

# Proposed RPZ Meeting Report

**Broomhill & Thornwood - 19<sup>th</sup> February 2026**

**Meeting between:** Glasgow City Council (GCC) Officers, Broomhill Community Council (BCC), Thornwood Community Council (TCC)

**Location:** Broomhill & Hyndland Parish Church, Broomhill

**Date:** 19 February 2026

**Time:** 10:30am – 12:15pm

## Attendees

- Cllr Lana Reid-McConnell
- Andrew Beglin (GCC / NRS)
- John Telfer (GCC / NRS)
- Representatives from Broomhill CC & Thornwood CC

---

## Purpose of the Meeting

The meeting was convened to discuss the proposed introduction of a Restricted Parking Zone (RPZ) covering Broomhill and Thornwood.

Questions from Broomhill Community Council and Thornwood Community Council had been submitted to Council officers in advance to allow researched responses during the session.

---

## Key Points Discussed

### Distinct Areas, Different Needs

It was agreed by all present that Broomhill and Thornwood are distinct areas with different characteristics and parking pressures. Officers acknowledged that the boundaries of the two areas could be considered separately in any review of the current proposal.

There was agreement in the room that Broomhill may not benefit from the RPZ as currently proposed, whereas concerns remain in parts of Thornwood.

### Origin of the RPZ Proposal

Officers confirmed that the original RPZ proposal (referenced in a 2016 GCC committee report) was initiated following resident requests. However:

- No records are available detailing these requests.
- The number, format, or content of such requests is unknown.

Officers stated that resident input is the sole source of information used to determine whether to progress an RPZ proposal. No independent data collection is undertaken to confirm whether a parking problem exists before proceeding.

Officers also conceded that there may be no commuter or non-resident parking issue in Broomhill.

### **Evidence Base and Measures of Success**

Officers confirmed that:

- No data has been gathered to assess the effectiveness of existing RPZs in Hyndland or Partick.
- There are no defined measures of success.
- Success is primarily inferred from observing some empty parking bays during the day.
- Night-time parking is not considered when assessing effectiveness.

A TCC representative highlighted that parking pressures in Thornwood are often most acute at night and expressed concern that an RPZ could increase evening stress due to reduced capacity.

Officers further confirmed:

- No data exists to distinguish commuter vehicles from resident vehicles.
- No before-and-after monitoring has been undertaken to measure commuter parking levels.
- No monitoring has been conducted to assess displacement into neighbouring areas.

In Partick, “before and after” photographs were referenced as evidence of reduced vehicle numbers, but no detailed data was available on residents’ ability to park closer to their homes.

### **Parking Capacity and Space Loss**

TCC and BCC representatives highlighted figures from the Streetwise survey previously provided by GCC, indicating potential loss of:

- 173 spaces in Thornwood
- 412 spaces in Broomhill

Officers queried these figures and appeared unaware that capacity calculations had been included in the survey material. A summary printout was provided to officers for further review.

### **Discouraging Commuting and Car Use**

Officers confirmed that one aim of the RPZ policy is to discourage commuter parking and reduce car use within the city.

Parking by individuals travelling from out with the area to work locally is classified as commuter parking.

It was acknowledged that suitable public transport alternatives are not always available. Officers suggested that people could choose to work or live in another area if this was a problem.

Officers stated that it is 'hoped' increased demand would drive future transport investment. As GCC do not control public transport in Glasgow, this is not something GCC is yet in a position to guarantee.

### **Future Surveys**

Officers outlined plans for additional surveys to determine the extent of commuter parking.

The proposed methodology includes hourly vehicle counts noting make, model and colour. Vehicles arriving around 8am and departing around 6pm would be assumed to represent commuter parking.

It was acknowledged that distinguishing commuter vehicles from resident vehicles remains challenging, though officers indicated that efforts are being made to improve understanding.

It was requested that data from the new surveys be made public, ideally through public presentations in the local area or at a minimum online through the likes of Teams (accessibility needs via computer access should be considered)

Officers suggested a parking workshop by which to gather current information on what the actual parking issues are within Broomhill and Thornwood. It is understood that no workshop has previously taken place. Should this go ahead the CC's asked that there is representation from more than just Transport departments. Essential service providers (Social work and Education) along with wider representation of community views should be sought.

### **Obstructive Parking**

There was consensus that obstructive corner parking is an issue, particularly in Thornwood.

However, there was not agreement that an RPZ is necessarily the most appropriate solution.

Officers confirmed that double yellow lines could be introduced at corners, subject to a suitable Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

### **Boundaries and Enforcement**

Officers confirmed that:

- RPZ boundaries may be adjusted at the periphery.
- Individual streets within an RPZ cannot be selectively excluded.
- Current parking enforcement is prioritised in areas where RPZs already exist, due to prioritising income generation.

### **Community Engagement and Data Transparency**

Officers stated that raw data from Community Engagement Surveys would not be shared with BCC or TCC, citing concerns that free-text comments may contain personally identifiable information.

When asked whether anonymised data could be shared without comment sections, officers declined. Instead, a summary report compiled by GCC officers will be provided. The format and level of detail of this report have not yet been specified.

Officers acknowledged that the RPZ has been designed with a 'toolkit' that is 20 years old and that this needs to be updated. This includes the FAQs and reviewing the available permits. No timescale is currently available for when this will be undertaken.

In 2025 Parking Services gave updates to NRS committees regarding the publication of a Parking Strategy. As of November 2025 this was still under development. Officers did not know of a publication date at this time.

### **Commitment Regarding Progression**

Officers made clear statements that:

- The RPZ would not proceed without community support.
- The proposal would "not be bulldozed through."
- No progression of the scheme will take place until at least mid-March, when the proposed schedule will be known.
- No advancement will occur without consultation with, and agreement from, both Community Councils.

This was presented as a firm commitment from the Council officers present.

### **Community Council Positions**

- It was agreed that Broomhill and Thornwood should be treated separately, with parking solutions tailored appropriately to each area.
- Thornwood CC confirmed it would support Broomhill CC's right to oppose an RPZ in Broomhill, even if deemed appropriate in Thornwood.
- Continued collaboration between the two Community Councils was affirmed.
- One TCC representative expressed strong support for the RPZ, citing perceived commuter parking issues in Crathie Drive.
- The CC's affirmed that they wish to continue positive dialogue with NRS Parking Services on addressing concerns raised and thanked the officers for attending the meeting.

### **Next Steps**

- GCC officers will confirm the proposed schedule for advancement no earlier than mid-March 2026.
- Additional vehicle surveys are planned.
- A summary report of Community Engagement Survey results will be issued.
- No further progression will take place without consultation and agreement with both Community Councils.
- Cllr Reid McConnell reaffirmed that this needs to have a community lead approach and continued to ask for increased reassurance and communication from Parking Services regarding timelines and actionable steps.

---

**This report is intended to provide a factual summary of discussions for public information.**