

APPENDIX F - Summary of objections/comments received (following the Public advertisement)

(i) Online comments

Objections/ Officer response report reference para.	Do you support or object to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order and Anti- Terrorism Regulation Order for the Bath City Centre Security Scheme?	Objection details	Partly support details	Are you responding for yourself or on behalf of an organisation?
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31	Object	The whole scheme is badly thought out, illogical, discriminatory, and overly bureaucratic. Absolute dogs dinner		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.10 & 7.11 7.14 & 7.15 7.28 & 7.29	Object	There is little risk of vehicular terrorism in Bath, we all know that. The creation of a ring of steel is more to do with the skewed anti-car agenda than terrorism. If you want cars out of Bath, close the car parks and leave those who live and trade from the centre to have a fighting chance of survival. Requiring two hours notice for emergency plumbing services, for example, is an utter nonsense.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	There is no need for this at all no proof of attacks		Myself

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>This proposal is based on terror threat information from 2016. This is now out of date and should be reviewed with the local police force. Disabled access and parking isn't fit for purpose. Security of our city and people who live and work within it and those visiting are important, however, if businesses aren't protected there won't be any workers or visitors. Too many shops have closed already partially because of the pandemic we don't want to lose anymore. The plans are disproportionate.</p>		<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>It's not needed.</p>		<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The whole of the area in-scope.</p>		<p>Myself</p>

7.22 & 7.23	Object	The provision for local taxis seems to have been almost completely ignored (for example if an elderly or disabled person called for a taxi from west gate street how would the driver know if they held a blue badge?). Also it seems that the taxi rank at orange grove (an essential service for elderly and disabled residents and visitors) looks like it is being reduced		Myself
7.20 & 7.21	Object	Milsom Street. This street is essential for me to have access to so that I can visit my bank. I cannot walk the distances from other parking facilities and they don't allow me free parking. I need access between the hours of 1000 to 1800. If access can be granted to other streets why can this not include Milsom Street. This restriction is having a major impact on my life.		Myself

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>It is far too restrictive, especially for people who struggle with mobility.</p> <p>The reason to restrict access is ridiculous and not a real risk.</p> <p>The problems that this could cause are dangerous and potentially life threatening.</p>		<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9</p>	<p>Partly support</p>		<p>The proposals to allow limited access to the area around Westgate St, Saw Close etc to Blue Badge drivers, but NOT to allow drivers of Blue Badge holders to stay parked, will not benefit parents of children in wheelchairs or other disabled persons who need a carer with them at all times. Eg. my XX cannot be left unattended in her chair, so having access would be pointless for us. Creating extra disabled parking nearby would be beneficial though, and it would be great to have a map of where these spaces are located.</p>	<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>All city centre streets</p>		<p>Myself</p>

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.16 & 7.17</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to anti-terrorism being used as an excuse for introducing traffic restrictions. I have seen no evidence to justify the extent of the proposed restrictions on the basis of anti-terrorism. Why, for example, is it considered that an attack is more likely after 6pm than before?</p>		<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.16 & 7.17</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>All streets these TROs will affect. 1. The so-called risk assessment and these mitigation measures imply that terrorists will only operate between 10am and 6pm. So are evening visitors and hospitality-users in the city expendable? 2. Most terrorist attacks are carried out by pedestrian, not vehicle-borne terrorists. Closing roads or walkways to traffic will present no obstacle to a determined terrorists, or even a casual one. 3. Despite what the police may suggest, this is about undue diligence. There have been no increases in terrorist attacks in the South-West since The Troubles of the early 70's. This is all about our local administration and police force doing the bare minimum to avoid being accused of negligence or ineffectiveness - an 'xxx-covering' exercise to use the national vernacular. 4. Of greater risk to public safety are COVID, flooding, eScooters on pavements & roads, muggings by drug users, raging cyclists etc. The likelihood of a terrorist attack on the general public here in Bath is relatively slim.</p>		<p>Myself</p>

7.14 & 7.15	Object	I work in Abbey Green, I cannot see how our business will be able to run with the changes proposed. How are we supposed to get stock delivered, repairs done etc		Myself
7.6 & 7.7	Object	This proposal will not achieve the objective of eliminating a terrorist attack if Bath was to be targeted. This is a gross waste of taxpayers money.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.3 & 7.3	Partly support		All city centre streets that are included in the proposals	Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.18 & 7.19	Object	<p>Isolating Cheap Street, Westgate Street and Upper Borough Walls in the way proposed is guaranteed to strangle the city centre. Businesses need access, deliveries of goods, people (especially those with mobility challenges) need access.</p> <p>The proposals are presumably designed to effect a shutdown in the heart of the city, which is a very unfortunate approach to consider. The ultimate costs of this will be borne by the remaining residents once the financial consequences inevitably filter through.</p>		Myself
7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.42	Object	<p>Cheap Street and Upper Borough Walls</p> <p>Extremely difficult to get deliveries - my staff and sales reps are having to carry heavy deliveries up to XXXm to the shop.</p> <p>Also, lots of customers in cars including disables, no</p>		An organisation

		longer able to visit us easily which is costing us revenue.		
7.6 & 7.7	Object	It's a dishonest way of banning vehicles from the city centre. The most recent terrorist attacks in this country have been committed by suicide bombers on foot, not vehicles		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	The plans are not justified by the current risk and are based on out of date information. I entirely object to the proposed scheme and changes.		Myself
7.6 & 7.7	Object	Any threat is liable to come from individuals with back packs rather than vehicles.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	They are unnecessary		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	I don't. I also don't want this putting in place.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	They are nonsensical on all streets they are currently located.		Myself
7.8 & 7.9	Object	Your proposals are illegal under the Equality Act		Myself

7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9	Partly support		<p>Many of us are unhappy about the treatment of the disabled in this, not only in the literature we've read so far but also in the apparent attitude and spirit of the council exercised toward the disabled.</p> <p>Past council literature has made it look as though there is insufficient Blue Badge parking for disabled people to access a large swathe of the city centre: https://www.bathgazette.co.uk/post/ways-that-the-ring-of-steel-would-fail-the-disabled-in-bath</p> <p>I think Beau Street should be made available for Blue Badge parking to allow disabled people greater access to some of these streets like Stall Street.</p>	Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7	Object	Permanently restricting access to the city centre for a hypothetical, insanely specific, once in a lifetime event is ridiculous. By all means, install bollards, take precautions and use common sense to keep the city centre safe but don't shut down the city centre. Do that and the terrorists have already won.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.30 & 7.31	Object	This is an unnecessary and unworkable scheme which will do nothing to enhance the security of the city centre		Myself

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21 7.28 & 7.29</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>By using the threat of terrorism that was first mentioned 6 years ago and only actioned by bollards, BANES Council are now trying to close off Bath City centre to cars. My mother has a blue badge and she is now being marginalised. She cannot now get close to the shops she used to visit i.e. bottom of Milsom Street. You have mandated that she can use spots outside the Guildhall or by M&S. You are squeezing the disabled out of Bath in your quest to manage a terrorism threat that is highly unlikely to happen by car - all part of an excuse to rid Bath of cars for good - shame on you - you are an abysmal organisation.</p>		<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>What terrorists are you trying to save us from? Stop living in fear and controlling us.</p>		<p>Myself</p>

7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.12 & 7.13	Object	The police report is SIX years out of date, there are no areas in the centre of Bath vulnerable to attack by a vehicle due to clever positioning of existing street furniture etc. However, if these proposals are agreed you are putting everyone in Bath at risk of a terrorist attack by preventing a prompt response by emergency service vehicles if we were under attack by an active shooter or a suicide bomber. You are clearly advertising to a would-be terrorist how to attack the city of Bath, and achieve maximum carnage, by agreeing to these measures.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	Because its complete and utter nonsense and you're taking the residents of Bath for fools if you think anyone believes this is anything to do with terrorism. Why would any city in the world let alone Bath, that relies heavily on tourism promote the idea that we need a ring of steel due to a terrorism threat? You lot are absolutely crackers.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9	Object	I object to all of it. The security threat has reduced it is not proportionate to the threat it will cause hardship to citizens especially the elderly and disabled.		Myself

7.8 & 7.9 7.28 & 7.29	Object	This discriminates against those who can't walk and cycle and it is not needed. This is pedestrianised by stealth		Myself
7.6 & 7.7	Object	This does not stop on foot terrorist which is more likely and is too restrictive to drivers		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	We do not want roads shut off		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.26 & 7.27	Object	Insufficient evidence to demonstrate this approach is appropriate. No detailed cost benefit analysis.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.8 & 7.9	Object	Disabled people and others need to park near Bath shops to buy things, helping to support the local economy		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself

