

ResponderType	FeedbackCategories	OrderSupport	FeedbackText
Resident	Traffic	Support	Wellsway is a very dangerous road with numerous car crashes and drivers regularly speeding and 20 miles an hour should be mandatory for this residential road that has been neglected in terms of speeding cars and traffic.
Resident	Traffic,Safety	Support	There have been a number of accidents at the junction of Kipling Road/Wellsway/Bloomfield Road since I moved here 12 years ago. The reduction to a 20mph speed limit is a step in the right direction but traffic should not be able to turn right up the Wellsway from Bloomfield Road at this junction as this is one of the main causes of such accidents.
Resident	Parking, Traffic,Safety,Disturbance,Financial,Environmental	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	Traffic,Safety,Environmental	Support	Please reduce speeds to 20mph and then enforce the limit
Resident	Safety	Support	I very much support these proposals, particularly the change to 20mph
Resident	Traffic,Safety,Environmental	PartlyObject	As a local architect, I object to the proposed reduction of the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph, but I support the introduction of the peak-hour bus lane on Bloomfield Road and the A367 Wellsway. In practice, the existing 30mph limit is only achieved where road conditions, visibility and traffic levels allow drivers to travel safely at that speed. During busier periods, vehicle speeds are naturally constrained by congestion and the character of the road itself, making a blanket 20mph limit an unnecessary restriction that is unlikely to deliver a meaningful improvement in safety. By contrast, the proposed bus lane has the potential to improve the reliability and attractiveness of public transport by reducing delays for buses during peak commuting periods. Prioritising bus services is a more targeted intervention that encourages sustainable travel while maintaining the existing speed limit, which I believe already reflects the nature of the road and the conditions experienced by drivers.

Resident	Traffic,Financial,Environmental ,Other	Object	object to TRO 26-043C.The Council states that this proposal will improve public transport and support the wider mobility hub scheme. However, the evidence provided does not demonstrate that the proposed bus lane and 20mph restriction will achieve those aims.The documentation provides no convincing analysis of:bus journey-time improvements;queue reduction;interaction with Churchill Gyratory congestion;operational impacts of buses merging back into general traffic;effects of loading activity on bus operation;effects of turning traffic on bus reliability.The proposals shorten crossing distances and narrow parts of the carriageway, but no evidence is presented showing that these changes will materially improve journey times or network performance.Existing pedestrian crossing times are already very short. Reducing crossing distance by a small amount appears likely to generate only marginal benefit, while the primary source of delay on the route remains downstream congestion associated with Churchill Gyratory and associated queuing.No analysis is provided showing that the proposed measures address that constraint.The scheme also appears internally inconsistent. It claims to support bus priority, yet introduces:kerb build-outs;constrained carriageway widths;loading activity accessed from the bus corridor;altered junction geometry;loss of turning capacity and operational flexibility.At locations such as Bloomfield Road and Hayes Place, the design may remove opportunities for buses and other vehicles to move around obstructions and rejoin traffic safely and efficiently.The police response itself demonstrates that supporting speed evidence was required and raises questions regarding the relationship between road design, compliance and enforcement.Conservation Area, Historic Form and Carriageway Narrowing. The physical works associated with this Order fundamentally alter one of the defining characteristics of Wellsway: its historic width and openness.Wellsway was historically laid out as a broad approach route into Bath and formerly accommodated tram operations. That historic geometry remains visible today and forms an important part of the area's character.The proposed scheme narrows the perceived carriageway through:kerb build-outs;widened footways;revised crossing layouts;bus lane arrangements; side-road entry treatments.The Council repeatedly describes these changes as improvements to placemaking and character, yet no document:identifies the existing character of Wellsway;evaluates the effect of narrowing the carriageway;assesses the visual impact of introducing modern highway engineering features;demonstrates that the proposals preserve or enhance the area.This omission is particularly significant because the transport benefits remain unclear. Existing crossing times are already short, Churchill Gyratory remains the dominant traffic constraint, and no evidence has been published showing that narrowing the highway will produce meaningful network improvement.The result is that a historic street form is being permanently altered without any demonstrated heritage justification and without clear evidence that significant transport benefits will follow.Grounds of objection: No bus journey-time or congestion modelling.No assessment of interaction with Churchill Gyratory.No explanation of bus lane operation, merging and turning conflicts.No evidence that crossing narrowing provides meaningful network benefits.No conservation, heritage or townscape assessment despite significant alteration of the historic street form.These proposals are being consulted on through three separate TRO processes despite forming a single integrated scheme. This fragmentation makes it difficult for residents to understand the cumulative impacts of the proposals or assess the interaction between bus priority measures, highway geometry changes, parking restrictions, crossings, loading activity and mobility hub objectives. I do not believe the Council has demonstrated that the combined effects of the scheme have been properly explained, assessed or consulted upon.Throughout the documentation the Council repeatedly refers to improving “character”, “placemaking” and “amenity”. However, none of the supporting documents identifies what is distinctive about the existing character of Bear Flat or explains why the historic form of Wellsway should be altered. The Council cannot credibly claim to enhance character without first assessing the character that already exists. The absence of any visible conservation, heritage or townscape assessment is therefore a significant omission and further undermines confidence in the scheme's justification.
Resident	Traffic,Safety,Disturbance	Object	I wholly object to this proposal. It does nothing to improve safety. Motorists will continue to drive at above 20mph as this is a major route south of Bath, and changing the speed limit does nothing to change this. Pedestrians will think cars will be slower, but many motorists continue to travel at a higher speed, which will increase the risk.

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 or design assessment associated with these proposals that can be made publicly available? My concern is that the published documentation makes repeated references to pedestrian improvements, amenity and placemaking, but appears to contain no explanation of how the historic character of Bear Flat has been considered or protected.
----------	------------------------	--------	---