

ResponderType	FeedbackCategories	OrderSupport	FeedbackText
Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Access,Financial	Object	The plan to install a zebra crossing at the end of Church Street is I believe wasting Council money. I cross the road from Church Street to the Tyning almost daily without a problem. Any loss of parking spaces in Church Street are not acceptable.
Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Access,Financial	Object	I totally object to the proposals on the basis that the footfall of people who might use this crossing does not warrant the expenditure proposed. I walk my dog regularly across this road and never have a problem crossing over in either direction. In my opinion the proposals are a total waste of our tax payers money and should be scrapped. However having said the aforesaid, I would like to see the island at the junction removed as it is quite a problem turning right around it in the face of oncoming traffic travelling down Widcombe Hill.
Resident	Parking,Financial	Object	I strongly object to the loss of parking spaces resulting from this proposal. Parking in Church Street is already limited and the loss of three spaces will make the situation significantly worse for residents. The proposal does not take account of the affected area being at the end of zone 3 (zone 2 begins around the corner of Widcombe Hill and in The Tyning opposite) which limits alternative parking for residents. Widcombe Terrace at this end of Church Street contains eight dwellings each with two allowable parking permits. There would not be sufficient places left if the proposed changes go ahead and the proposal does not consider the impact on residents or suggest alternatives. The claimed saving of two parking spaces below the bus stop is misleading as this space is only ever used for one vehicle. The benefit of the raised crossing at the end of Church Street is questionable as the pavement only continues for a short distance above Church Street. Also there has been a major reduction of traffic in Church Street as a result of the measures already taken and must have reduced any theoretical risks to crossings significantly. The narrowing of the road to accommodate the zebra crossing will surely reduce this further. The proposal does not evidence any incidents that have occurred to date in this section of Church Street.
Resident	Traffic,Safety	PartlySupport	I strongly support all components of this proposal. The entrance to Church Street from Widcombe Hill has a far wider radius than is required for the speed limit and the volume of traffic. Narrowing this will create wider kerbs for safer and more pleasant pedestrian use of the pavement. This is important given the footfall along Church Street, especially by visitors to Prior Park Gardens and the proximity of the bus stop. A bench could also be installed on the new, wider pavement area. The raised continuous footway will further calm traffic entering Church Street and reinforce that it is an area where pedestrians and other active modes are prioritised. The zebra crossing will make pedestrians safer when crossing to/from The Tyning, and calm traffic. Consideration should be given to installing additional traffic calming measures uphill of this site i.e., on Widcombe Hill to the east of the junction with Tyning End. Eastbound traffic often accelerates hard uphill once it is past the pinch point of that junction, which is dangerous given the narrow pavement on the north side of Widcombe Hill.

Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Access	Object	This is completely unnecessary, Unless going to catch a bus(Only one service an hour) anyone wanting to go down the road has good pavements on both sides. The Speed bump is useless and does not improve any access or protect anybody. Reduction of Resident's parking will create much worse congestion in Church Street. A Financial waste of money which would be much better spent on a new crossing in Prior Park road where there there is a clear need - unlike on Widcombe hill where recent Road markings have already reduced much speeding. I completely oppose this rubbish proposal.
