the last resort.
- Supportive of traffic-free schools (four respondents). Two respondents cite safety concerns at Mosshead and Craigdhu Primary Schools.
- It would help to visualise where different schools are on the hierarchy as well as a set of criteria to implement and an assessment of the impact of different stages of the hierarchy before moving to different levels.
- Supportive but concerned about simply moving congestion elsewhere (three respondents).
- Roads around schools need to be open so late children can be dropped off.
- Local engagement required to tailor solutions to local circumstances and concerns.
- BetterBriggs wishes to see Traffic-free Schools Pilots take place as soon as practicable in order to trial this method of improving children’s safety, health and wellbeing . The right to be safe on the way to a place of education is essential in upholding children’s rights (UN Convention on the Rights of the Child).
- MCC support traffic-free schools pilots in order to prioritise active travel.
- Support (as well as surrounding streets).
- Support (as well as banning cars within a certain distance of schools).
- Parents unlikely to comply with restrictions (two respondents).

<sup>2</sup> Transport Scotland (2022) Reducing car use for a healthier, fairer and greener Scotland: A route map to achieve a 20 percent reduction in car kilometres by 2030. Document available [here](#).

- Parents who choose to park as close to school as possible contributing to the problem.
- Safe drop-off zone (four respondents). One respondent suggests a drop-off area within the school grounds.
- Traffic-free school measures punitive on residents, one of whom says they have never encountered issues with parking (two respondents).
- Plan needs to be clearer on what restrictions are to be enforced and what the effect will be on those who need to drive.
- There needs to be traffic-free school measures at St. Matthews PS due to the current dangerous situation.
- Restrictions on access will disrupt a busy daily routine.
- Moves the problem of congestion elsewhere.
- Action required to deal with dangerous driving and traffic near Lenzie Academy, Holy Family PS and Lenzie Meadow PS.
- Action required to ensure children's health and safety.
- Support for residential areas around schools too. Park and stride schemes move dangerous parking elsewhere and harm resident access.

**EDC response:**

- The Council will use the responses and data gathered through this survey to build on existing consultations and evidence gathering regarding the viability of traffic-free schools pilot schemes (in line with Action 18a).
- A common theme amongst responses was the idea that traffic restrictions around schools will simply move the problem of congestion elsewhere. Firstly, the purpose of the measures will be to encourage those who are able to use sustainable transport to get to and from school to do so, reducing congestion. Secondly, removing the concentration of congestion from certain locations outside schools, where there is the most movement of children, is the priority of these measures.
- There were concerns about the impact of traffic-free schools measures on residents and those who must drive children to school for various reasons including but not limited to work. The intention of the schemes is that residents will be able to access their street at all times (as in traffic-free school schemes in Glasgow, Clackmannanshire, East Renfrewshire and London). Regarding those who must drive their children to school, the option will still be viable but access to certain streets around the school will be limited to create a safer environment for all children.
- The Council acknowledges there were numerous responses disputing the way the hierarchy appears to place traffic-free schools as a "last resort".
- A set of criteria to establish where schools are on the schools access hierarchy is an interesting proposal. However, the Council sees the schools access hierarchy as a general guide to how transport options should be prioritised rather than a precise framework that schools are measured against.

**Changes:**

The schools access hierarchy is changed to remove the sections 'Enforceable Restrictions' and 'Traffic-free Schools'. This change means the hierarchy focuses on prioritising sustainable and safe transport modes.

The 'Traffic-free schools' section is moved to the side of the hierarchy to illustrate that it is not a step that can only be employed after having explored other options in the hierarchy. This new position underlines that, given the will or the necessity to implement a traffic-free schools pilot scheme, that option will be explored.

'Enforceable restrictions' is removed from the hierarchy and 'safe parking' moves to the bottom of the hierarchy with a reminder that parking restrictions will be enforced if necessary.

"Delivering this policy", Policy 18 is changed to reflect removal of 'traffic-free schools' from schools access hierarchy and to emphasise that the option can be explored based on schools' circumstances.

"Delivering this policy", Policy 18 changed to include reference to provision for resident access in case of traffic-free schools schemes.