7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21 7.30 & 7.31	Partly support		Only party support as currently you are discriminating towards disabled people because those that can't walk or push certain distances are being disproportionately disadvantaged which breaches the equalities act, by not allowing parking on Milsom street for bb holders or disabled exempt vehicles we can no longer shop in those shops or eat in those areas as the distance of the next blue badge spaces are too far, so that directly affects disabled people/people with protected characteristics through not making suitable enough reasonable adjustments.	Myself
7.8 & 7.9	Object	Disabled parking restrictions.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.5 & 7.6 7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.28 & 7.29	Object	It's 6 years out of date. It's damaging business and is discrimination against the disabled. It's a smoke screen for getting cars out of the city. If you want to reduce cars make the alternatives more attractive like £1 bus journeys		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31	Object	The City centre needs to be available to Blue Badge Holders and people who live in the City Centre. Residents live and work in the centre of Bath.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself

7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9 7.18 & 7.19	Partly support		Cheap street. If you propose that Blue badge holders will be able to gain access how would this be done, the badge is in the persons name and not the car the is being driven. So how will the two be matched up.	Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.10 & 7.11 7.12 & 7.13	Object	It is an over reaction to a small problem and directly affects Blue Badge Holders stopping them having kerbside access to the roads inside the area. The two hours wait for emergency access is stupid. What happens if there is a need for 999 access.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31	Partly support		I think that the ideas behind them are good, however the impact on those with accessibility issues is too great for me to be able to fully support this.	Myself
7.10 & 7.11 7.14 & 7.15	Object	You are punishing people who choose to live in Bath. Make it Bath permits only or something in city centre. But two hours notice for an emergency? You're just asking for people to die and/or have their house ruined and have to pay for damage. Will you be liable for the costs incurred?		Myself

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.14 & 7.15 7.26 & 7.27</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Protecting from a single specific terrorist threat is a pointless waste of money and will not protect the city from other threats. It is a bad policy, amounting to "security theatre" that protects against a past attack, rather than broadly thinking about how to make the city more resilient. Such spending is almost always wasted, and has huge opportunity cost in this time of limited council budgets. The council should be ashamed of putting it forward.</p> <p>Minimising traffic in the city centre and making it accessible for active transport for everyone are laudable aims that should be pursued on their own merits not to "do something, anything" about some ridiculously low probability security threat.</p> <p>Finally it is still unclear how the proposals intend to allow residents of the city centre to enjoy 21st century life to the full; with no real detail on how different deliveries can be accommodated, and totally vague "you'd have to talk to us" requirements which don't appear realistic.</p>		<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I have undertaken terrorist briefing with A&S some of things you are saying are out of date, street furniture is in place to stop vehicular access already, this is anti car by stealth. Also discriminates against disabled and infirm.</p>		<p>Myself</p>

7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.14 & 7.15 7.16 & 7.17 7.18 & 7.19 7.24 & 7.25	Object	Westgate street, Saw close, Upper borough walls. If the purpose of closing these roads to local traffic was purely to stop terrorist attacks then there are surely better ways to do this without impacting local business and local people. A terrorist would only have to use a council vehicle and would be able to carry out an attack as they would be allowed into any of the restricted areas. High tourist season would maybe be tolerable as you can't move around the city then anyway. Christmas market is the prime example and the main time an attack would be likely. Why restrict all year round? Do terrorists stop work at 6pm?! Never heard of anything so ridiculous. Put big concrete flower tubs on the roadside and make people walk on pavements instead of in the middle of the road.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.14 & 7.15	Object	Poorly thought out ideas that impact Bath residents		Myself
7.8 & 7.9	Object	Bath has a duty of care to older and disabled residents that is not being considered		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.10 & 7.11	Object	I'm keen to know why the council thinks that Bath is vulnerable to terrorist threats. Where is the evidence? Also, I worry about people living within the 'circle' if they have gas emergencies etc.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7	Object	They are disproportionate for resolving the issue.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself

7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7	Object	<p>These expensive proposals would do little to prevent attack, surely would be attackers could use motorbikes, drones or the green option, attack on foot.</p> <p>This is clearly an attempt by the council to push through and spuriously justify traffic policy.</p> <p>Involving the police as a smokescreen is despicable, what else could they say?</p>		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.12 & 7.13 7.26 & 7.27		<p>In the unlikely event of terrorist attack emergency services would be unable to reach due the bollards.</p> <p>Also many terrorist attack such Manchester it a person not a vehicle.</p> <p>During a pandemic when Banes keeps on informing us about stretched resources it seems ridiculous to be wasting money & time.</p>		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.10 & 7.11 7.12 & 7.13 7.14 & 7.15	Object	<p>All streets included in the TRO. These are all busy streets with access needed for deliveries, emergency services, plumbers and similar tradesmen, disabled people. The proposal will be unnecessarily restrictive and is based on an overly cautious assessment. While the police may feel they have to take a risk averse view, the Council should have wider considerations and balance the restrictions and inconvenience against the pessimistic police advice. On balance, I suggest the risk proposed does not merit these measures.</p>		Myself

7.8 & 7.9	Object	Because your proposal breaches the European Human Rights Act, you are therefore breaking the Law		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.10 & 7.11 7.12 & 7.13 7.14 & 7.15	Object	I object to this scheme in its entirety. This scheme is a cynical attempt to pedestrianise the city under the guise of a terrorist threat. This pedestrianisation will cut off the centre for residents, the disabled, trades and most importantly the emergency services. This is a risk to life, wellbeing and the economy of Bath.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.5 & 7.6	Object	All the streets you are proposing.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.14 & 7.15	Object	TRO proposals based on information from years back. I oppose all proposals as some of the measures outdated. It will seriously affect businesses and city residents. Untenable to have to give prior notice of deliveries		Myself

<p>7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9 7.34 & 7.35</p>	<p>Partly support</p>		<p>Strongly object to the access being given to Blue Badge holders as it severely compromises security - fake badges are easy to get hold of and this proposal makes a mockery of restrictions by anyone being able to claim they're disabled (but well enough to drive) or picking someone up.</p> <p>The genuinely disabled should be given all the support they need with mobility aids, pavement repairs and adjustments. That would genuinely offer all of us safety and the disabled that genuinely rely on cars to enjoy even safer streets without motor traffic.</p>	<p>Myself</p>
--	-----------------------	--	---	---------------

<p>7.2 & 7.3 7.4 & 7.5 7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.20 & 7.21</p>	<p>Partly support</p>		<p>This consultation has been too tightly focused on the immediate area around the Roman Baths and Abbey. Because the impact on parking and access will cause displacement issues for disability and residents parking across the city centre, details of that should have also been included.</p> <p>I note that in the near future a further consultation around Milsom Street and surrounding streets will be taking place. All of these planned and proposed changes will have an impact on each other and cannot be treated in isolation. XXX XXX XXXX XXX, Broad Street XXX parish is a major part of the city centre) we are XXX struggling to understand all the proposed changes, but also a fuller understanding of the knock on effects and implications that each of the emergents will have on each other.</p> <p>We do want the city centre to be a safe place to visit, but also we also want visitors and residents to have appropriate places to park and for access issues to be considered in these schemes in regard to St XXXXXX and other churches in the City Centre, particularly in regard to funerals, weddings and other particular services on Sundays.</p> <p>The focus of our attention is around the streets Upper Borough Walls, Old Bond</p>	<p>An organisation</p>
--	-----------------------	--	---	------------------------

			Street, Milsom Street, Quiet Street, John Street, Trim Street, Beauford Square, Northumberland Buildings, Broad Street, Northgate Street, High Street, Grand Parade and Pierrepont Street	
--	--	--	---	--

7.8 & 7.9	Object	You admit the negative impact on persons with disability, and you talk about a "pan disability study" (pages 9 and 11, without any timescale), and yet you plan to go ahead anyway without the benefit of the results of that study - which could change the current proposals.		An organisation
7.2 & 7.3 7.34 & 7.35	Partly support		<p>Although I support the general principle, I don't believe that there should be an exemption for post/parcel deliveries.</p> <p>As we have seen elsewhere in the city, these companies rarely park conscientiously without severely inconveniencing or outright endangering other road users. As we cannot reasonably expect this not to happen here, I believe that deliveries should only be permitted at times with reduced footfall.</p>	Myself

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.10 & 7.11 7.12 & 7.13 7.14 & 7.15 7.30 & 7.31</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The city centre needs to be accessible to disabled persons, elderly and emergency vehicles. Businesses are already suffering from the effects of Covid and need support from BANES and the public. The threat from terrorists is based on figures and information from 6 years ago and are therefore out of date. If a terrorist wants to access the centre they would do this on foot as in all the recent attacks in London and Manchester. Residents needs need to be met including service personnel and vehicles i.e. broken boiler, leakage in pipe and gas problems such as heating.I really don't understand what you think this scheme is going to achieve except mayhem to all who use the area.</p>		<p>Myself</p>
--	---------------	---	--	---------------

