

ResponderType	FeedbackCategories	OrderSupport	FeedbackText
Resident	Safety	Support	Please can you explain why you have not considered humps to be bottom of Kipling Avenue. This area leading onto the Wellsway and Bloomfield Ave is a major accident spot. Cars should not be able to turn right from Bloomfield Road up the Wellsway.
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 escooter riding extremely unsafe. Meanwhile, in good weather, reckless cyclist/escooter rider will try to be Evil Knieval 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!

			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 northwest 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 Knieval 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	Parking, Traffic, Safety, Disturbance, Financial, Environmental, Other	Object	
Resident	Safety	Support	I support these proposals which provide safe crossing places for pedestrians
Resident	Traffic, Safety, Access, Environmental	Object	I urge the Council to retain the right for vehicles to exit Bloomfield Avenue onto the Wellsway by making either a right or left hand turn as is currently the case. The current arrangement with the box and traffic lights enables this to occur in both directions. Any proposal to prevent a right hand turn would mean residents from Bloomfield Avenue and Maple Grove would need to use either Oldfield Road to cross two lanes of traffic on the busy Wellsway leading to a high build up of traffic on Oldfield Road. Or they would need to go down the length of Wellsway and return up the Wellsway causing more road congestion. Neither is a satisfactory proposition and could cause further traffic buildup and also pollution.

			I am pleased to see transport improvements proposed for Bear Flat, Bath (Wellsway). Having reviewed the proposals please note my comments. The proposals are largely welcomed. The implementation of 20 mph speed limit and clearer pedestrian priority on streets joining Wellsway should improve safety for all users. Bear Flat is a key cycle route connecting Two Tunnels to central Bath. The preferred cycle route from Bear Flat to central Bath is via Hayes Place/ Holloway. This cycle route should be clearly signed in both directions. The intersection between Wellsway continues to present a hazard. The space referred to as “pocket for cyclists to wait before turning right” has been reduced from the current right filter for all vehicles. Southbound vehicles often cut across this filter and the smaller size may make such behaviour more prevalent. The “pocket” should be more than “just paint”. Physical infrastructure e.g. raised surface should be added to the north side of the pocket to discourage drivers driving into this space. The restrictions on the (small) Bloomfield Road bus lane joining Wellsway are not clear from diagrams provided. This should remain a 24hr buslane. Restricting the times of this. Removes safer entry onto Wellsway that cyclists currently enjoy. Lowers traffic accessing Wellsway, thus removing a hazard that currently encourages vehicles travelling north on Wellsway to slow. The current road markings include a “Keep Clear” in front of the intersection between Bloomfield Avenue and Wellsway. This allows traffic to turn right out of Bloomfield when the pedestrian crossing is active. Such markings are not present on the proposal. Removing such markings may have a detrimental impact on traffic. Whilst the changes are welcomed I do feel they are rather limited in their scope. The area remains very vehicle focused. The carriageway remains very wide (4 lanes and parking in places) whilst “utility space” (pavement space, planters etc) is increased only very modestly. I am unclear if the design takes into account traffic flows due to school runs in the mornings. Traffic follows an informal rule of going up Shakespeare and down Kipling. However exiting Kipling is problematic due to heavy traffic on Wellsway. This leads to increased traffic on Chaucer with vehicles looking for less congested (and hence quicker) access onto Wellsway. Could the intersection of Kipling/ Bloomfield Rd/ Wellsway be replaced with a mini-roundabout. Such an enhancement would: Ease ingress of traffic from Kipling onto Wellsway and thus ease congestion in all avenues during “school run” without having a significantly detrimental effect on traffic flow on Wellsway. At all times slow northbound traffic on Wellsway entering Bear Flat. Remove need for filter from Wellsway onto Bloomfield, space that could be used for on street parking (or indeed formal School drop off spaces) bookended with planters, providing more greenery. Allow removal of the current “central reservation”, which would no longer serve a purpose. Allow creation of a larger “island” to the north of the intersection, which could provide more greenery. The priority between bus lane entering from Bloomfield and Wellsway needs to be considered, given proximity of junction to the mini roundabout and loss of bus lane on Wellsway itself. Such a plan could be extended to reconfigure the Wellsway/ Shakespeare junction to provide further pavement/ utility space for residents and physical protection for the bus stop but the two enhancements are largely independent of each other. Thanks for taking the time to read these comments. I would be happy to discuss further.
Resident	Traffic	PartlySupport	
			I have been told that there are no right-turn lanes or yellow boxes at the junctions of Hayes Place and Bloomfield and Bruton Avenues. I have not been able to find a map with the proposed layout but if this is the case it would seem to me that this is likely to lead to delays in the traffic flow at best and potentially to more accidents. Please can you review this.
Resident	Traffic	PartlySupport	
			As a local Architect and daily pedestrian who walks along Bloomfield Road and Hayes Place into the city every morning and back each evening, I object to this proposal. While I support measures that genuinely improve pedestrian safety, I do not believe raised table speed humps at these junctions are an appropriate or effective solution. The Council states that the humps will reduce vehicle speeds, yet vehicles already approach these junctions cautiously because they are required to stop before merging. In the many years I have used this route every day, I have never witnessed a vehicle failing to give way to a pedestrian crossing these side roads. If the objective is to provide pedestrians with a clearer and safer priority, a zebra crossing would be a more effective, intuitive and accessible intervention than introducing raised tables. Furthermore, raised speed humps can introduce new hazards, particularly for cyclists and motorcyclists, who may lose stability in wet or icy conditions or when avoiding parked vehicles. They also increase vehicle noise from braking and acceleration, and can impede emergency service response times. More fundamentally, I question whether this is the best use of public funding. Many roads across Bath continue to deteriorate due to inadequate long-term maintenance, and it is difficult to justify investing in infrastructure that addresses a problem for which there is little evidence while the underlying condition of the highway network continues to decline. Public funds would be better directed towards durable road maintenance and targeted pedestrian improvements where there is demonstrable need.
Resident	Traffic,Safety,Financial, Environmental	Object	