## General comments about the Draft Parking Management Plan

The final section of the consultation invites participants to offer comments on any other aspect of the Draft Plan or the Draft Plan as a whole. This section gives participants the opportunities to raise any parking concerns regardless of the theme. Note that comments received relating to the proposed hierarchy and the principle of traffic-free schools have been included in the section detailing responses for individual schools (pg. 25-39). Comments on parking at stations have been included in the section detailing responses for rail stations (p20).

Of the 274 responses to the consultation, 148 elaborated on their responses to the survey questions and provided comments on the Plan. See Appendix 4 for a breakdown of how many people from each area responded to this section of the survey.

## General comments, Council response and changes

### General comments about the Plan:

- Four respondents expressed general support for the plan, another four respondents adding that the plan does not go far enough to encourage behaviour change and modal shift towards sustainable transport. One of these respondents expressed that the future should be a free public transport network but before that, people should be incentivised to make sustainable transport choices and leave cars behind.
- One respondent highlights that now is a good time to promote active travel due to current enthusiasm for discussion of environmental issues.
- One respondent highlights the mobility and economic development benefit that could come from active travel infrastructure.
- Current transport network disjointed and lacking integration – need an integrated active travel network to compensate.
- Funds spent on parking better invested in connecting public transport to active travel routes – funding for such projects more likely to benefit local health and the environment.
- Unsupportive of the plan (three respondents), it lacks vision and the language is too convoluted. Another respondent said that permitting drive-thru development undermines aims to promote sustainable transport and that a station at Allander would provide long-term vision rather than a plan that reacts to the pandemic.
- Not everyone can walk or cycle and that car parking is essential for those with mobility issues who are unable to qualify for a blue badge (two respondents).
- The survey questions led people towards supporting Council aims, the council should focus on serving the community and addressing their needs. Another respondent suggests residents should be considered when drafting parking policy.
- Public transport should be improved, until such a point, parking must be available (two respondents).
- Public transport not as reliable as the car. Another respondent says the plan is anti-car without focusing on public transport as an alternative.
- Promotion of active travel not right as it is only for the young and able-bodied, excluding the elderly. It also fails to account for inclement weather.
- There is a lack of detailed analysis for Bishopbrigg's parking and transport needs compared to other towns in East Dunbartonshire (two respondents).
- Plan ignores requirements for scooters and motorcycles, vehicles that produce little congestion and less pollution. Their parking requirements are easier to accommodate and there should be provision for them at stations and in town centres.
- Concern that new housing developments will bring about increased parking problems in the towns. The council should ensure housing has adequate off-street parking to avoid pavement parking. Another respondent disagrees with greenbelt housing development.

- One hopes that specific groups will fulfil their responsibilities as it currently is not happening.
- Complaints to the Council about dangerous parking have been ignored.
- As other public services such as hospitals charge staff to park on their grounds the Council should do likewise for their workers. They also question whether the benefits for local residents from interventions in the regulation of parking are being measured or if the Council is assuming what will be beneficial to residents.

**EDC response:**

- Support for the Draft Plan and its policies is noted.
- The range of comments highlight the complexities in shifting to sustainable transport. The Council is working across transport policy – on active travel, with its 2020 Local Transport Strategy<sup>3</sup>, this Parking Management Plan and the forthcoming Climate Action Plan<sup>4</sup> – to shift transport use to more sustainable modes and to consider residents needs alongside national policy and the requirement to meet net zero by 2045 and reduce car mileage by 20% by 2030.<sup>5</sup>
- Whilst the West of Scotland’s inclement weather is often cited as an issue in promoting active travel, the Netherlands and Denmark are world leaders in active travel and have similar climates and rainfall to Scotland. What is important is that active travel supports journeys regardless of weather or time of day.
- Similarly, concerns are often raised regarding demographics that active travel may be more suited to. The World Health Organisation underlines the importance of good quality pedestrian infrastructure for elderly people as it lists “outdoor spaces and buildings” as one of eight components that form the [Age-Friendly Cities](#) framework. The Dutch example illustrates that, with good infrastructure, elderly people can have the same access to the benefits of active travel as anyone else in society; the age group that cycles the furthest distances per day in the Netherlands are those aged 65-75 (except for children under the age of 18).<sup>6</sup> The well-documented social and health benefits of active travel for the elderly are potentially significant.
- The Council acknowledges support for active travel infrastructure. The Council understands active travel brings wide-ranging benefits and is currently working towards a new Active Travel Strategy. The Active Travel Strategy will consider how to improve environments for all forms of active travel (walking, cycling and other forms of wheeling).
- The Council acknowledges responses calling for cooperation between schools, the Council, parents and other organisations to deliver schemes to improve safety around schools. The Schools Parking Policies 16-18 build on existing work and identify future work.
- The Council is not currently responsible for the enforcement of dangerous and obstructive parking. Police Scotland are responsible for the enforcement of these kinds of parking infringements.
- On desires for a more effective, well-integrated public transport network, the Local Transport Strategy sets out a number of actions to work in this direction and also notes the roles and responsibilities of other stakeholders in achieving this.