7.14 & 7.15 7.16 & 7.17 7.18 & 7.19 7.32 & 7.33 8.2	Object	XXXXXX XXX XXXXXX. York Street was our final access point and it has already been closed during the day. However, I do not typically need access before 10am because XXXX XXXX out at 10am! I need access during the working day after 10am. Have to carry very heavy bags of laundry, supplies and rubbish to and from Terrace Walk. This costs more time and therefore money and is physically almost impossible. The provision of loading bays in Terrace walk area is inadequate and I am regularly getting tickets because there is no space available. Will be even more difficult when the coaches return. Trades won't work inside the area, it is too difficult to access and they don't want to wait for gates to be opened and they can't park close. Our property has been devalued immensely because of these restrictions. No reason why the closure has to be extended until 10pm along York Street. Coaches should be dispersed around the city so ALL city traders can benefit from passing visitors. The visual effects of any implementations should be properly scrutinised and consulted with historical expertise.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31	Object	XXXX advice network disagree with the TRO report, and recommend that the Pan Disability study is carried out before decisions are made, due to the impact this could have on people with disability both physical and mental'		An organisation
7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9	Object	Not proportionate and harms accessibility		Myself

7.30 & 7.31				
7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31	Object	This is too draconian it stops people access		Myself
7.12 & 7.13	Object	This delayed an ambulance it's dangerous		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	Not needed		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.34 & 7.35	Object	I can't shop with it like this. I don't want outside cafes		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	It made it worse in town		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	Did not like it put it back to normal		Myself
&.4 & 7.5	Object	Do not agree with it		Myself
&.4 & 7.5	Object	I do not agree with this on any of these streets		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	No		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	I object to all		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	Object		Myself
7.6 & 7.7	Object	Too severe		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	I object		Myself
7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31	Object	Because of access		Myself
7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31	Object	It stops access and doesn't help stop the threat		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	It's a Very bad idea		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	I don't agree with it		Myself

7.4 & 7.5	Object	No		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.28 & 7.29	Object	I do not agree with anti car agenda		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	It's my right		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.14 & 7.15 7.26 & 7.27	Object	Total waste of money. Major impact on retailers as you have already taxed a number of businesses out of the City with rates this will exacerbate the problem resulting in more empty shops. This proposal is based on historic data. It doesn't need a vehicle to cause a security incident!		Myself
7.6 & 7.7	Object	This will make little or no difference to terrorist criminals intent on causing harm. They will simply circumnavigate your (well publicised) restrictive measures. Most recent attacks have been on foot, with knives, machetes or explosive backpacks.		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	BANES can't run a golf course or a car park or even execute the Cleveland VBridge strengthening ...I have no confidence in their anti terrorist proposals.		Myself

7.2 & 7.3 7.14 & 7.15 7.48	Partly support		It is complicated to me. I understand the need to have security but I am concerned about relatives being able to drop me off or pick me up etc as they used to do,also deliveries.	Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.30 & 7.31 7.34 & 7.35	Object	I do not agree that the risk of terrorism in Bath necessitates closing streets which are already fairly quiet. This scheme neither justifies the inconvenience caused to businesses, residents, delivery companies and those with disabilities, nor does it make terrorism any less likely, since equally busy areas such as High St and the area around Grand Parade, Orange Grove, Manvers / Pierrepont St and Dorchester St will remain unprotected.		Myself
7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21	Object	Two areas or groups of streets: Parking nearby• outside the restricted area is too far for some of us Covid restrictions have already removed useful site such as Kingsmead and Milsom St		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.18 & 7.19 7.20 & 7.21	Object	Cheap Street, Westgate Street, Upper Borough Walls, York Street, Kingsmead square.		Myself

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.26 & 7.27</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to the entire proposal to restrict access to any of these streets. From the latest information this proposal has been brought forward on the basis of security advice received in around 2016, which is five years ago. This advice would have been given to the previous Conservative administration and yet in their final budget prior to the 2019 election, in which the Liberal Democrats assumed control, there was no budget allocation for city centre security other than a small sum. The Liberal democrat Council has provided no evidence of why City Centre Security became such a key issue after they took office, when it had not been previously.</p> <p>These proposals only provide security against one very specific form of terrorist threat, which is often referred to as vehicle as a weapon (VAW) attack, where a vehicle is used to drive into pedestrians with the aim of killing or injuring them. While there have been a small number of such attacks on the UK mainland, most recently in 2017, far more people have been killed and injured by terrorists in other forms of attack, mostly carried out by pedestrians. It is not a balanced approach to restrict the free movement of the citizens of Bath, and those visiting the city, to protect against one very specific form of terrorist threat. If terrorists are really interested in attacking people in Bath and cannot use VAW then as in other cities they can use knives, pedestrian carrying bombs, or various other means of attack.</p> <p>This proposal can be seen as Bath & North East Somerset Council's very own Maginot Line, and like the original is 'a defensive barrier or strategy that inspires a false sense of security'. It will be just as</p>		<p>Myself</p>
--	---------------	--	--	---------------

		<p>ineffectual against a terrorist attack as the Maginot line was against the invasion of France.</p> <p>Finally I object on the grounds that the Council appears to have taken little account of the response to the public consultation which ran from 16 November 2020 to 31 January 2021. While an accessibility consultant was appointed to undertake an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA), something which should have been undertaken prior to any consultation, there has been no effort made to address the other concerns raised. In February 2016 the Cabinet Office published guidelines on consultation which made three key points, the third of which is "the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory required proposals. This should be evidenced by a briefing document presented to the decision making body". While the report submitted to Cabinet on Tuesday 20th July 2021 contains full details of the public response, and a summary of the key issues raised, nowhere are those concerns actually addressed. Where is the Council's response to those issues and a reasoned argument as to why the threat of terrorism outweighs all other considerations. It would appear that the Council is merely paying lip service to its statutory duty to consult and that its mind was made up before the consultation was undertaken. It was forced to undertake a proper EIA as this is also a statutory requirement, but in all other respects the product of consultation has not been "conscientiously taken into account" arguable not taken into account at all.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>7.2 & 7.3 7.14 & 7.15 7.18 & 7.19 7.43</p>	<p>Partly support</p>		<p>Stall street and Bath street area. Also Westgate street.</p>	<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.2 & 7.3 7.14 & 7.15 7.43</p>	<p>Partly support</p>		<p>I have already done this but got through without being able to raise my issue. I support the restriction of traffic as prevention of terrorist acts. Of course. But I also have an issue being a local trader who needs access to these streets to carry out my business. I am a street trader. I set up and pack down my stall every day. Previously a bollard would lower on recognition of my number plate and I would have access to the street. Now that is over I am treated with aggression by whoever these new people in red vests are that are given authority. On the rare occasion it would be very helpful to have access to pack up my stall a little early. At the moment I am forced to work exceptionally long days and cannot leave if I have an emergency. Surely there could be a little understanding for local traders.</p>	<p>An organisation</p>

<p>7.2 & 7.3 7.14 & 7.15 7.16 & 7.17 7.18 & 7.19 7.46</p>	<p>Partly support</p>		<p>XX XXXXXX XXX X XXXXX XX XXXXXX XXXXXX. The nature of our business means that we have to build and pack down our market stall every day. We used to have storage nearby for our setup and stock (this ended up being redeveloped), which we would love to have again, but unfortunately storage in the city centre is very hard to come by. We also used to have flexibility with the time that we packed up our stall which was very important to us. Now, we must unload and load from our van on Upper Borough Walls. The gates on Upper Borough Walls and their closure to traffic between 10am- 6pm has had a severe impact upon the running of our business (and of the other XXXX XXXX traders). Prior to the installation of the gates and access restrictions, we successfully operated for many years.</p> <p>Just to illustrate the particular impact the restrictions have on myself and my business, I have a XX year old son who has just started school. Because I can only pack up from 6pm onwards, this effectively means I can only get home XX XXXXXXXX by 7.30-8pm. This makes balancing business and family life extremely hard. The lack of access during the day means that we are effectively trapped, unable to respond to the emergencies, whether mundane or serious - a child that suddenly needs</p>	<p>Myself</p>
---	-----------------------	--	---	---------------

