

Summary Report of Metered Parking Meeting  
7.30pm, Friday 10 June 2005  
Kelvin Stevenson Memorial Church, Belmont Street, Glasgow

Present:

Frances MacInnes: Chairperson  
Patricia Ferguson MSP: Glasgow Maryhill  
Ann McKechin MP: Glasgow North  
Sandra White MSP: Glasgow  
Robert Brown MSP: Regional MSP for Glasgow  
Bailie Haleema Malik: Firhill, Ward (25)  
Peter Wilson: Chairman, Woodside Community Council  
John Clarkin: Parking Manager, Glasgow City Council  
Michael Brady: Parking Liaison Officer, Glasgow City Council  
Approximately 400 local residents and business owners

Apologies:

Jim McKechnie: Councillor, North Kelvin, Ward (19)  
Numerous by email

Note

John Clarkin and Michael Brady are referred to collectively as 'A'. The level of applause has not been recorded which was often a telling indicator of the general feeling.  
'F' refers to comments and questions from the floor.

Due to the overwhelming number of attendees, the downstairs hall proved too small and the meeting moved upstairs into the roomier church. The Council's coloured leaflet was handed out - it had not been available early in the consultation period. The meeting was chaired by its organiser, Frances MacInnes (abbreviated FM below).

FM introduces herself and the two Council officials, John Clarkin and Michael Brady.

A: The meeting of the Roads and Lighting sub-committee dealing with the remaining areas is on 21 June 2005. The present public meeting is not part of the completed consultation process, but the comments will be passed on. Council policy and the proposals were outlined. Obstructive parking is serious. The Fire Service has concerns with access.

FM (opening remarks): Through the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), numbers of written requests for a parking scheme were obtained, e.g. Napiershall, nil; Belmont, 35; Cranstonhill, 10; Kelvingrove, 8; Sandyford, 9; Park, 57; Woodlands, 20; Woodside, 1; Spiersgate, nil.

Are there in fact more objectors than residents in favour (as is suggested by the high attendance at this meeting)? If commuters are the problem, why do we have to pay for the

solution? The Kelvinbridge park-and-ride car park is generally nearly empty on a daily basis.

As a result of the income generation of £302,000 - noted in the Committee Report on the Budget and Service Plan presented to the Roads and Lighting Committee on 15 March 2005 - the money raised from parking permits and pay and display will be used to pay for part of the Lighting Network Renewal Project. This means the residents in the west-end, in addition to the already hefty council tax that they pay, are being imposed with an additional parking tax to fund a city wide lighting project.

Peter Wilson (Chairman of Woodside Community Council): notification of the Traffic Management Scheme was received late and caused a problem allowing the community council to arrange a meeting to discuss the issue fully. A letter of objection was sent in to the Council from Woodside CC. A letter was sent back in response to the objections outlined. These objections were not addressed and the CC were asked to respond to this within 14 days or their objections would be considered withdrawn. Peter Wilson was unhappy with this as Community Councils don't meet on such a regular basis and this was felt to be unfair.

Sundry points from the floor:

F: Fire concerns should be addressed in terms of current law.

F: Adopted roads are owned by frontage properties. Roads Scotland Act (1984) Section 1 says that the Council can gain no profit from such land. Frontage owners can apply to stop up a road if there is an alternative route for potential users (see example of University). Park Quadrant could be made into a car park.

F: Why that timing of 8 am - 10 pm in relation to commuters?

A: Only the Belmont area is not having the parking restrictions limited to 8 am - 6 pm.

FM: FOI – according to the information received from the Council under the FOI, there are no recorded requests for the restrictions to apply on Saturdays or to apply on Sundays. There have been two recorded requests for the restrictions to apply after 1730 hours.

A: the early requests were unsolicited before the consultation period.

F: 'I was unaware of proposals until last week.' - proper consultation wanted!

In reply to a criticism from the floor that notice of the meeting was too short, FM pointed out that it was privately arranged and paid for by the Metered Parking Group. She clarified that the Councillor had been asked on a number of occasions to arrange a meeting. This she was told was not necessary. Given the number of people who knew nothing of the proposals, a meeting was arranged at very short notice and publicised by leafleting as wide an area as possible by volunteers. It was impossible to ensure that everyone got a leaflet and she apologised for this. However, given the turnout, the communication had seemed to work.

Patricia Ferguson MSP: She found out about the scheme in the same way as everyone else. She thanked FM, who has done far more than the Council to raise public awareness. She had written to the Chief Executive of the Council on two occasions and was still awaiting a reply.

Has there been any liaison between Councils of Glasgow and East Dunbartonshire?

Why no guarantee of spaces for residents?

What precautions will there be against overflow of commuters to nearby areas? In particular north and west of the proposed zoned areas.

There is a problem with parents stopping/waiting near Glasgow Academy.

In regard to developments after January 2000 there is an obligation for residents of these new buildings to be told that they cannot have permits. Residents of buildings built after 2000 should have been informed in their missives that they would not qualify for a resident's permit in the event of a parking scheme being introduced in the future.

Sandra White MSP: She had written to the Council regarding a number of objections raised by her constituents.

What guarantees of space for residents?

Concern over overspill.

Why not free 'park and ride' for commuters? This would alleviate congested streets from commuter parking.

Problem with doctors' surgeries. Doctors must keep cars close by and use them for house calls.

A: Many points raised are not land service issues. Park-and-ride land is not Council property. It is not Council policy to provide car parks and thus attract people into the city. People pay for an annual permit in the city centre car parks and aren't guaranteed a space.