**Changes:**

No change required.

<sup>3</sup> Local Transport Strategy, 2020-2025, East Dunbartonshire Council, published 2020, plan available [here](#).

<sup>4</sup> More information available [here](#).

<sup>5</sup> Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Act 2019, 2019 asp 15, Bill passed by the Scottish Parliament 25 Sept 2019 and received Royal Assent 31 Oct 2019, full document available [here](#).

<sup>6</sup> Statista (2018) “Average biking distance per person per day in the Netherlands in 2018 by age”, data available [here](#).



Overarching policies, comments, Council responses and changes

<b>Overarching</b>
<b>Policy 1:</b> Operate a Parking Management Hierarchy (pg. 23 of the Draft Parking Management Plan).
<b>Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Milngavie Community Council (MCC) support the hierarchy set out for parking management.</li> </ul>
<b>EDC Response:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MCC’s support is noted.</li> </ul>
<b>Changes:</b> None required.
<b>Policy 2:</b> Carry out enforcement on restrictions made through the Parking Management Hierarchy (pg. 24)
<b>Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An online platform for residents to report parking infringements.</li> <li>- Enforcement of cars parking on double yellow lines, notably Council operated vehicles that park illegally on a daily basis in Mosshead.</li> <li>- Transparency of levels of enforcement and fines required.</li> <li>- Enforcement of parking on double yellow lines (one respondent) and in bus stops (another respondent) needed in Bishopbriggs.</li> <li>- Enforcement required for people parking on double yellow lines.</li> <li>- Enforcement required for pavement parking (two respondents). One respondent describes needing to enter the roadway on a mobility scooter to navigate cars parked on the pavement.</li> <li>- Council vehicles regularly contravene restrictions, saying that if the Council does not take a lead on this issue then no one else will follow. Another singles out a Lennoxton business that parks illegally every Saturday evening.</li> <li>- People need educating of the dangers of parking on pavements, particularly the effect on those who walk to school and face dangerous situations as a result. They suggest education and fines for pavement parking.</li> </ul>
<b>EDC response:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of enforcement of parking restrictions, the Council is responsible for the provision of a safe local road network, including providing parking space in order to relieve or prevent congestion. The Council can use a Traffic Regulation Order to create parking restrictions on specific roads and, since 2014, can administer parking penalties where these restrictions have been put in place. From the responses, there is a clear desire for enhanced enforcement of parking restrictions in East Dunbartonshire. The Council has recently recruited four additional dedicated parking wardens. These wardens patrol streets daily with a focus on town centres and off-street, pay and display car parks. Since Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) was introduced in 2014 over 35,000 penalty charge notices (PCNs) have been issued across the East Dunbartonshire area.</li> <li>• It is the responsibility of Police Scotland to enforce parking offences where obstructive and dangerous parking is observed. Importantly, it is the responsibility of all vehicle drivers to park safely, considerately and in compliance with the law. Pavement parking currently falls under the jurisdiction of Police Scotland and complainers need to contact Police Scotland on 101 at the time of the incident occurring.</li> <li>• On the transparency of enforcement, the Council completes DPE returns annually for Transport Scotland, these are available online.</li> <li>• The Council notes comments informing of Council vehicles contravening parking restrictions. The Community Safety team is aware and will follow up the complaint about</li> </ul>

