

ResponderType	FeedbackCategories	OrderSupport	FeedbackText
Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Disturbance,Financial,Environmental,Other	Object	OBJECTION!The enormous pavement extensions at the junction of Bloomfield Avenue and Wellsway, and opposite, are unnecessary, unfit for purpose and dangerous.Their outcome would be that 2 busses/trucks and 2 cyclists width, won't fit safely between the build outs; and a bus pulling out from the bus lane (northerly direction into Bath) will squash any cyclist or e-scooterist unfortunate enough to be there.Ambulance needed to take away the injured and anyone else needing hospital emergency care will be impeded by the pinch points and pavement build outs, and indeed any emergency vehicles will be held up in both directions by the pinch point and restricted road width – about half of the original width. Any fire engine trying to get to the south side of Bath will be catastrophically delayed by this thoughtless scheme.There seems to be no consideration in these plans of the danger and costs of repair and diversion/redirection of any underground utilities that will be under the “new” kerb lines, and since road junctions hide usually complex underground utilities layout; Like the “ring of steel” bollard stupidity in central Bath that suffered £6 million pounds or £7 million pounds extra costs because “the underground utilities were not in the expected place and had to be moved”, this plan looks much the same. OBJECTION!Under section 80 of the Environmental Act 1995 - To say that there is neutral impact on air quality is completely wrong. During construction there will be noise, dust particulates and extra harm caused by the construction process. The construction process will use tonnes of kerbstones, concrete, tarmac, line paint and road surfacing, street furniture and bollards all of which needs to be transported from manufacturer to depot to jobsite. Does Bath and northeast Somerset council still have a climate emergency? If so this scheme does not comply with it. OBJECTION!It's well known that obstructing traffic flow increases pollution and degrades air quality and it is totally predictable that this scheme will do just that. OBJECTION!Road humps/speed tables are badly placed in this scheme. Any extra road surfacing means that the utility companies will take longer (more digging) to access buried utilities. Building humps over areas where utilities join (telecom ducts and power cable joints/water and gas connections etc. and don't forget the drains and sewers) means that the vehicle being raised by the hump forces extra impactful loads on the utilities below, degrading their structure prematurely and leading to potential failure. OBJECTION!It is also unwise to site humps on a hill (Shakespeare avenue and Bruton avenue) because in adverse weather accumulated water, dead leaves and general rubbish will sit at the base of the humps (ice in winter) making vehicular traction and braking difficult and cycle and scooter riding extremely unsafe. Meanwhile, in good weather, reckless cyclist/scooter rider will try to be Evil Knievel and use the speed bump like a launch pad for a wheelie ski jump, maybe leaping the whole length of the ramp/hump to be surprised when they can't stop and suffer serious injuries with road or vehicle impact. OBJECTION!The hump at the end of Bloomfield avenue is totally unnecessary and a dangerous protrusion into Wellsway. OBJECTION!The hump at Hayes place into Wellsway is unnecessary. OBJECTION!Reducing speed limit from 30 to 20MPH. This is unnecessary, as vehicle speed in this area is always slow. It's a waste of money and signposts. OBJECTION!
Resident	Safety	Support	I support these proposals

Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety,Access	PartlySupport	As a local architect, I support the proposal to introduce dedicated loading bays, including the goods vehicles only loading bay, as these will provide essential servicing facilities for the Co-op and Cook retail units and help support the continued viability of local businesses on Wellsway. Providing clearly designated loading areas should reduce informal parking and improve the overall operation of the street. However, I would encourage the Council to carefully consider the interaction between loading activity and bus movements. When a goods vehicle is loading outside Cook, there is the potential for an approaching bus to be obstructed within the bus lane, forcing it to merge into the general traffic lane. This could create unnecessary delays, reduce the reliability of bus services, and introduce avoidable conflicts with passing traffic. I therefore support the principle of the proposal but recommend that the detailed design is reviewed to ensure sufficient clearance or alternative arrangements are provided to prevent loading operations from impeding buses.
Resident	Parking,Traffic,Access,Financial,Environmental,Other	Object	I object to TRO 26-043B. Although presented as a parking and loading Order, this proposal forms part of a wider redesign of Bear Flat and cannot be assessed separately from the associated raised table and bus lane proposals. The proposal removes and alters parking provision, introduces loading arrangements and relocates bus stops. However, no assessment is provided showing: impact on nearby residential parking demand; parking displacement into surrounding streets; impact on local businesses; impact on visitors and service vehicles; interaction between loading activity and the proposed bus lane. Of particular concern is that the plans appear to place loading activity within, or directly accessed from, the same corridor used by the proposed bus lane. This creates an inherent conflict between bus priority and loading operations. No evidence has been provided demonstrating how this arrangement improves bus reliability. The relocation of bus stops and associated highway changes also alter visibility and turning behaviour at key junctions, yet no operational assessment has been published. The proposals appear likely to affect traffic turning into Shakespeare Avenue and visibility for traffic emerging from nearby side roads. There is likewise no evidence that the effect of these changes on existing local traffic patterns, including school-related movements associated with Beechen Cliff School, has been properly assessed. Conservation and Streetscape Impact. Although presented as a parking and loading Order, the associated plans substantially alter the appearance and function of the public realm through: relocated bus stops; additional highway markings; altered kerb alignments; loading facilities; changes to the relationship between carriageway and footway. These changes form part of a broader reconfiguration of Wellsway's historic street space. The Council claims that the wider scheme improves placemaking and character, yet no analysis has been published explaining: what existing character is being preserved; how the revised layout relates to the historic street form; why the existing arrangement is unsuitable; how the proposed layout enhances the area. The historic width and openness of Wellsway are part of the character of Bear Flat. Reallocating and narrowing elements of that space is a significant urban design decision, not merely a traffic management decision. Grounds of objection. No parking displacement assessment. No assessment of loading bay and bus lane interaction. No junction visibility or operational assessment. No assessment of impacts on local traffic patterns and school-related traffic. No conservation, heritage or townscape assessment.