This reply generated an angry response from the floor as people didn't think it was a relevant comparison when it was their homes that they were talking about.

Haleema Malik affirmed that she is supporting us 100%. She doesn't want to have to pay £150 to park so why should she ask us to?

F: Woman from floor stated that she lived in the Woodlands area where many of her neighbours speak little English. Why were the notices not translated into Urdu and Punjabi? The notices were difficult to find, never mind be understood by many from the ethnic minority community who needed help with letters of objection etc.

The '14-days' is a piece of nonsense.

A: If one area scheme does not go ahead, cars from neighbouring areas will move in. Wilton St is being surveyed for possible extension of the scheme.

FM to A: So you admit that there will be a displacement of cars from metered zones to non-metered zones? In a letter sent by GCC it stated that there would be a 'buffer' zone at the Belmont Street bridge. Already cars are parking in this area and up into Wilton Street, in a bid to avoid the pay and display area. The scheme in Belmont Street is not even active yet. Where does this all stop? How many other areas does the Council plan to meter?

Wouldn't it be better to address the issue of commuter parking, which is the cause of the whole problem?

In Arlington St, according to a resident who has surveyed the plans in some detail, the bays will halve the amount of parking space. This does not assist in resident parking, it only exacerbates the problem and increases the displacement of cars into other areas.

F: Similarly, a woman noted that a stretch of road that can accommodate 17 cars now has only 9 bays.

A: The £150 is to pay for enforcement.

Patricia Ferguson: noted that £302,000 would be raised for lighting.

A: this sum is partly from fines.

F: Criticism of Council not providing parking for commuters. Could they not negotiate with SPT for park-and-ride land?

F (Jack Stuart): There are two separate issues - the scheme and the mishandled consultation. There was nothing in any election manifesto. Why have the Council not organised meetings? His letter 'inviting' him to withdraw his objections did not address any of the points he had raised. Councillor Hanzala Malik had said there was a problem in Woodlands (i.e. not elsewhere). He had also said that the scheme has to be revenue neutral, which is clearly untrue. Most residents are not car commuters so why should they pay?

FM: There are inconsistencies amongst the 9 schemes and other schemes currently running throughout the city. For example, in Hillhead there are residents parking bays.

F: woman expressed concern for her personal safety at night if she has to park far from home. Currently she has no problem parking outside her own home. She fears that when the parking zone is enforced, residents will have difficulty finding a parking space (number of spaces are fewer than currently due to the size of each bay, and the large loading bay in the middle of Belmont Street). She fears that she will have to park further from her home ie at the top end of Belmont/Wilton Street. This part of the street in recent months/years has been subject to a number of serious rapes and attacks. Could the Council ensure her personal safety?

A No response.

F: Anne-Marie McGuire (the Council's Administrative Assistant) had said in one of her letters, that there was overwhelming objection to evening/weekend restrictions. Was this an admission of 'overwhelming objection'?

F: belief that those favouring restrictions make up perhaps 2-10% of residents. The Council Officers were asked for the figures to confirm this.

A: They did not have the figures at hand and therefore could not answer this.

F: If it is the case that between 2-10% of residents has requested parking controls and that the majority (of which there were approximately 400 residents in attendance at the meeting), were not in favour, at what point does the Council take notice of the majority opinion?

A: No response

F Local businessman (Electrician) who has a business in Clarendon Place. His job requires visits to many houses in the local district. Suggestion that a period free of restriction in the middle of the day would help him, but not the typical commuter; there would be some saving on parking warden pay.

FM to A: How will the Council react to our comments?

A: said they would take back the comments made and report them to the Director of Land Services.

FM to F: This is the beginning, not the end! She thanked Maureen McRobb for arranging the hall hire, Doreen Edgar, John Hinton and Richard Burton for their assistance and background research in all matters concerning the parking proposal.

We need a committee to take things forward.

Forms made available for volunteers to record their details.

Invitation to email [meteredparking@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:meteredparking@hotmail.co.uk) for Minutes of meeting.

Patricia Ferguson: Happy to help in any way.

FM: Contributions to help with costs would be welcome. (A collection was taken.)

F: 'I have never had a problem parking.' He has lived in the area for 10 years without any problems, including renovation with properties round about, scaffolding, delivery trucks and still no problem. Why should he have to pay £150 now?

A were asked about Roads and Lighting Committee: their names are available on Council website.

F: Some churchgoers drive to church. Never a problem till now. Public transport on Sunday is unsatisfactory.

A: The official spoke about the Wilton St area being surveyed and that it would be monitored after restrictions were introduced in other areas.

A: Legal requirements for consultation were followed. The '14-day' request is legal.

F: there is a cul-de-sac off Wilton St with maneuvering problems that the overspill will exacerbate.

A: That area is being surveyed. The city takes £750,000 in fines.

F: Could the money raised from this not be used to pay for enforcement without the residents having to pay?

A: No, money raised from fines cannot legally be used in this way .

F: What will A do to promote our case?

A: The process cannot be stopped. We will ask for a meeting with the Director of Land Services to meet with a smaller contingent of the Metered Parking Group who can pass on the points raised and the strength of feeling.

F (Jack Stuart): Thanked A for coming - they are not to blame for the scheme - which is not theirs.

F: indignation that Council policy is not mentioned in coloured leaflet in relation to justification of scheme. Why? This is deception. Either the scheme is part of Council policy or it is as a direct response to residents and business requests (as per leaflet). Which is it?

A: Replied, it is Council policy.

F: Then why does it not say that in your literature? Are you deceiving us?

The meeting had to end before everyone could have their say.