<p>Council vehicles in Mosshead. The Community Safety team issues PCNs to all vehicles (including Council vehicles).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a legal provision in the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019, section 50 that prohibits pavement parking but it has not yet come into force. The Council agrees there should be education of the dangers of parking inconsiderately, as such the PMP notes the responsibilities of drivers and the presence of four additional Community Wardens should help to reinforce the message that parking must be done safely and considerately. When the pavement parking legislation becomes enforceable officers will monitor appropriately and take any enforcement action required.</li> <li>• The Council notes the idea for an online platform to reporting parking infringements. There is a dedicated parking mail box (parking@eastdunbarton.gov.uk). Currently, when the Council receives complaints of illegal parking including parking in on-street disabled bays and school estates, Wardens aim to conduct ad-hoc patrols. Realistically it is not possible to respond immediately to every complaint and it is likely that vehicles have moved by the time the Council can attend.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> No changes are required.</p>
<p><b>Policy 3:</b> Carry out the implementation and enforcement of the parking prohibitions as part of the Council's duties as set out in Part 6 of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019 (pg. 26)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for ban on pavement parking and encouragement for stringent enforcement (three respondents). One of whom reports that current levels of pavement parking make mobility with a pram/wheelchair difficult and dangerous. Another of whom singles out South Mains Road and Drumgoyne Avenue in Milngavie as particularly bad for pavement parking.</li> <li>- Pavement parking a particular problem in neighbourhoods not designed for multi-car households (four respondents).</li> <li>- MCC highlight pavement parking as a serious impediment to active travel and welcoming the upcoming ban. They suggest that where pavement parking occurs to ensure a continuous clear pavement is available on one side of the roadway.</li> </ul>
<p><b>EDC response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a legal provision in the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019, Part 6 that prohibits pavement parking but it has not yet come into force. Specific issues about Drumgoyne Avenue, Milngavie have been raised with the relevant department at the Council but, until the provisions within Transport (Scotland) Act 2019 come into force, The Council is unable to carry out enforcement on these infringements as they come under the jurisdiction of Police Scotland who enforce dangerous or obstructive parking.</li> <li>• The Council agrees that inconsiderate parking discourages and represents a danger to active travel.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> No changes are necessary for this policy although the Council will continue to monitor the implementation of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019. The Council can then enforce new prohibitions on pavement parking, double parking and parking at dropped kerbs.</p>

Electric Vehicles policies, comments, Council responses and changes

<p><b>Policy 4:</b> Support an enhanced electric vehicle public charging network (pg. 27)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One respondent supports the increased provision of EV chargers as long as they do not impede footways.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Three respondents are supportive of the policy. Three other respondents are supportive of significantly maintaining, and significantly increasing, existing infrastructure.</li> <li>- Support improvements as current infrastructure is inadequate and hoarded by people charging for long periods (two respondents). The other respondent suggests introducing time limits.</li> <li>- Bring Mugdock Rd chargers into operation.</li> <li>- One respondent says revision of charging is required.</li> <li>- Use of electric vehicles should be discouraged as they contribute to congestion. They are not a panacea for traffic and parking problems.</li> </ul>
<p><b>EDC response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the policy is noted.</li> <li>• The Council's Electric Vehicle Action Plan<sup>7</sup> and Local Transport Strategy 2020-2025<sup>8</sup> propose increasing the availability of charging infrastructure.</li> <li>• The Electric Vehicle Action Plan proposes exploring options for introducing a tariff-based system for using public chargers.</li> <li>• The Electric Vehicle Action Plan proposes introducing a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to restrict petrol/diesel vehicles from occupying charging places and to ensure no fully charged electric vehicles occupy places. The Council has begun this process, with approval granted at a recent meeting of the Council's Place, Neighbourhood and Corporate Assets Committee to continue to raise an order in line with statutory processes for TROs, as outlined within the Parking Management Plan. If the TRO is raised then this will ensure all current on and off-street charging spaces in East Dunbartonshire are regulated to ensure they are only used by electric vehicles whilst actively charging.</li> <li>• The Council work with Transport Scotland to install electric vehicle charge points across East Dunbartonshire, connecting to the public ChargePlace Scotland network. Three rapid chargers were installed in Mugdock Road Car Park in 2021, providing an additional six charging spaces in this location. However, the new charge points are not yet operational as they still require to be connected to a power supply. To achieve this, a sub-station is required to be installed within the car park to serve the new charge points. Arrangements are being finalised with Scottish Power to progress this work and the new charge points will become operational once these agreements are in place in due course.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> No changes are required.</p>
<p><b>Policy 5:</b> Require electric vehicle charging infrastructure to be delivered in new development (pg. 28)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Three respondents support the policy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>EDC response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the policy is noted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> No changes are required.</p>
<p><b>Policy 6:</b> Support access by active travel by ensuring provision of sheltered cycle parking facilities at key locations (pg. 29)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fully support the Policy and add infrastructure that caters for all different kinds of active travel and wheeling (e.g. cargo bikes).</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup>Electric Vehicles in East Dunbartonshire – available [here](#).