StakeholderGroup	Safety,Disturbance,Environmental	PartlySupport	Bear Flat Association (26-043 A and B) (VARIOUS ROADS, BEAR FLAT, BATH) (RAISED TABLE SPEED HUMP) (PROHIBITION OF STOPPING, WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2026 (26-043C) (A367 WELLSWAY, BEAR FLAT, BATH) (20 M.P.H SPEED LIMIT) (BUS LANES) Order 2026 1Bear Flat Association wishes to confirm its support for the above Permanent Traffic Regulation Order, though we do have some points on matters of detail. 2We think a slower, steadier traffic flow taking up much less of the available highway space will be beneficial. And the much narrower crossing and much shorter red phases for traffic will likely ease congestion. We especially welcome the 20-mph limit, wider pavements and the provision of features such as planters. Overall, Bear Flat will, we think, become safer and calmer, less a highway, more a local centre. BFA have supported the scheme in principle all along: it fulfils much that we sought in our Vision for Bear Flat Centre in 2020. 3We ask that these points are considered: 4The 20mph zone is planned to end just north of Milton Avenue. We consider that it should extend south from Bear Flat to a little south of the Hatfield Road junction. It will be great to have a 20 limit through the local centre, but the Wellsway southward has many junctions, a crossing, bus stops, a Tesco store, a church and hall, a public house, a dental practice that justify a lower limit. 5For vehicles travelling north on Wellsway intending to turn right into Hayes Place, there is currently a space to wait to turn right and a yellow box to facilitate such a turn, but these are not on the SVL plans. It is hard to follow the logic of replacing the yellow box with a 'keep clear'. It may be thought that the road is wide enough to afford wriggle room for northbound traffic to pass traffic waiting to turn right. Would this be so when the bus stop has two buses present and the loading bay is in use? We ask for a right-turn lane and a yellow box here. 6Similarly, for those travelling south on Wellsway intending to turn right into Bloomfield Avenue, there are currently chevrons in the middle of the road so drivers can pull over out of the way of traffic continuing south and a yellow box to facilitate such a turn, but these are not on the SVL plans. We ask for a right-turn lane and a yellow box here. 7Similarly, again, there is no provision for turning right into Bruton Avenue, and there appears to be scant room for traffic to pass vehicles waiting to turn, such that a queue could cause congestion and possibly impede pedestrians on the crossing. 8Yellow boxes at the junctions with Hayes Place, Bloomfield Avenue and Bruton Avenue would also be important for traffic emerging onto Wellsway.
------------------	----------------------------------	---------------	---