Resident	Traffic,Safety,Financial	PartlyObject	While laudable in other contexts I don't agree that it's necessary to install a raised continuous crossing over the junction of Church Street with Widcombe Hill. Since the introduction of the Church Street LTN (which we are both big supporters of), the traffic volume into and out of Church Street from/to Widcombe Hill is too small to warrant one, in our opinion. As the the door we use to access 6 Widcombe Hill is without a pavement and is therefore directly adjacent to the road, we'd much prefer the resources were instead used to extend the pavement outside 5 Widcombe Hill, up to our lower street door. We approve of the remainder of the proposal 26-021. Kind regards, Jeremy & Sarah
Resident	Parking,Financial,Environmental	Object	1) Zebra crossing across Widcombe Hill between Church Street and The Tynning I have to object to the zebra crossing on environmental grounds. Anything that causes vehicles to stop on an upward slope will increase pollution due to the additional power required for the many hill starts vehicles will be required to do if the proposal is implemented. A stated aim of the Liveable Neighbourhoods is to reduce pollution. The proposal on what is a relatively steep slope is therefore contrary to this aim. Instead, I believe a more sustainable approach would be to put signage on the eastern pavement of The Tynning advising pedestrians to cross Widcombe Hill from the western pavement of The Tynning beside the Royal Mail post box as visibility for crossing the road there (where the zebra crossing is proposed is already good but there is little infrastructure to suggest this is a better place to cross Widcombe Hill from The Tynning). I believe other street signage and an alternative road surface across a wider area of this part of the hill would be sufficient to create reduced speeds without adding the pollution that a zebra crossing will force upon the neighbourhood from uphill traffic having to stop. 2) Raised continuous crossing at the junction of Church Street I had originally objected to this on environmental grounds too as a raised crossing again increases pollution from vehicles having to drive up & over it. However I have reconsidered: removal of the current tiny pedestrian island will smooth the angle at which uphill vehicles will enter Church Street. This should I believe mitigate or hopefully be better than the pollution that will be created by driving over the raised crossing. My objection therefore remains based on financial and parking reasons. It feels like we are trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist. This is already a low vehicle traffic zone on account of the bollards half way along Church Street removing through traffic; and crossing the mouth of Church Street as a pedestrian is already easy. Why therefore spend money and remove valuable parking spaces for a problem that does not exist? There are far more difficult areas to cross which would benefit from this funding and this should be assessed and then requested from the funding provider.
Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Financial	PartlyObject	The number of cars coming out of Church street is minimal, as well as the number of pedestrians crossing the entrance, therefore creating a raised crossing and reducing parking spaces feels wholly unnecessary, and the money would be better spent on zebra crossings at the bottom of Widcombe hill (outside of the White heart) or near the other entrance of Church Street on Prior Park Road/Ralph Allen. I am very much in support of the zebra crossing on Widcombe Hill.

Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Access,Disturbance,Financial	PartlyObject	Hi, your proposals while well-meaning don't seem to be fully thought through and as such the money could be more wisely spent. For convenience I will use the numbering system as per your https://www.bathnes.gov.uk/church-street-and-prior-park-road#proposals. No. 5 is already in place and as per the aforementioned webpage "This was made permanent in January 2024 after a six-month trial and public consultation. ". This should not be considered a proposal given it is in situ and previously approved. I would strongly object if this was to be reversed and this is clumsily presented if you don't mean it this way. I have no issue with No. 3 but would recommend improvements on same. I think this is where the raised continuous crossing should be, i.e. it becomes both a zebra crossing and a continuous crossing thereby aiding pedestrians and acting as a traffic calming measure (& hopefully not becoming a danger to downhill cyclists but I will defer to the experts on that particular point). Regarding No. 1 ("Install a raised continuous crossing over the junction of Church Street..."), this is not necessary any more since the installation of the bollards at St Thomas à Becket Church (i.e. No. 5). Since the installation of No. 5, Church Street has become a minimally trafficked road - used predominantly by residents and visitors / deliveries to same. In other words, the need for No. 1 has been made obsolete by No. 5, which has worked perfectly since its installation and has stopped the nuisance rat-run traffic that used to plague the road. If No. 1 was to fall away then that would also mean No. 2 not being necessary. While I would hate to see the loss of 3 no. spaces on Church Street, if you were to tell me they were being removed to allow wider vehicles to negotiate the bend on Church Street just off Widcombe Hill then I would have less of an argument. However, the Proposal appears to be in the context of No. 1 and, as such, purely in that context is unnecessary. My feeling on this is that those overseeing this should review once more and get this right in order to provide the correct solution and save public money. I can't help feeling that No. 1 was designed without taking into account No. 5 whatsoever. While the following is not related to the above, it is connected nonetheless. I think the sight-lines in the downhill direction of Widcombe Hill need improving and I have witness a lot of delays in recent times where neither the upcoming or downhill traffic is at fault. While the following is not a perfect solution, I do think the road marking stopping cars travelling down Widcombe Hill
Resident	Parking,Safety,Financial	PartlyObject	In general I am very much supportive of the proposal and its intent. However, I do not understand why the raised crossing at the entrance of Church St is deemed necessary. Safety is of course paramount, however since the road is no longer a through road the volume of traffic on the road is small. I cannot see how the cost of the raised crossing can be justified. Has the raised crossing as a standalone element being surveyed? cost justified? I am sure the money could be better used, perhaps installing further speed calming initiatives on Widcombe Hill or on Ralph Allen Drive, both of which are a much greater need. There have been several accidents on Ralph Allen Drive over the years, I am aware of none at the entrance of Church St in the 10 years I have lived here. This element of the proposal makes no sense to me. Furthermore the impact of loss of 3 parking spaces on Church St, when we are the very edge of zone 3 and with limited alternative options available for the residents of nearby streets.