<sup>8</sup>East Dunbartonshire Council (2020) Local Transport Strategy 2020-2025, pg. 56, available [here](#).

**EDC response:**

- Support for the Policy is noted and the comments will help inform the forthcoming Active Travel Strategy.
- The current network of off-road cycling and walking routes is currently being audited in preparation for the forthcoming Active Travel Strategy. This audit aims to raise issues with current infrastructure for all users, including different kinds of active travel and wheeling.
- The Council acknowledges that infrastructure should consider users of all the various forms of active travel and the Council understands the future importance of e-cargo and cargo bikes for personal business and care journeys and their potential to contribute to reductions in transport emissions, infrastructure for different forms of active travel will be considered for specific, strategic locations.<sup>9</sup>

**Changes:**

No changes are required.

---

<sup>9</sup> Sustrans (2020) "Reinventing transport: planning for e-cargo bikes", article available [here](#).

Town centres policies, comments, Council responses and changes

Town Centres
<p><b>Policy 7:</b> Continue to operate the car park charging scheme to ensure adequate turnover is achieved in town centre car parks and encourage journeys to be made by sustainable travel (pg. 30)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Economic development benefits for town centres linked to the removal of parking charges (nine respondents). One respondents chooses to go to large, out-of-town shops such as Asda to avoid the parking charge, another two respondents raised this specific issue.</li> <li>- Parking charges must be implemented (and increased accordingly) to compensate for negative externalities of car use and to deter car use and encourage modal shift. Another respondent agrees and suggests no free parking in town centres with free shuttle buses and bike hire schemes instead. Another respondent agrees, saying all Council car parks should see year on year increases in charges and parking should not be subsidised.</li> <li>- Seven respondents advocated free parking to varying degrees (from completely free to free for the first half hour). One respondent gave a reduction in footfall as a reason to provide free parking. MCC suggest a short period of free parking for quick visits to shops.</li> <li>- BetterBriggs feels the current provision of town-centre parking is appropriate.</li> <li>- Two respondents describe Kenmure Drive parking as underused due to charges.</li> <li>- Car park charges leads to more on-street parking resulting in congestion.</li> <li>- The respondent states that the increase in income from carpark charges is marginal compared to the damage done by pushing cars onto neighbouring streets.</li> </ul>
<p><b>EDC response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council acknowledges there are a range of different views on the issue of payment for parking in town centres in East Dunbartonshire. By 2030, the Scottish Government aims to reduce total national car mileage by 20%.<sup>10</sup> Considering the aims of the Scottish Government, the aims of the Local Transport Strategy<sup>11</sup> and the findings in the Draft Plan (see point below), it would be inconsistent to provide free parking and encourage the use of cars for everyday journeys to town centres. Understanding that some people have to use cars to access these places, charges are kept low and on selected days the charges are waived.</li> <li>• In section 3 of the Draft Plan (pg. 18), “Evidence and Policy”, shows that whilst the use of Pay &amp; Display car parks has fallen, footfall has been sustained in town centres following the implementation of parking charges. The option for residents and visitors to use pay and display car parks in town centres remains an important one for businesses.</li> <li>• Vehicle traffic is one of the main contributors of emissions and particulates that cause poor air quality. Parking charges are an important tool to encourage more people to replace shorter journeys to town centres with more sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling. These forms of transport benefit the health of the individual as well as improving local air quality which has a positive impact for all residents and visitors.<sup>12</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> Based on the analysis of the effect of charging for parking on occupancy and footfall and the mixed responses, the Council acknowledges the diversity of views and interests. No changes required.</p>
<p><b>Policy 8:</b></p>