Resident	Parking,Traffic,Financial ,Environmental,Other	Object	I object to TRO 26-043A. Although presented as a proposal for raised table speed humps, this is not simply a traffic-calming measure. The proposal forms part of a wider redesign of the Bear Flat area, including bus lane changes, parking restrictions, relocated bus stops, footway widening, side-road entry treatments and mobility hub proposals. It is therefore impossible to properly assess the raised tables in isolation. The Statement of Reasons asserts that the raised tables will improve pedestrian safety and reduce vehicle speeds, but no supporting evidence has been provided showing: existing speed data at each junction;collision history;pedestrian counts;school-time and off-peak crossing demand;evidence that current Highway Code pedestrian-priority rules are not achieving the intended outcome;near-miss data;assessment of alternative measures such as high-visibility surfacing.The Council relies on broad assertions such as “improve pedestrian safety” and “reduce vehicle speeds”, but provides no site-specific evidence demonstrating that raised tables are necessary or proportionate at these locations.The proposals also fail to assess the interaction between the raised tables and likely driver behaviour. The revised layout introduces constrained carriageways, turning movements, bus stop activity and merging traffic. Drivers attempting to pass stationary vehicles or take gaps in traffic may encounter raised tables immediately afterwards, creating conflict between expected vehicle behaviour and vertical traffic-calming measures.The proposed raised tables are located at the bottom of side roads where residents are aware of existing surface-water pooling issues and existing drainage infrastructure. No drainage assessment has been published showing the impact on water flow, gullies or standing water.Conservation and Historic Character. The proposed raised tables are not simply traffic-calming measures. They introduce permanent physical changes to the form of the street through raised entry treatments, altered kerb lines and changes to the visual relationship between the carriageway and adjoining roads.Bear Flat forms part of Bath's historic urban environment. Wellsway historically functioned as a broad approach route into the city and formerly accommodated tram movement. Its width, openness and junction geometry form part of the area's established character.The Council repeatedly refers to placemaking, improved amenity and improved character, yet nowhere in the supporting documents is there any assessment of:the existing historic character of Wellsway;the impact of narrowing junction mouths;the effect of raised entry treatments on the appearance of the street;whether less intrusive alternatives would achieve the same objectives.The proposal therefore asks residents to accept permanent changes to the physical form of the street without providing any evidence that the heritage or townscape implications have been assessed.Grounds of objectionNo evidence demonstrating that raised tables are necessary.No assessment of driver behaviour, merging movements or safety interactions.No drainage assessment.No conservation, heritage or townscape assessment despite permanent physical alteration of a historic streetscape.Less intrusive alternatives have not been shown to have been considered.
----------	---	--------	---

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 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 at the coloured surface, which is inherently less safe as it is so busy. The pedestrian priority crossings on Shakespeare Ave will increase traffic congestion on the Wellsway, especially at peak times, even if they are not turning up Shakespeare Ave. 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 required road crossings for people, and especially for children, from the Bear Flat Centre, to and from their bus stop, increases the risk of accidents. 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 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 together with moving the bus stop, is likely to be more dangerous for both pedestrians and drivers.
Resident	Parking,Traffic,Safety	PartlySupport	I support the plan to install a speed hump at the bottom of Bruton Avenue. However, pedestrians frequently walk out of the Coop store and cross the bottom of Bruton Avenue without looking for approaching traffic. If there is essentially a pedestrian crossing installed, people are even less likely to be looking out for cars as they will assume right of way. It is especially hard as a driver if you are exiting Bruton Avenue or turning left into Bruton Avenue from the Wells Road. Removing the first parking space from the Coop side at the bottom of Bruton Avenue would aid visibility and especially help when the large Coop lorry is delivering as this in itself makes turning left into Bruton Avenue challenging.
Resident	Safety,Access	Support	It is difficult to cross at some of the points identified so seems a good idea.

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.
----------	------------------------	--------	---