Resident	Parking,Safety	PartlyObject	the zebra crossing is needed and i support. The raised pavement at the entrance to Church Street is unnecessary along with the loss of 3 car parking spaces. By closing through traffic in Church Street cars usage is down and risk to pedestrians significantly reduced. The cost of doing this intervention cannot be justified, particularly as Widcombe Hill has had an extraordinary amount of money spent on it in recent years. At a time of national shortage of funds there are other engineering interventions urgently needed in the ward and the city that this money could be used for, let alone in other parts of the economy. Parking is at a premium in the immediate vicinity and the loss of three car parking spaces will lead to considerable unnecessary stress for residents and parents of young children in particular -do you really want parents of young children parking on the other side of Widcombe Hill with push chairs and shopping. This is another example of where recently the council transport department seems to be driven by outputs and not outcomes. Its coming across as money/budget to be spent, whether Banes money, WECA money or DFT money . The recent 2025-6 data shows B&NES as the tenth worst in the country for local road maintenance. Budget needs to be repurposed for these urgent needs in Banes, rather than raised crossings that are not needed. Local residents oppose it, local councillors oppose it --how has it got this far in a TRO process? Strongly oppose the raised pavement.
Resident	Traffic,Safety	Object	This is yet another unnecessary waste of tax payers money in my local area being spent on something that barely anyone has called for. As a resident who walks, cycles and drives I feel I have a clear overall view of what is needed and isn't. The pavement being enlarged and the carriageway being narrowed at the base of Widcombe Hill has made my life more difficult in every way possible. When my husband cycles the narrower road means he has a much greater risk of being clipped by a vehicle plus more stress from holding up cars travelling up the hill behind him. On the occasions when we need to drive our car it is difficult and dangerous when attempting to turn right out from Clarendon Road due to either traffic blocking the road behind the parked cars on Widcome Hill to proceed down the hill and for traffic speeding from above to get through before a vehicle comes up the hill. As a pedestrian I take my life in my hands crossing Prior Park Road to get to Widcombe Parade every day as the 'crossing not crossing' that was there before has been removed . It takes some genius to waste money making the situation worse for literally every mode of use and yet you have managed it. And now more wasting of tax payers money to put in an unnecessary crossing which no-one will use instead of a crossing where it is actually needed outside the The White Horse. And don't even get me started on the unnecessary blocking of Church Street for what reason, does a councillor live there? I would like to see a study on how that has affected congestion on Prior Park Road. I objected to the proposal for that and when I saw the consultation later my response was classed as out of area despite me living on Widcombe Crescent. This poorly thought through and expensive unnecessary changes will no doubt be reversed in a few years.
Resident	Traffic,Access	Neutral	You are installing new give-way signage around the crossings and removing the existing traffic island BUT why are you not putting up signage at the entrance to Church Street that informs drivers that there is no vehicle access or parking at the National Trust Prior Park. We now have many thousands of pedestrian tourists using Church Lane that access and exit Prior Park. The volume of tourists already makes it difficult to drive through groups of pedestrians on Church Lane, but we also have many tourist vehicles following their Sat-Nav to the Prior Park entrance in Church Lane. It is a dead end and they invariably get stuck with nowhere to turn round, often causing chaos. The latest development in this matter is tourists coming out of Prior Park and calling an Uber. So we now have many taxis driving up and down Church Lane and trying to turn round outside the park entrance. I have uploaded some photos of tourists getting stuck, accessing our drive to turn round and even people who park in our drive and visit the park whilst blocking us in! The second point is will the bollards by the church be removed during the installation works of the raised crossing? Otherwise how will residents get in and out?