<sup>10</sup> Scottish Government (2020) “Update to the Climate Change Plan 2018-2032: Securing a Green Recovery on a Path to Net Zero”, plan available [here](#).

<sup>11</sup> East Dunbartonshire Council (2020) Local Transport Strategy, 2020-2025, plan available [here](#).

<sup>12</sup> EDC (2020) Local Transport Strategy, 2020-2025, pg. 55.

Continue to review the scheme to determine the benefits of adding other car parks into Pay and Display operation (pg. 31)
<b>Comments:</b> There were no comments specifically referring to this Policy.
<b>EDC response:</b> A lack of responses to Policy 8 is noted and it is assumed that responses to this Policy reflect the varied opinions represented in response to Policy 7.
<b>Policy 9:</b> Manage all Council car parks to ensure they are used appropriately and are operating effectively (pg. 32)
<b>Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MCC believe there is a potential economic benefit from the provision of some long stay parking for users of West Highland Way or other long-distance walking routes in the area.</li> </ul>
<b>EDC response:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council notes MCC's idea for long stay parking for hikers and visitors. The Council would encourage visitors to use sustainable transport to arrive at the start of their hike on the West Highland Way particularly as there are rail connections at the start and finish of the route.</li> </ul>
<b>Changes:</b> No changes required.
<b>Policy 10:</b> Suspend parking charges for events and activities that are considered to have vital importance and worth to the local economy (pg. 33)
<b>Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Disagree with the Policy on principle. These events are exactly what parking charges should be retained for and the enforcement of parking restrictions should be enhanced in order to ensure events are accessible by active travel.</li> </ul>
<b>EDC response:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per policy 7, this is a contentious issue with strong views on both sides. The current Council policy aims to promote sustainable transport and reduce car use while acknowledging that, in some instances, the Council may wish to waive charges.</li> </ul>
<b>Changes:</b> No changes required.
<b>Policy 11:</b> Keep town centres clear to create attractive, safe and pedestrian friendly environments that are accessible for people who cycle (pg. 34)
<b>Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The town centre has been a more pleasant environment with the reduction in commuter traffic as a result of working from home.</li> <li>- Parking enforcement required in Bishopbriggs town centre to reduce emissions, congestion and encourage behaviour change/modal shift towards sustainable transport.</li> <li>- Reduction of the amount of traffic that passes through Bishopbriggs is required. Respondent proposes cycle lanes and free short-term on-street parking as well as on-street dining. They say the current level of traffic and pollution requires a reduction in lanes to force people out of cars.</li> <li>- New retail development has created congestion.</li> </ul>
<b>EDC response:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council recognises that changes in working patterns can have an effect on creating safe, pedestrian friendly town centres. At the same time the Council understands that, in the future, commuting will likely increase from the levels seen during the pandemic. Therefore,</li> </ul>