Resident	Safety	Object	The coloured surface indicating pedestrian priority at the junction of Shakespeare Ave and the Wellsway may give pedestrians a false sense of security. It is an extremely busy junction and car drivers may sometimes have very little time to respond to pedestrians crossing. Currently many pedestrians crossing Shakespeare Ave do so further up the avenue, ie where the back lane comes out from Shakespeare Ave, opposite the church. The proposed pedestrian priority crossing at the junction may encourage more to cross on the coloured surface, which is inherently less safe as it is so busy. The coloured surface indicating pedestrian priority crossings on Shakespeare Ave will increase traffic congestion on the Wellsway, especially at peak times, even if cars are not turning up Shakespeare Ave, due to tail backs that would be caused. Southbound stationary traffic would quickly back up across the main pedestrian crossing on the Wellsway. Congested traffic across a pedestrian crossing can give pedestrians, who at peak times will be mostly school children, a false sense of security that it is safe to cross, when it is not (as traffic will still be running freely on the north bound lane) Gradually moving the south bound bus stops, away from the Bear Flat Centre, to south of Shakespeare Avenue, increases pedestrians needing to cross roads from the Centre. School children, often visit the Coop before and after school. Increasing the required number of road crossings for people, and especially for children, from the Bear Flat Centre, to and from their bus stop, increases the risk of accidents, especially as they will now need to cross at such a busy junction. Active travel England recommends that pedestrian priority on continuous footpaths are for when traffic flow is below 45 cars per hour. In the peak school times the volume of cars up Shakespeare Ave is likely to be excess of 45 cars in 10 minutes. (Traffic flow up Shakespeare Ave was collected electronically by Banes in September 2024 and should show that if results for 8.30 am each morning are looked at) Active travel England also recommends, clear lines of sight for continuous footpaths. Due to the Deli building at the bottom of Shakespeare Ave being very close to the footpath, cars coming up the Wellsway turning left do not have a clear line of sight of pedestrians waiting to cross Shakespeare Ave towards the proposed amalgamated bus stop. Cars would have very little time to respond. The proposals planned would be suitable if the volume of traffic were significantly lower. Focus should be on reducing car traffic by reducing bus fares for working adults, increasing bus frequency and bus reliability, and increasing safe places to store bikes when away from home. Currently the proposed scheme, ie the coloured priority crossing at the bottom of Shakespeare, combined with moving the bus stop, is likely to be more dangerous for both pedestrians and drivers.
Resident	Parking,Access	PartlyObject	I'm not sure what the value of the proposal on Bloomfield Avenue or Hayesfield Park are, improving free parking would be better to give people the opportunity to park as visit the shops at Bear Flat. This will improve the area by increasing business. I object to the no waiting at any time restrictions in this area.
Resident	Traffic,Safety,Access	PartlyObject	I would note that the relocated northbound bus stop shifted from outside the pub means that when a bus is present at the stop, right turn traffic heading from Wellsway into Hayes Place will block the carriageway for any other traffic heading down the hill. A turning vehicle at that point would also probably stop the bus from being able to pull out. Both these factors would have some impact on the bus timings, which I understand was one of the key drivers of this scheme. The turn into Hayes Place is vital for the businesses there, but also for the many residents who need access and deliveries down the Holloway. At a time when generally there seem to be more yellow boxes being installed, I am confused by the logic of replacing the yellow box on the Wellsway at the exit of Hayes Place with a 'keep clear'. Not sure what message that sends, arguably its something that can be more easily ignored by driver at what is already a complex junction.

Resident	Traffic,Safety,Access	Object	We live 300 metres from the Coop and the right angle on the Bear Flat Wellsway. We walk that route at least twice a day ,once to buy product and at other times walking back from the bus stop we drive that route at least three times a week and I walk with my bike along the pavement to Bloomfield Road or ride it down Holloway at least once a week during non-winter days.The section of road on the Wellsway between Bloomfield Road and Oldfield Road is ,according to ATC information , second only to London Road in number of vehicle movements with 20,000 movements per week day.Detailed examination of the numbers also shows that roughly half of this flow is between 7am to 9:30 am and then again between 4 and 6pm. Footfall is at its highest between 7:45 am and 9 am and then at 3 to 3:30pm when the schools finish classes and again at 5 to 5:30pm when walking commuters are coming home. Outside of these hours traffic flows freely and pedestrians can walk at ease with relatively little pollution.One of the proposed interventions will make the situation more dangerous at these peak times-the loading bay outside the Coop. It is imperative that this business loading bay is not used between 7:30am to 9.30am and again between 4pm and 6pm in the evening. If vehicles are permitted to off load at these times then there is simply not enough room or turning circle for the buses/HGVs/larger cars to navigate two way traffic. Furthermore the absence of the current yellow box will make turning into Hayes Place from the Bruton Road direction even more hazardous for cars , and particularly cyclists. Changes needed: 1.The loading bay outside the Coop must have time restrictions-it cannot be used between 7am and 9.30am and it cannot be used between 4pm and 6pm. 2.It's not clear with the plan who has the right of way with the raised and widened crossing area at the entrance to Hayes Place-is it the motorist/cyclist or is it the crossing pedestrian? Surely it has to be the motorist/cyclist ,as if they stop on the corner to allow pedestrians to cross it will not only hold up traffic on the Wellsway, but increase the chances of Wellsway traffic bumping into each other, particularly at peak times. There is a lot of scepticism locally that the reduction of the width of the road will actually make the buses flow more punctually. Figures in the Movement Strategy document showed that buses from the Odd Down P&R to the city centre are 85% on time and 4% early. Anybody living on Wellsway or near to it ,and those of us that use the buses know that bus punctuality is worst going into the city between 7:45 am and 8.30am and going out of the city between 4 and 6pm-reducing the width of the road will have minimum effect on punctuality at these times, some believe it may actually make it worse!
Resident	Traffic,Safety,Access	Object	I write to comment on the proposed TRO's with the reference 26-043 A, B and C. First, can I say that I am in favour of the proposed 20-mph zone, but it should extend further south from Bear Flat Second, two observations: •Currently there is a refuge in the middle of the Wellsway where cars can wait to turn right into Hayes Place, but this is not on the SVL plans - its omission is likely to cause traffic to be blocked as the carriageway will be narrower •There is no mention of measures to prevent parking on the widened pavements. Overall, If the intention is that Bear Flat will become safer and calmer, less a highway, more a local centre, then I cannot see that these measures will help. That will only happen if the traffic flow is reduced, and these measures do nothing about that, they merely introduce a choke point which is going to worsen congestion both above and below Bear Flat and frustrate both residents and those passing through. And probably worsen rat-running along Chaucer Ave. Very unimpressed with the way these proposals have been designed (by someone with no local knowledge?) and pushed through, ignoring local objections.