Resident	Environmental	Neutral	I am concerned about the flashing Belisha Beacons causing further light pollution to the upper floors of the Crescent, particularly in winter when the deciduous trees are bare. Various street lights, including ones on Widcombe Hill are already very intrusive.

Resident	Safety	Support	As a regular walker from The Tynning, along Church Street to Prior Park Road, I would find this crossing invaluable. Equally, I would find it valuable as a driver: emerging from The Tynning onto Widcombe Hill is always daunting as the traffic comes up the hill too fast and cannot be seen and it is almost upon you; this crossing would force the traffic to slow down which would be very helpful.
Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Access,Disturbance	Object	This proposal is appalling. It widens the road junction at the end of church street allowing cars to exit church street at speed while removing the pedestrian safety refuge which is useful in crossing Widcombe hill at this point. The distance that pedestrians have to cross this excessively wide junction has increased - a junction more in keeping with a motorway entry point than an LTN. No one crosses church street at the point proposed. Everyone crosses above the junction where you can see cars coming down the hill. This is a inhumane and frankly dangerous proposal
Resident	Financial	Object	We regularly cross the Church Street junction when walking up Widcombe Hill. Traffic VERY rarely accesses Church Streetthere is absolutely no need for traffic calming at the Church Street junction. This would be a complete waste of tax payer funding. Making Church Street a no through road has already achieved a significant reduction in traffic and speed. Additionally, removing resident parking would just push more parking onto Widcombe Hill. Tax payer funding should not be spent on making changes to Church Street junction when it presents no risk to pedestrians or vehicles.
Resident	Traffic	Neutral	You are focusing on the wrong street - Prior Park Road has real safety issues and is in need of crossing, whilst this street already has multiple traffic calming measures / it feels like a real wasted opportunity to instal it here and not on Prior Park Road
Resident	Safety	Object	I have lived in Bath long enough to see too many traffic "improvements" be installed and then be ripped out soon after because they are dangerous. All at our expense as council tax payers. The very recent example are the changes at the top and bottom of Widcombe Hill but there have been scores over the last 25 years. There is a current fad of putting pedestrian crossings at junctions. This one is fundamentally bonkers and there will be accidents. That junction has terrible visibility down the hill on a good day if a driver is turning right from The Tynning onto Widcombe Hill. By contrast pedestrians have clear line of sight both up and down the hill, whether they are on the Church Street side or The Tynning. To put a crossing at the place those cars will turn right into is dangerous for both pedestrians and cars. If there is an accident I am keeping a record of this objection and I will be contacting the Council very swiftly thereafter to hold you responsible. The council routinely ignores the feedback of residents and it seems it is the only way to hold you accountable for your actions
Resident	Parking	PartlyObject	Whilst I can understand the need for a zebra crossing, I am objecting to the loss of 3 parking spaces on Church Street. Parking on Church Street is already at full capacity and residents/visitors face considerable difficulty in finding somewhere to park a car (particularly at evenings and weekends). However, the proposals do not offer any suggestions how this will be addressed. Where will the 3 vehicles now park? These vehicles will not simply disappear through 'wishful thinking' - and I doubt the proposals will magically encourage residents to give up their personal vehicles. I can only suggest that if the proposal proceeds as suggested then the zone 3 parking area will need to be extended to include neighbouring zones (or amalgamated with them). Could BANES therefore give consideration to addressing where the vehicles should now be parked. Thank you.

Resident	Traffic,Safety,Environmental	Support	I fully support the work the council have implemented so far on Widcombe Hill to improve safety and calm traffic. I'm very much in favour of this next plan of work (zebra crossing and associated work) aiming further to improve safety for people walking on Widcombe Hill. Will there also be speed cushions on the section outside St Matt's church? Cars often still race up this narrowed section, passing within inches of pedestrians on this narrower section of pavement.
Resident	Traffic,Safety,Environmental	Support	I support it to make it safer for pedestrians