			<p>picking up from school, a parent in hospital - that inevitably occur through life. It also has the effect that on any days where I have other commitments (eg need to be back at 6pm for my children because my partner has to go out), it effectively means that I cannot run our market stall that day - therefore unnecessarily missing an entire day of trading, and meaning that at a time when there are many empty shops in the city centre, even the market traders are unable to be there as much as they would like.</p> <p>Additionally, the restricted access times create a bottleneck of service vehicles (refuse collectors, delivery vehicles, the XXXX XXXX XXX traders etc), who all want to access at the same time, rather than being staggered throughout the day.</p> <p>Regarding security considerations, the presence of the market traders is a net benefit to security. There are XX traders, who have operated for many years, and who are well known to BNES council. Building in some flexibility for the market traders and therefore meaning that they are able to trade on more days, will actually have a beneficial impact on the security of the area. We all know the area very well, have a vested interest in the area and will always keep a keen lookout for any potential problems.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The market stalls XX of Bath are successful and popular small businesses, highly visible to visitors and locals, and with a loyal following both in person and online. They are one of the joys of Bath, situated at the heart of the city. The vendors are incredibly determined and committed - the arduous nature of setting up and dismantling a shop every single day of trading, demands a particular sort of business person who truly loves what they do and loves their city. They act as an impromptu visitor information centre, easily accessible to passers by and shoppers, as well as eyes on the street. We pride ourselves on our great relationships with police, community support officers and other officials.</p> <p>The combination of the £9 per day CAZ charge (which street traders were not granted an exemption to despite possibly being the only type of business who must, by the very nature of their businesses, bring a van into the centre, at least in the absence of adequate local storage), and the restrictions imposed upon our working hours by the Upper Borough Walls access gates have had a huge impact upon our businesses. We have been proactive in trying to overcome this problem by seeking new storage in the city centre (via various emails and phone calls with the council)</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>but we have been unable to secure anything. Having some flexibility with the access gates is therefore essential for us and the other XXXX XXXX traders. We would therefore propose that along with blue badge holders, the XXXX XXXX XXXX traders be granted access to Upper Borough Walls. Even if this was only from 4pm onwards, this would have a hugely beneficial impact on us and the other XXXX XXXX traders, our businesses, and the city centre.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.24 & 7.25 7.30 & 7.31	Object	Because if the impact on disabled parking and worsening disabled access to the centre. Also because of the impact on residents living in the zone. I don't understand why big events like Xmas market/ food festivals aren't security risks too.		Myself
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.6 & 7.7 7.14 & 7.15 7.18 & 7.19 7.48	Object	To begin with, closing streets to vehicles does not stop possible terrorist activity, as individuals can come on foot or on motorbikes past the barriers. I object to Hot Bath Street, Bath Street and St. Michael's Place being closed daily to traffic. I have a Central Parking Permit and sometimes park in one of the two places in Lower Borough Walls. Now, if I leave before 6pm I can drive up Stall Street and along Beau Street to get out of the City. Also deliveries will be difficult.		Myself
7.8 & 7.9	Object	As a carer for a disabled person I am concerned that he is being discriminated against. There is a discrimination/equality law giving the disabled the same rights as able bodied. These people will not be able to access many of the streets in the centre of Bath. You may be aware that it takes longer for these people to wash and dress in the mornings and therefore are not able to be in the city before 10am. Your proposals to give them access to some streets does not include cheap street as barriers are in operation.		Myself

<p>7.2 & 7.3 7.14 & 7.15 7.16 & 7.17 7.18 & 7.19 7.46</p>	<p>Partly support</p>		<p>Following on from our earlier response XX, by means of clarification, the preference of us and the other XXXX XXXX market traders would be that all day access to the gated area on Upper Borough Walls for the XXX XXXX XXXX market traders would be the ideal solution. As we could then respond to any unforeseen/emergency situation as mentioned in my previous consultation response. If this is not possible, then having access for the XXXX traders from 4pm would still be of great help to us all.</p>	<p>Myself</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The whole daft idea</p>		<p>Myself</p>

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.18 & 7.19 7.20 & 7.21</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Dear XX</p> <p>Bath City Centre security scheme consultation. (Blue Badge Holder)</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Bath and NE Somerset council proposals to restrict vehicle access to central Bath.</p> <p>I would very much like to meet you or your colleagues and discuss the matter, but all the slots at the Commercial hub at 15 new Bond Street are sold out, and in any case the venue is rather difficult to get to by car, even with a blue badge, as Milsom Street is closed during daytime, and Green street is the opposite side of the bus gate from where I live. So even if there was a slot available to discuss the proposal, you have made it as difficult as possible to discuss it by choosing that particular venue.</p> <p>3 years ago I was delighted to walk to the end of my road and wait for the bus into Bath, and then walk around Bath to do my shopping or whatever. Now, severe arthritis and pain in my hips and pain in knees means that walking even a short distance is beyond me. I had one hip replaced, but that went wrong, so the second hip can't be replaced until the first one is sorted. Meanwhile Covid has set back all operations, so it will be a while before I become a normal person• who can walk, cycle, and ride an e-scooter or whatever, although at my age, I don't see cycling or e-scootering as practical transportation.</p> <p>Now, in order to go shopping, get a haircut, visit my bank, dentist, tailor, bookshop, or anywhere in Bath,</p>		<p>Myself</p>
--	---------------	--	--	---------------

		<p>on my own, it's very difficult, as I have to use 2 sticks to walk, and carrying anything, even a shopping bag of any size, really means I need an extra hand, or be able to park very close to where I need to go, and/or have my wife drive me.</p> <p>This expensive and unnecessary bollardising scheme is certain to make a visit into Bath much more difficult for me and anyone else with mobility difficulties. So much for BANES slogan Improving People's Lives• !</p> <p>I have lived in Bath since 1975, and seen the traffic get worse because of idiotic traffic schemes, road closures, pedestrianisations, one way systems, extra traffic lights, and endless bollards. Confusion and difficulties caused by these schemes are always blamed on extra traffic• and a self-righteous refusal to realise that the scheme was wrong, and the real cause of the problem. Utility companies do their best to get construction and repairs done speedily. Any roadworks project run by BANES to move a traffic island, extend a footpath and add more traffic lights takes ages to carry out and probably costs more than anticipated £ and council tax-payers have to pay the price.</p> <p>Over the years I've lived in Bath, I have found useful independent shops providing excellent service. The watchmaker in Abbey Green gets a visit for a watch battery change every 12-18 months. Last time I wanted to go there I was confronted by your barriers, and it was too far for me to walk. Milsom Street is shut, so my tailor, Waterstones, and my Bank are inaccessible to me. I used to like to visit Jolly's at Christmas, but I'm not sure if it still exists. Kitchen's</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Cookshop in Quiet Street was also handy for kitchen utensils, a lot better to see, touch and choose what you need, rather than from an online supplier and discovering when it arrives that it's not what you expected.</p> <p>I also need to visit Specsavers in Upper Borough Walls but the road is blocked off by your barriers and it's a very long way from any disabled parking. It would also be nice to go out for a meal in Bath and visit the Theatre Royal. That's also blocked off to vehicles. I would also like to get to the Mobility Assured shop in Hot Bath Street from time to time, but that also seems to be blocked. When their shop was opposite the Tesco Garage in Coombe Down it was easier.</p> <p>All of this scheme that you are proposing is flawed and discriminates against Blue Badge Holders and older people with mobility difficulties. If you want Bath to be the place to live, work and visit• , please consider everybody's needs.</p> <p>£2.7 Million of council tax-payers money could go a long way to helping real people who really need help, so why spend an awful lot of money on lumps of metal and jobs for the boys blaming unlikely terrorism?</p> <p>Bollards do nothing for ordinary people. Bollards won't stop a grenade-tosser on an e-scooter. Bollards give a backpack bomber a pleasant pre-detonation perch. Bollards provide a perfect ricochet point for shrapnel, toilets for dogs and an anchor point for a deliberately crashed vehicle. Remember the truck trapped on</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>bollards in Milsom Street? Did you see that a police car crashed into a bollard in Leeds recently? Parked vehicles would shield pedestrians from a rogue vehicle, act as air filled baffles to absorb and deflect explosive blast and shrapnel, and provide a hiding place from a maniac with a meat chopper. This particular bollard scheme was not precisely defined in the Lib-dem manifesto, and with the threat level reduced from severe to substantial, blaming terrorism is unsound and profoundly undemocratic. Scrap this wasteful bollard scheme and blame the threat level reduction, and in the same breath cancel the e-scooter trial and blame that on a potential terrorist act using them!</p> <p>Please don't make it more difficult for Blue Badge holders to access Bath and aim to genuinely improve people's lives.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, xxxx</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21 7.28 & 7.29 7.30 & 7.31 7.32 & 7.33</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>In your email communication dated 23 September 2021, you requested recipients, under a 21-day public consultation process, to submit an objection or any other comment about the proposals by 14 October 2021.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the lack of consultation time to what is fundamentally a very serious issue I now submit my objections and comments based on the information supplied by you as I have not been able to attend the public meetings.</p> <p>Overall the Council is failing in its duty to Bath. There appears to be no joined up policy to clean up detritus, improve road surfaces, to stop the exodus of small businesses and generally be proud of Bath.</p> <p>On the specific issue the Council appears to be addressing a fundamental change to how persons gain access to Central Bath as a security issue. Whilst it is understood that the UK Threat Level is currently substantial• the measures being undertaken by the Council, mainly TROs, do not appear to cover likely terrorist attacks but merely restrict cars, especially Blue Badge holders, from accessing many shops, because cars are unable to park close to the venue.</p> <p>The paragraph; There will be the same amount of parking available to Blue Badge holders as there was previously, Blue Badge holders driving into the restricted streets will be able to park on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours where there is available space to do so. • adds absolutely nothing. This is because;</p> <p>1. The number of spaces is not relevant, albeit there are very few at the location is the key. For example, to shop at the top of Milsom Street you either have to impede traffic along George Street or park on New Bond Street and walk a considerable distance. This</p>		<p>Myself</p>
--	---------------	---	--	---------------