<p>it is important to implement sustainable transport policies to ensure town centres are attractive, safe and pedestrian friendly while being accessible for those who cycle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As stated in policies 1, 2 and 3, enforcement of parking restrictions is an important part of this plan and part of broader aims to encourage a shift towards sustainable transport.</li> <li>• Transport provision in Bishopbriggs is being considered through the Council's <a href="#">City Deal project</a> and is referred to in Action 11(c) of the Parking Management Plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> There was little to no objection to the principle of this Policy and it requires no change.</p>
<p><b>Policy 12:</b> Introduce on-street parking charges where appropriate to ensure adequate turnover is achieved in town centres (pg. 35)</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove on-street parking.</li> <li>- On-street parking near train stations be strictly time limited to ensure that commuters cannot take up a space all day.</li> <li>- Supportive of the Policy and urges consideration of introducing a time limit on parking at the Morrison's (Bishopbriggs) car park so that commuters are dissuaded from driving to rail station.</li> </ul>
<p><b>EDC response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an issue of inappropriate parking on the streets and car parks around some of East Dunbartonshire's rail stations. Policy 14 is in place to consider specific parking issues in neighbouring streets to rail stations.</li> <li>• The Council is aware that the car park at Morrison's in Bishopbriggs is used to serve the rail station but enforcement of the private car park is the responsibility of businesses.</li> <li>• Rather than removing on-street parking, the Council supports identifying appropriate locations to introduce charges for on-street parking. These Traffic Regulation Orders to introduce pay and display on-street could alleviate the issue of rail users taking up space on residential and commercial streets for long periods of time. It is also hoped that charging for on-street parking has a similar effect on use of parking space as the introduction of a charge for parking in off-road car parks, a reduction in overall use without a reduction in footfall (footfall increased in town centres)<sup>13</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes:</b> No change required.</p>

For policies 13-15 see pg. 20-21.

For policies 16-17 see pg. 42-44.

<sup>13</sup> East Dunbartonshire Council (2021) Draft Parking Management Plan, pg. 18.

## Conclusions

This section summarises the consultation carried out on the Draft PMP and provides several key messages to consider for the production of the final Plan. The consultation provided individuals and groups the opportunity to have their say on the Draft Plan and allowed East Dunbartonshire Council officers to make amendments to take account of responses.

- More people will use rail services less frequently rather than more frequently after the pandemic (Question 1).
- More people will use rail station parking facilities less frequently rather than more frequently after the pandemic (Question 2).
- Most participants (53%) want to see increased parking capacity at rail stations (Question 3).
- 58% of participants agree with the order set out in the schools access hierarchy while only 14% disagree (Question 6).
- 67% of participants agree with the principle of traffic-free schools while 23% disagree (Question 7).
- 14 schools recorded stronger than average support for the principle of traffic-free schools (with a sample size of over five responses).

The responses expressed a variety of views on the Draft Plan as a whole and its policies. The responses to Questions 1-3, 6, 7 and the comments received indicate support for the aims of the Draft PMP. There is broad support for the principle of restricting unsafe and unlawful parking in line with the parking management hierarchy. There is also support for action to be taken to ensure streets around schools are safer environments for all. The following changes will be made to the Draft Plan as a result of the consultation;

- Policy 16 amended to clarify Council support for all schemes that promote the use of active travel to and from schools.
- Remove 'Enforceable Restrictions' and 'Traffic-free Schools' from the schools access hierarchy. This allows the hierarchy to be focused on access to schools by sustainable modes and in a safe manner. The 'Traffic-free Schools' section is moved to the side of the hierarchy to illustrate its separation from the hierarchy and its ability to be implemented at any point if there is the need or demand at that particular school. The schools access hierarchy, following the removal of these two sections, is now focused solely on the Council's desired prioritisation of modes of transport to and from schools.
- Wording of Policy 17 to change, removing the word *more* to read: *encourage and promote responsible and safe parking in the vicinity of schools*. This change clarifies that no level of irresponsible or unsafe parking is acceptable.
- Policy 18 is changed to underline that traffic-free schools pilot schemes available for all schools given the need or the demand for them, based on the unique circumstances of the school.
- Action 18(a) is updated to provide more information on the implications of traffic-free schools schemes for local residents and those that need to access the vicinity of the school by car.




## Appendix


Appendix 1: results of questions 1, 2 and 3 by area

### Results of Question 1 by area


#### Bearsden and Milngavie




#### Bishopbriggs, Torrance, Balmore and Bardowie




#### Kirkintilloch, Lenzie, Waterside and Twechar



Lennoxtown, Milton of Campsie, Haughhead and Clachan of Campsie




Community - Prefer not to say/blank



**Results of Question 2 by area**


**Bearsden and Milngavie**

To what extent will you revert back to using parking facilities in and around rail stations the way you did prior to the pandemic?




**Bishopbriggs, Torrance, Balmore and Bardowie**

To what extent will you revert back to using parking facilities in and around rail stations the way you did prior to the pandemic?