Resident	Traffic,Safety,Access	Object	Re the above numbered TROs which apply to the Bear Flat area of Wellsway. 1.I am disappointed that the 20mph speed limit is not to be extended further south from Bear Flat - this is also a residential area. 2.Despite local concern and feedback no allowance has been made for a 'turn right' lane for vehicles coming from the south and wishing to turn into Hayes Place. A considerable amount of traffic turns into this area as this is the only turning off Wellsway serving Hayes Place (residents and shoppers), Holloway and roads off it (residents and shoppers) and Beechen Cliff Road. As the proposals stand anyone turning right from the south will block traffic and cause more, rather than less, congestion. 3.Introducing a pinch point at the pedestrian crossing outside The Bear pub will cause difficulty for any 'blue light' vehicles needing to travel south out of Bath. I cannot see how these proposals will improve traffic flow in this area, if anything the pinch point at the crossing will worsen congestion and create more pollution.
----------	-----------------------	--------	--

Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	Object	I struggle to understand how residents can have confidence that objections will be properly considered when construction is scheduled to begin almost immediately after the consultation period ends. The timing creates the impression that the outcome has effectively already been decided and raises legitimate questions about how representations can be fairly assessed, analysed and acted upon in such a short space of time. My greatest concern is not the principle of improving pedestrian safety, but the complete lack of meaningful consideration given to a conservation area and the historic character of Bear Flat. The proposals involve significant physical changes to the streetscape, including raised tables, kerb build-outs, junction narrowing and alterations to the historic geometry of Wellsway. Yet despite these being substantial interventions in an area of recognised historic character, I can find no proper conservation, townscape or heritage assessment within the published documentation. References to "placemaking" and "amenity" are not the same thing as demonstrating how these changes preserve or enhance the character of the area. Wellsway's unusually wide carriageway reflects its historic development, including its former tram function. That width and openness form part of the area's character. The proposals materially alter that character, but there appears to have been no transparent assessment of whether that change is appropriate or necessary. I am also concerned that: the consultation has been fragmented across three TROs despite operating as a single scheme; objections raised through the Somer Valley Links consultation do not appear to have been substantively addressed; no clear evidence has been published demonstrating that less intrusive alternatives were properly considered; no robust explanation has been provided as to why these works are necessary in this particular location. As my elected representative, I believe your responsibility is not simply to note concerns but to ensure that residents receive a fair process and that significant changes to a historic area are properly scrutinised. I therefore ask: Do you consider it reasonable for works to commence on 20 July when the consultation closed on 16 July? Have you seen a conservation, heritage or townscape assessment for these proposals? Will you request that works are delayed until all objections have been fully considered and responded to? Will you seek publication of any conservation, traffic, safety and design assessments that have informed the scheme? If such assessments do not exist, will you support pausing the project until proper due diligence has been undertaken? I would appreciate a substantive response, as I am struggling to see how residents can have confidence that their concerns are genuinely influencing the outcome. Conservation Officer, I would be grateful if you could clarify the following: Were you, or another member of the Council's conservation or heritage team, formally consulted on these proposals? If so, at what stage of the design process were you consulted? Did you provide written comments, recommendations, concerns or objections? Was any assessment undertaken of the impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area? Was the historic form of Wellsway, including its unusually wide carriageway and historic street geometry, considered as part of that assessment? Did you conclude that the proposed junction narrowing, raised tables and associated highway works preserve or enhance the character of the area? Were any amendments made to the scheme as a result of conservation advice? Is there a conservation, heritage, townscape
----------	------------------------	--------	--