		<p>is not an option for many disabled nor good for security.</p> <p>2. Parking on Yellow Lines for three hours has always been available.</p> <p>3. The wording restricted streets• needs clarifying. At present cars cannot enter certain restricted streets between 1000 and 1800 hours. Due to disabilities many residents in the wider Bath area are unlikely to be able to arrive and leave outside those times. Incidentally those times are also when many shops are closed. Milsom Street is a prime example. Security to prevent a terrorist attack by a vehicle is always difficult but well-placed barriers/chicanes can help. A CCTV system is likely to identify vehicles but will not prevent the attack nor will speed limits. In any event the terrorist will always be looking to circumnavigate any security. This could include motor cycle or even bicycle delivery of explosive devices. By the time these poorly thought out schemes are implemented terrorists may well be using Council litter bins to plant explosives as was seen in the 60s & 70s.</p> <p>If the Council wish to halt the decline in shops and other venues and to hold on to its World Heritage status it needs to;</p> <p>1. Allow increased access for the disabled not just those who can walk and bicycle</p> <p>2. Improve road layout, condition and surface</p> <p>3. Stop the decline in independent outlets by allowing them to flourish; not be forced out by low footfall and rents caused by the Council's inability to attract more than bused-in• tourists, who spend little except in hospitality venues and main attractions, such as the baths.</p> <p>Thus, in my opinion the complex planned changes do</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>nothing to further the attraction of Bath and nor are they likely to reduce or foil the likelihood of terrorist attack. I object to the scheme and would expect it to be re-assessed it its entirety.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.48	Object	Bath Street, Hot Bath Street St. Michael's Place closures during daytime, effects the residents XX. Friends, relatives, come to the area of those streets to collect, residents, some of whom have difficulty with walking. With closures, will the residents be able to be collected at the SE end of Westgate Buildings, where the pavement is wide? And the same for delivery of goods. Will vans be able to park there?		An organisation
7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9	Object	Discrimination and its unnecessary. Its not proportionate		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	Don't agree at all		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.28 & 7.29	Object	Pedestrianisation not wanted		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	No		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	Don't want any streets closed		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	Keep open		Myself
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7	Object	<p>Vehicular use for terrorism purposes is rare enough to be a negligible threat. To restrict usage based on the premise of such a rare event is unwarranted.</p> <p>If it were to reduce pollution, a great contributor to deaths, or traffic accidents, then, if the evidence supports it, it would be a genuine reason for restrictions. There is no evidence to support that in the consultation as is.</p>		Myself
7.8 & 7.9	Object	Mobility vehicles		Myself
7.4 & 7.5	Object	.		Myself

7.2 & 7.3	Support			An organisation
7.14 & 7.15 7.18 & 7.19 7.44	Object	There is insufficient dedicated provision for the loading/unloading of goods for premises on Upper Borough Walls, including the XXX XXX XXXX. Additional pick-up/drop-off facilities for car-borne visitors to premises on Upper Borough Walls, including the XXXX XXXXX XXXX, are required nearby.		An organisation
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.2 & 7.3 7.45	Partly support		Westgate Buildings, Westgate Street, Milsom Street, York Street, St James Place	Myself

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.20 & 7.21 7.28 & 7.29</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to the proposals for the following reasons:</p> <p>XX (both blue badge holders) have disabilities which affect our mobility and if this proposal is taken forward it will significantly limit our ability to access essential services in the city centre. This proposal will restrict accessibility to the city centre for all of those with mobility issues as well as tourists with accessibility issues who will not be aware of the permit based system to access the restricted zone.</p> <p>In particular disabled people without a carer will be unable to park in the restricted zone which means they will have to walk further distances unnecessarily over and above the 50m that they are assessed to obtain a blue badge. If this proposal is not reconsidered and withdrawn it may be legally challenged as it does not make allowance for the extra inconvenience and stress that this will bring by limiting the ability to park in the centre.</p> <p>The temporary security barricades in place at present are sufficient rather than this wholesale change to inner bath to bring pedestrianisation by the back door with little provision for disabled residents. This seems like a watering down of the allowances for disabled residents for example the reduction of disabled parking to three hours only which is not related in any way to the issue of security for the city.</p> <p>I still believe that the proposal is an overreaction to the security threat - many other cities in the UK have not made such draconian changes to their inner cities and have no plans to do so.</p>		<p>Myself</p>
--	---------------	--	--	---------------

		<p>These proposals mean that Bath will become a two-tier city for those with a disability and those able bodied in terms of accessing city centre facilities such as shops, banks and the theatre.</p> <p>I would ask the council to reconsider for these reasons above</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.18 & 7.19 7.20 & 7.21</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>All of the TRos being consulted on. Various roads central area. Parking and Loading App 4 Saw close 1.Change 24 hour loading bays to certain hours to allow DP particularly in afternoon and evening. There use to be 4 Dp spaces before shared use came in and they have not been replaced 2. Loading bay in Barton st outside the pub.. a recent addition does nor need to be 24 hours change to shared use with DP particularly for pm and evening to help theatre attendance 3. Bridge St. reinstate SYL without the loading restriction. Create 3 DP spaces at VAG end . 4. Grand parade. restrict loading bay to certain hours. Create 3 DP to facilitate access to Guildhall Mkt/Pulteney Bridge shops/ VAG/ restaurants 5. High St change the 24 hour loading bays to shared DP/Loading and same in Orange grove. Change half of spaces to 2 hours App 5. Avon St North. Move barriers northwards to allow parking to be reinstated plus taxi and DP spaces App6. Remove no loading in front of shops and change to DYL. install 2 DP spaces to make up for those removed in York st under this TRO App 8. Henry St, Removal of DYL deprives BB holders of space to park in heavily utilised area. Add 2 DP spaces in Henry St south side outside former Barclays Bank Change half of spaces to 2 hours to increase turn around App 9 Broad St. Change all parking to left hand side as the railings make it difficult for disable drivers to park here as cant get out of drivers door. Change 24</p>		<p>Myself</p>
--	---------------	---	--	---------------

		<p>hour loading bay to shared use DP.</p> <p>CHEAP ST /WESTGATE ST ETC Access for all categories as well as BBH can be removed at ANY time. Seems there is no challenge to this ..Equality Act? There should be an ANPR system of access, if London can do it for Congestion charge why not Bath? Appalled no access for BBH until Jan 1st 2022.. we have already been locked out for the summer and seems we will miss Christmas shopping as well</p> <p>While its a manual system a max waiting time for those wishing to enter /leave should be stated in the order</p> <p>Why does BB need to be shown exiting the area..not needed</p> <p>Access to Hot Bath Street...concerned as to access to St Michaels day centre is restricted to organised transport. The arguments as to whether the measures are proportionate and necessary has already been well rehearsed but I see the letter from the Chief Constable is part of the TRO consultation. The economic justification cites terror attacks in 2017 of which only Westminster and London Bridge were vehicle related and the greatest loss of life was Manchester arena where no vehicle was used. As has been seen by the latest attack in Norway..again not a vehicle...the are a multiple set of circumstances that can result in an attack and the TROs proposed will not stop them. I would therefore argue the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		proposed measures are DISPROPORTIONATE.		
--	--	---	--	--

7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.48	Object	<p>Objections previously raised to the Security Zone are only partially answered by the Council's concessions, such as allowing Blue Badge Holder access through specific barriers and other minor amendments to the original proposal. Many concerns remain as to how the Council will mitigate the impact on residents and so it is essential that the council works closely with XX and other representative bodies, as well as individual residents, to provide practical solutions BEFORE the measures are implemented and to ensure that these are communicated clearly and in detail to every resident within the zone and surrounding streets. XX has met with the council officers to detail these concerns (submitted separately) and will continue to press for answers that work for all residents, Blue Badge Holders and otherwise. Until these are provided, we are unable to support the TROs as currently proposed.</p>		An organisation
7.2 & 7.3	Support			Myself
7.8 & 7.9 7.18 & 7.19 7.20 & 7.21	Object	<p>Cheap St, Westgate, York and Milsom St Upper Borough Walls and Saw Close Kingsmead Square. Contravening the Equalities Act (treating those with disabilities differently). Lib Dem slogan - 'Let's look after each other' or is that = just some!</p>		Myself & an organisation

7.8 & 7.9 7.16 & 7.17 7.18 & 7.19 7.20 & 7.21 7.28 & 7.29 7.30 & 7.31 7.32 & 7.33	Object	Cheap St, Westgate St, Saw Close, Upper Borough Walls, York St also Milsom St. The hours of restrictions are too harsh. I feel you have ripped the heart out of the City of Bath and it's unique character and these proposals will continue to play into terrorists hands by further curtailing our freedom and closing us down - exactly what they want and need to help their cause succeed. The car will not go away - but bikes will in bad weather. You do not say how Blue Badge holders will access the restricted streets.		Myself
---	--------	---	--	--------

(ii) Email and telephone comments

Objections Report reference para.	Comment
7.2 & 7.3	Will there be a booklet showing all the areas for new disabled parking in the future. Also will the new restrictions be clearly marked on the roadside soon mistakes can be made, hence a fine
7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21 7.30 & 7.31	So we're still segregated from Milsom street shops and restaurants if we can't push or walk far enough!!!! WELL DONE, PAT YOURSELVES ON YOUR BACKS..... What discrimination and segregation... and breach of the equalities act, as no reasonable adjustments for access to shops as we're disadvantaged by being disabled and not being able to walk or push wheelchairs far enough and so discriminated against by being segregated from Milsom street area... You must be SO proud of yourselves- Milsom street isn't closed for security only CAZ so BB holders need to be given access to park down there for access, as like myself, I don't have the ability to push from other places to Milsom street- In case you hadn't noticed it's a hill, so even more reason to be able to have access to it. Why put bb spaces on broad street but not back on Milsom street... makes no sense- we still can't access that area from broad street as we would have to push all the way round which is what we can't do, Do you not understand about disabilities and people who can't travel longer distances but ARE independent.... Broad street is one of the most polluted in Bath, so why add more spaces there, when Milsom street has the car parking spaces already, you just added the kerb yellow lines to stop disabled people being able to go shopping or eating on Milsom place area....You really are so out of touch. And you have Wera our MP supporting the athletes from Bath in the Paralympics