**Kirkintilloch, Lenzie, Waterside and Twechar**


To what extent will you revert back to using parking facilities in and around rail stations the way you did prior to the pandemic?



**Lennoxtown, Milton of Campsie, Haughhead and Clachan of Campsie**




**Community - Prefer not to say/blank**




**Results of Question 3 by area**


**Bearsden and Milngavie**




**Bishopbriggs, Torrance, Balmore and Bardowie**




**Kirkintilloch, Lenzie, Waterside and Twechar**



Lennoxtown, Milton of Campsie, Haughhead and Clachan of Campsie



Community - Prefer not to say/blank



Appendix 2


Baldernock PS	0	Harestanes PS	0	Oxgang PS	2
Baljaffray PS	2	Hillhead PS	0	St. Helen's PS	5
Balmuildy PS	25	Holy Family PS	15	St. Machan's PS	0
Bearsden Academy	22	Holy Trinity PS	0	St. Matthew's PS	8
Bearsden PS	15	Killermont PS	16	St. Nicholas' PS	6
Bishopbriggs Academy	18	Kirkintilloch High	3	St. Ninian's High	6
Boclair Academy	8	Lairdsland PS	2	Thomas Muir PS	14
Castlehill PS	1	Lennoxtown PS	2	Torrance PS	2
Clober PS	6	Lenzie Academy	19	Turnbull High	0
Colquhoun Park PS	7	Lenzie Meadow PS	18	Wester Cleddens PS	14
Craigdhu PS	7	Meadowburn PS	13	Westerton PS	2
Craighead PS	2	Millersneuk PS	8		
Douglas Academy	7	Milngavie PS	6		
Gartconner PS	3	Mosshead PS	8		

Total: 292 (more responses for different schools than total number of responses due to some responses applying to multiple schools).


Appendix 3

Results to Questions 6 and 7 by area:

**Bearsden and Milngavie**




	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the proposed hierarchy	22	46	11	5	16




	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools	52	16	13	13	10

**Bishopbriggs, Torrance, Balmore and Bardowie**




	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the proposed hierarchy	29	25	4	8	13




	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools	47	20	10	5	0



**Kirkintilloch, Lenzie, Waterside and Twechar**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the proposed hierarchy	19	12	2	3	23



	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools	31	9	12	5	5

**Lennoxtown, Milton of Campsie, Haughhead and Clachan of Campsie**

There were too few results from the Lennoxtown area to express usefully in a graph. Below their responses are presented in a table.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the proposed hierarchy	2	1	0	0	4
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools	2	2	0	1	2

**Community - Prefer not to say/blank**

There were too few results that selected prefer not to say/left the option blank to express usefully in a graph. Below their responses are recorded in a table.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the proposed hierarchy	1	2	2	3	2
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
Agreement with the principle of traffic-free schools	3	2	1	2	1

## Appendix 4

### **General comments by area:**

#### **Bearsden and Milngavie**

Of the 108 responses received from Bearsden and Milngavie, 57 wished to make either general or specific additional comments about the Draft Plan as a whole or its constituent policies.

#### **Bishopbriggs, Torrance, Balmore and Bardowie**

Of the 83 responses received from Bishopbriggs, Torrance, Balmore and Bardowie, 43 wished to make either general or specific additional comments about the Draft Plan as a whole or its constituent policies.

#### **Kirkintilloch, Lenzie, Waterside and Twechar**

Of the 63 responses received from Kirkintilloch, Lenzie, Waterside and Twechar, 38 wished to make either general or specific additional comments about the Draft Plan as a whole or its constituent policies.

#### **Lennoxton, Milton of Campsie, Haughhead and Clachan of Campsie**

Of the seven responses received from Lennoxton, Milton of Campsie, Haughhead and Clachan of Campsie, four wished to make either general or specific additional comments about the Draft Plan as a whole or its constituent policies.

#### **Prefer not to say/blank**

13 respondents selected “prefer not to say” or left the question blank when asked which local community within East Dunbartonshire they belong to. Of those 13, there were 6 responses to the final question in the survey which asked for comments about any aspect of the Draft Plan either general or specific.