	<p>yet simultaneously preventing them and the disabled community from access to the top part of town on Milsom street..... WELL DONE!!!</p>
7.20 & 7.21	<p>The real issue for us is not being able to get to Milsom street. Why can't the restrictions be lifted in this street for disabled. This is vital to us.</p>
7.2 & 7.3 7.28 & 7.29	<p>Thank you for your very informative letter. XX I thoroughly support any measure to improve security of the city, country and its inhabitants. And therefore support such measures. However I have one major concern and that is I trust the Council are not climbing on the back of security measures to further restrict vehicles from Bath. The general state of road surfaces in the city is a total disgrace. I use a 3 wheel motorcycle (trike) as my disability prevents use of a motorcycle and it is always a relief to having exited the city limits. The council always seems to find money for improving cycle access yet cyclists contribute zero to road maintenance. Time something was done.</p>
7.2 & 7.3 7.30 & 7.31	<p>Would you be able to send me a map of Bath that shows the restrictions of where I can and can't park? I need to see how this is good by to effect me as I do struggle getting access around town , I often have to go into Bristol where access is easier.</p>

<p>7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31 7.34 & 7.35</p>	<p>I'm really unsure how this addresses the primary issue with the public realm in the city centre as stated in the Access Report: see column E</p> <p>Where is the commitment to move the Mobility Shop or fix the pavements? A disabled Taxi driver now has full access to these areas at any time of day?</p> <p>*Anyone* with a stolen or fake Blue Badge can now drive into these places in minutes. There must be more onerous requirements placed upon access by Blue Badge Holders and much more commitment from the council to fix the *actual* access issues, to provide a long term commitment to remove cars from Cheap Street, and to not use cars as a mobility device. Sadly Afghanistan changes everything as you fully know and the new council administration is playing lip service to the security issues raised by the Police for cheap political gains. There was SO much more you could have done yet even after you have finished installing these measures the city centre will be inaccessible to wheelchair users and visually impaired people. Cars are not mobility devices and Blue Badges can be easily copied and faked.</p> <p>Anybody familiar with this space could have told you that 60% of disabled have no access to cars and rely heavily on public & community transport.</p> <p>You failed to solve the accessibility issues, made the public realm worse, while leaving the city wide open to a terrorist vehicular attack. Well done. It's a horrendously poor sticking plaster. I just hope it doesn't end up with somebody in a Land Rover slaughtering 100s of people in the canyon that is Cheap Street. It would be like shooting fish in a barrel. There is literally no escape but you know this don't you?</p> <p>Fix the issues raised in the report. Don't ignore them.</p>
<p>7.2 & 7.3</p>	<p>Short comment only ... excellent example of how to use technology in selecting and informing specific sections of the community. Wish Central Government was always up to this mark. Registered "Blind", but sight good enough to do this with appropriate aids.</p>
<p>7.2 & 7.3</p>	<p>A map where a blue badge owner can park would be easier, as not everyone can read .</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.5 & 7.6 7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31</p>	<p>The terrorists have already won when disabled people are restricted as to where we can go and when we are allowed to go..</p>

7.2 & 7.3	<p>Thank you for your email. Unfortunately, being restricted with my mobile, and not originating from Bath, I was not able to make sense of a lot of it. I am also statemented as being dyslexic which further complicates matter for me.</p> <p>Is there anyway you could send me a photocopy of the streets you mentioned, and using different coloured highlighters as a key, mark the roads you talk about.</p> <p>I know this would save me embarrassment and a fine at a later stage.</p>
7.20 & 7.21	<p>Isn't it a shame you didn't have the common sense to send Emails when implementing a bogus clean air zone in Bath which caught countless uninformed drivers now facing fines. Some disabled drivers actually have to use vans amazing as it seems but alas, BANES can't fathom that out.</p>
7.2 & 7.3	<p>Is there a map that shows the existing provision and proposed changes to blue badge parking please? This would be much easier to understand than just a list of street names.</p>
7.2 & 7.3	<p>Wish to indicate receipt of this important communication and confirm that I have read it; I agree with the proposals and the necessary motivation behind them. Yes, Bath would be an attractive target for terrorists, particularly as crowded centres are easy to identify.</p>
7.2 & 7.3	<p>For those who are not conversant with Bath it is virtually impossible to understand the information without a map Somebody should have included a map to be able to understand and make sense of the proposals.</p>
7.4 & 7.5 7.20 & 7.21	<p>This is all a load of over-reactional rubbish and totally impractical! This, together with air-pollution actions, are totally unrealistic and not at all thought out in a sensible way. I am ashamed to be a LibDem supporter after the ridiculous decisions the Council has taken in road planning. Further, no sensible actions have been put in place to help alleviate the problems the closure of Cleveland Bridge has caused. The whole thing has been badly mismanaged. I am not alone in this complaint. I very much doubt their will be another LibDem Council for a long time due to this complete lack of regard for Bath citizens rights.</p>
7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9 7.18 & 7.19 7.20 & 7.21 7.30 & 7.31	<p>I have been told by XXXX that here is where I need to request the Braille version of the Security zone consultation document. I would like this sent to my address so I can use it XX with deaf and blind people.</p> <p>There has also been some confusion about BBH accessing Westgate St for essential services, could you send me the outline of how access is gained while we wait for the outcome of the consultation and any automated barriers to be fitted. I am very concerned about the people I support at work and loved ones with disabilities being able to access Westgate St, Milsom St & other areas on an equal footing with non disabled people ole. This isn't possible at the moment. Disabled people need to have clear information so they can plan accessing shops, services & leisure especially after shielding for much of the last 18 months. Disabled people also want to plan for the festive season, go out to lunch or the theatre, meet friends, buy Xmas food ans presents. At the moment disabled people are still actively excluded from streets that non disabled people can walk too.</p>

	<p>Please send me any plans, meeting notes & maps so I can explain to disabled people what's going to happen in a way that they can access.</p>
<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.5 & 7.6 7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21</p>	<p>More restrictions for local people. Of course if you live in the city centre why would you complain. I have written before XX but not only that elderly people are finding it more and more difficult to see to their needs. The disabled parking in Milsom street is lamentable. Before 10 am when nothing is open helps no one. Once again tourists and students come first. Nothing for the council tax payer who live out of town. Living in Batheaston should give us reasonable access to the city. My car is a petrol hybrid. Buses are not convenient as I live XXXXX. I have neither the time to use these or want to because as a carer I have to be careful to shield my husband. Also his careers are constantly fighting the clock to get to clients. Bath is not a museum. As a COUNCIL TAX a payer I want to be able to get into Bath to support local businesses and visit the bank etc. Not unreasonable is it? However being unable to vote either to remove the MP or the council I am sure you can totally disregard my concerns.</p>
<p>7.8 & 7.9 7.30 & 7.31</p>	<p>This does seem longwinded and challenging for a XX year old. Main thing is to keep silly cars from parking in disabled slots or opening their doors without looking or parking on pavements and to make restrictions clear, in my view. XX</p>
<p>7.2 & 7.3</p>	<p>Wanted to know how people without internet access could book appointments for info sessions. Explained Council Connect were able to help and that I would follow up to make sure that was happening. Also that location is not accessible, explained how to get there and that attendees the previous day had parked in the disabled bays. I booked XX a slot at the 12 October session and emailed her the confirmation. She said it was discrimination that people could not get access to the information and she had made complaint to Bath Live. She also advised she had not received her blue badge letter, having reviewed XX has said there are several reasons why she may not be on a list, this was given to XX.</p>

7.8 & 7.9 7.28 & 7.29	Requested a phone call via Parking Services. His objection was given to XX verbally: "You are not doing this for security reasons, it is pedestrianisation for your own political ends with no consideration for older & less mobile people. Council take no notice of people."
7.2 & 7.3	<p>I am a resident of Bath and have a few questions I would like to ask someone about the road closures being brought in due to anti-terrorism.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What is the effective date of the road closures.2. I have arthritis in both knees and a heart murmur which can make walking very difficult at times. I walk with a stick. I am not registered disabled and do not drive - therefore do not hold a blue badge.3. I rely on taxis and public transport round town and would like to know if:-<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Taxi's have full access to all areas of town.b) Public transport will not be disrupted in town.c) Will there be any taxi ranks in town - and what will happen to the one by Orange Groved) Will there still be access to the bus and railway stations by taxi.e) Will I still, for example, be able to shop in Waitrose and get a taxi home.

<p>4.5 7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.14 & 7.15 7.28 & 7.29</p>	<p>For the first ever I am contacting all Councillors about the Council's continuing progress in trying to pedestrianise Bath City Centre.</p> <p>The Council's website, where one can object to this, was created as to stifle any real ability to give a detailed objection, just a box ticking exercise.</p> <p>This is what I would have said:</p> <p>You asked for my comments on the proposed closure of many (more) of the City Centre streets, yet fix it so I am unable to give a proper detailed response to these proposals. You produced an insipid computerised questionnaire in an attempt to ensure that objectors are unable to put down their detailed reasons why the "Council" is behaving so stupidly and irrationally. Those in the majority on the Council are really just trying to implement their ideology by the back door. This is just the start of their campaign to pedestrianise the City Centre so why don't they have the guts to say so instead of hiding behind some hypothetical terrorist attack.</p> <p>I am sure any terrorist would find plenty of crowded places to detonate a bomb that is not in these streets they have named. Is their belief that every city and town in the UK should have traffic bans on them?</p> <p>I cannot believe that the Chief Constable of Avon & Somerset Police would be stupid enough to suggest that City Centres, such as Bath, should be closed to vehicles and we should all be terrified and succumb to some possible future terrorist attack. I am pretty sure you are misrepresenting some statement the Chief Constable has voiced in the past as to being PREPARED to close streets in an emergency, not permanently.</p> <p>I assume the Council is determined to turn Bath into a Museum and to get rid of all the retail shops in Bath because that will be the result of your long term plans. All we'll have left is facilities for tourists (and students). Shoppers are already going elsewhere to shop and the number of businesses that have closed down in Bath is proof.</p> <p>It's a shame the "Council" is not looking after the citizens of Bath but just pursuing some warped view of their own.</p> <p>It would be lovely if all comments, such as mine, could be properly registered as something to be considered when the relevant authority make their decision.</p>
<p>7.6 & 7.7 7.14 & 7.15 7.48</p>	<p>I am writing to voice my concerns over the proposed closure of roads in the area around XXXX. Having been refused a parking permit XX I am no longer a car owner. It is an on-going problem having anything delivered or removed, packing a vehicle when I go away as well as unpacking a vehicle for friends or family visiting. It is a real cause for anxiety already without the road closures that are being planned.</p> <p>While I realise the road closures are for our protection I do query the relevance as many terrorist attacks have been carried out by individuals walking into areas. It seems to me an expensive but by no means foolproof plan involving a great deal of upheaval and inconvenience for little gain in security - in the statistically unlikely event of a terrorist attack in Bath.</p>

7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21	Called on behalf of blue badge holder. Thinks the letter they received is nonsensical and didn't understand there was a link to the consultation. Although she has internet access she has an old laptop so would like a print copy to discuss with her friend. Would like to be part of a focus group and thinks BB holders should be written to about Milsom St plans as well.
---------------------------------------	---

<p>7.2 & 7.3 7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21 7.30 & 7.31</p>	<p>Number of blue Badge Holders = possibly 5,000?? Potential voters.</p> <p>Has information been posted to Blue Badge Holders who do not use internet or through disability cannot use their hands to type or their eyes to see? Please confirm.</p> <p>There is no telephone number (other than Council Connect who politely connect to Parking who politely say they can only give an email contact). They are not aware of any 'phone number or dedicated responder and have received many enquiries to do with the information circulated XXXX. This lack of a 'phone number could be seen as ploy to thwart objections from Registered Council Tax paying Blue Badge Holders.</p> <p>XXXXX seem to brag about the very things that deny independence and the chance of lifestyle choices for Blue Badge Holders. It is as if Blue Badge Holders don't count.</p> <p>It is a known fact that disability/advancing age means Blue Badge Holders don't rise early. (In fact that probably applies to the entire population in general). Some have carers.</p> <p>The majority of Blue Badge Holders are not ready to shop before 10am. Likewise the wider population.</p> <p>100% of Blue Badge Holders of all ages apply for a badge due to poor mobility (including blindness/deafness/physical weakness/incurable disease). Accessibility to the city on a bike is at least difficult for the majority and walking challenging for them, but that is not apparent in the Cabinet's plan.</p> <p>York Street. Closed 10am to 10 pm</p> <p>Cheap Street, Westgate Street, Sawclose, Upper Borough Walls. Closed 10am to 6pm</p> <p>Milsom Street, New Bond Street closed 10am to 6pm.</p> <p>What is controlled access to closed streets? How does the process work?</p> <p>What is pick up and drop off any time?</p> <p>How does it work?</p> <p>Bridge Street has double yellow lines and kerb lines to ban ALL parking. It used to be possible to park there with a blue badge.</p> <p>More disabled spaces needed - back entrance to the market.</p> <p>All comments submitted to a department who will collate all and prepare a report. Who prepares the report? It has to be someone with total impartiality? B&NES has lost the public's trust.</p> <p>Commercial Hub 15 New Bond Street. Tickets to the sessions available in daytime hours when Milsom Street and New Bond Street is only open to motorists before 10am and after 6pm. So how can Blue Badge Holders get there as Upper Borough Walls and other side streets are similarly closed? Again no 'phone number to use. There are still many who rely of the 'phone and are discriminated against if no 'phone number is provided.</p> <p>Throughout the Blue Badge Debate greater consultation at local level would have helped get to a good conclusion instead of the diabolical situation the frail and disabled have been left it! It seems that politicians focus on groups of residents who offer the least resistance to their plans to gain voters.</p> <p>Number of disabled spaces in city centre inadequate as each user can park for three hours max.</p>
--	--

	<p>Bath is not just about students and tourists. The current Leader of the Council says he will listen to residents. He needs to encourage his Cabinet to do likewise.</p>
--	--

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7 7.8 & 7.9 7.20 & 7.21 7.30 & 7.31</p>	<p>I have received your email about the Bath City Centre Security Scheme as I am a Blue Badge holder. As I cannot attend the information session I wish to submit the following comments and observations.</p> <p>I am a member of a Stroke Support Group and already find Bath City Centre disabled unfriendly and I feel we will be locked out further. The main car parks are expensive and your map appears to show permanent bollards across the entrance to Southgate Car Park. On-street parking on double yellow lines can be risky as we do not know what will be classed as obstructive and could be open to interpretation Traffic Wardens. Planning to provide extra Blue Badge spaces does not guarantee they will materialise. Also parking bays are better as they can be longer to allow wheelchairs etc to be accessed from the rear of vehicles.</p> <p>You list roads with drop-off/pick-up points on them. If you need help from a carer this is useless if the driver is your carer as they will need to stay to help you access the shops.</p> <p>If you live on the east side of the city I don't know how any of the areas can be accessed because the Walcot Street bus gate blocks entry into the city centre. This is made more complicated because of the current closure of Cleveland Bridge. Access from the east is an ongoing problem and it feels as though this area is never given due consideration by Bath City Council, unlike the centre or the west side of the city. Public transport is not always an option for people with disabilities.</p> <p>A further concern is access for emergency vehicles as time is critical in any emergency. How long will they have to wait for the moving bollards to be unlocked especially outside Council working hours?</p> <p>Whilst appreciating that public safety is paramount some of these measures seem to be overly excessive. I understand the proposals are based upon a 2016 report. Has there been a material change to the threat level to the city since that time.</p>
--	---

7.8 & 7.9
7.20 & 7.21
7.30 & 7.31

There are 5,000 registered Blue Badge Holders (BBH) registered in BNES of all ages (blind/physically frail/physically impaired by incurable disease etc). Many rely exclusively on telephone contact: Many are internet able: Many are potential voters!

The content of Cllr Rigby's email should have been made available to every registered BBH/citizen in the city. However, through my social circle it is evident that if you don't have email the information is not posted to you, even if you are entitled and should receive it. Hence you are not informed and unable to participate and the consultation is therefore void.

The only contact number in the message 01225 394041 and is linked to Council Connect where the friendly operator connects you to Parking. Parking has received many enquiries about Cllr Rigby's Consultation plan but can only provide callers with an email address/no named representative. I have asked questions and Parking management has NO name OR telephone number associated with this project, just the same email addressed as in the e-mail message citycentresecurity@bathnes.gov.uk . It is impossible to gain a copy of the consultation document from 01225 394041 so an email address is the only option and you can only do this if you have an internet connection! I am afraid a short sighted, slap dash approach has been taken in progressing this consultation process unfairly and I suggest it be extended time wise and information wise to allow more meaningful contact with 5,000 BBH.

The email came to me on Thursday 23rd September - closing 14th October (16 working days not 21). It only went to email users and not to BBH without email.

The email says all comments will be amalgamated into a report. What reassurance is there that an independent source will do this in an unbiased manner and not someone who will 'bend the facts' to suit? Who is doing this?

The information sessions are limited to ticket only during normal daytime working hours in a road (and neighbouring roads) which are closed to the public from 10am to 6pm. (No consideration given to disabled BBH being able to get to the venue which has no immediate parking, no access by vehicle.) There is no adjacent parking. I have a ticket (but am unfortunately unwell)there is no help offered to BBH in reaching the venue or checking mobility!!! I hope I can get to the venue which is in the middle of a busy pedestrianised city. Like many BBH public transport is not an option.

To get the tickets you have to click on a site within the email. So if you did not get notification through the post with a positive telephone number you cannot get a ticket! As shown above Council Connect or Parking has information to share. If there is no BBH access you can't attend a session. This would totally dilute the importance of these sessions and deny residents their rights.

The main thrust of this consultation is to close roads to vehicles for security reasons, which removes very useful BB places (Cheap Street/Bridge Street). Having said that the city is at risk any time and would benefit from more police. Unfortunately the

residents relying on a BB to live independently would not have access to the city centre with closures imposed between 10am and 6pm in many roads where banks and essential services/shops can be found. Most residents with or without a BB would not find businesses open before 10am or be able to shop before 10am.

We are told there will be controlled access to closed streets but no explanation as to how. At the moment Cheap Street is gated and locked with a padlock. Access is available to pedestrians and cyclists. In order to protect pedestrians cyclists should also be banned from closed roads, along with e-scooters.

If you look at social media sites locally you will get a feel for the disappointment Bath residents have generally voiced. For my part I asked our MP a long time ago to champion BBH to no avail. Perhaps she could be guided to review her stance. It would be very encouraging to see her represent BBH who reside in B&NES. This BBH group is not directly represented and has to take whatever is decided without meaningful debate via the 5,000.

All BBH SHOULD have received Cllr Rigby's communication: The venue for information sessions should have been where there is parking and not plonked in a building in the middle of Bath that BBH might struggle to get to. In recent years Bath has lost its 'buzz' due to vehicle bans. Cllr Rigby should be encouraged to review her whole approach to this consultation and the venue relocated and her time frame for information sessions extended. At the moment many BBH and residents have been denied participation. That is disgraceful. It is as if BBH don't matter.

Moving on, DAZ's (Dirty Air Zones) have been created in and around Bath as heavy duty traffic is forced to travel through local residential streets with constant traffic flows impacting seriously on house stability, family lifestyles and safety. Cllr S Warren seems not to have any concern about the fallout from the CAZ which she has just discovered has so far incurred at least £7,000 in charges for Council owned vehicles which have strayed into CAZ. Who pays for this poor management?

The next election will no doubt reflect the mess Bath is in. It is really time that intellect and honesty shows itself in politics (it would restore faith in politicians).

The public has recently been aware of disharmony within the BNES Cabinet which may well have impacted on the performance of Cabinet members and Cllrs. Seeing a well formed group of politicians go about their business with efficiency would be impressive, particularly if their focus is aimed at the needs of residents.

<p>7.4 & 7.5 7.8 & 7.9 7.18 & 7.19 7.20 & 7.21 7.30 & 7.31</p>	<p>GENERAL COMMENTS:</p> <p>This is a narrow survey aimed only at blue badge holders though, much like the incomprehensible maze that B&NES Council has made of the city centre of Bath for residents and visitors alike, the letter received by my blue badge holding friend one week into the '3 week survey' and references made in that letter to how blue badge holders may respond - many of whom have to be severely disabled in order to even qualify for a blue badge these days - is equally confusing and guarantees a minimal response.</p> <p>I have been asked by my friend as her main carer and driver therefore to respond on her behalf. I am able bodied though also find, much like the more severely mobility impaired blue badge holding resident population, that living on the steep hills of Bath not served by public transport, as most residents do, carrying heavy shopping from the centre of town is not feasible as one gets older so we are also now excluded from the centre by the now infamous 'Ring of Steel', with no car parking, no seats to rest, no public conveniences, NO CONSIDERATION FOR THE NEEDS OF REAL PEOPLE, putting off tourists as well as us residents. It is noticeable that shops are having to close as a result and Bath is becoming a featureless, unexciting, unfriendly backwater which has been surpassed by more intelligent city/town councils elsewhere who LISTEN to their people rather than design 'surveys' which ensure that most of those affected do not hear of it or cannot participate for one reason or another.</p> <p>It would take much more than 2 minutes to complete this survey properly, referencing all the many references made, without clearly explaining the existing conditions with map to those in receipt of the letter and many blue badge holders NOT having access to internet or the ability to use it.</p> <p>I therefore present highlights of our response by means of this email and hope that at some point the whole of Bath will be given the chance to raise and help resolve issues that our Council apparently can not resolve themselves, showing not only are they NOT 'improving lives' as the B&NES Council logo boasts but are proactively DOWNGRADING AND DESTROYING lives instead. B&NES Council non-conformance with even the basic provisions of UK Human Rights and Equality Law legislation is now shaming the city worldwide.</p> <p>I present two examples of what I have had to help people with just in the past few days which demonstrate the agony of ANYONE now needing to use ANY of the facilities in Bath's city centre.</p> <p>Example 1: My blue badge holding friend, now bored and stressed with having been EXCLUDED BY B&NES COUNCIL from ALL necessary shops in Bath eg clothes, shoes, stationery, books, bank, post office, and ALL forms of entertainment eg theatre, cinema, concert venues (eg Abbey, Forum, Chapel Arts, St Michaels), coffee shops and restaurants, needed at least to purchase some books, in Waterstones in Milsom Street. As ALL parking in Milsom Street is banned apparently (though no signage to explain the different confusing options where 'loading only' lines have been put on the pavements to stop even blue badge holders from parking there), we had to encircle the area when we spotted a well hidden 'blue badge' space down a side street behind Jollys' spotted from Queen Square, where also there is no parking these days. That shows in a nutshell the disdain with which B&NES Council treats the disabled these days. Though we were lucky to have one blue badge holder on the point of leaving as we arrived with no space otherwise, my friend was put to considerable strain walking the remaining distance to Waterstones and I also needed osteopathic treatment the next day for helping support my friend just to do this whilst parking spaces right outside had been forceably closed for use without ANY crowds to protect as B&NEs Council has</p>
--	--

successfully made Milson Street a near wasteland these days!

Example 2: I had to rescue a very large Royal Mail HGV delivery truck in Lansdown Road who had missed signs for Bath city centre and Sorting Office in spite of looking out for these as he came off the A4 over Churchill Bridge and joined the confusing mass of traffic going in all directions that anyone unfamiliar with the city has to meet making Bath infamous for the most unintelligent traffic management system of any city worldwide with the morass of multiple traffic lights and absence of any meaningful signposting in the area of Southgate Street/St James Parade/Dorchester Street junction deserving of the Guinness Book of Records and the city of Bath the butt of jokes for its extreme maze like qualities! However even trying to redirect this Royal Mail truck driver back into Bath from Lansdown Road (after having to turn around as well of course) and to the Sorting office via Queen Square with a simple map I made on the back of a pad was a challenge in itself and in the end we had to wait for and flag down a smaller Royal Mail van heading into Bath who knew the way to follow - though NOT via Guinea Lane due to the size of the truck! I am not surprised that businesses and shops are all going elsewhere.

These two examples JUST OVER THE LAST FEW DAYS join the many thousands of other examples.

SPECIFIC ANSWERS TO THE TRO SURVEY QUESTIONS AS THEY ARE POSED:

I shall now turn to the questions specifically posed in this survey namely:

1. QU: 'Do you support or object to the proposed traffic regulations and Anti Terrorism Order', though the way this question is phrased assumes the blue badge holder who does not herself drive any more, know what the existing restrictions are now and whether she objects to these as well or not. I shall therefore answer this question in 2 parts:

WE AGREE WITH ANY CHANGE TO REMOVE THE UNACCEPTABLE RESTRICTIONS PUT ON ACCESS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE TO ALL THE AMENITIES OF BATH CITY CENTRE INCLUDING ALL SHOPS, BUSINESSES AND ENTERTAINMENT FACILITIES AS DESCRIBED ABOVE.

WE ALSO DO NOT AGREE WITH EXISTING PARKING RESTRICTIONS INSIDE THE COUNCIL'S RING OF STEEL AND ALSO ON NEIGHBOURING STREETS FOR REASONS DESCRIBED ABOVE.

IN ANSWER TO THE ANTI TERRORISM ASPECT OF THIS QUESTION WE BELIEVE THE EXCLUSION OF SUCH A LARGE POPULATION OF BATH RESIDENTS FROM THE FACILITIES AND AMENITIES WE PAY FOR AS COUNCIL TAX PAYERS (WHICH STUDENTS AND TOURISTS ARE NOT) IS PLAYING INTO THE HANDS OF TERRORISTS WHO WOULD BE DELIGHTED TO HEAR THEY HAVE HAD SUCH A DEVASTATING EFFECT ON THE LIVES OF BRITISH CITIZENS. WE BELIEVE THAT NO TERRORIST WOULD HAVE THE PATIENCE OR INCLINATION TO NAVIGATE THE NARROW MAZE WHICH BATH HAS BECOME BUT INSTEAD TARGET THE JUNCTION MENTIONED ABOVE IE SOUTHGATE STREET/ST JAMES PARADE/DORCHESTER STREET WITH A STRATEGICALLY PLACED CAR BOMB IN THE UNDERGROUND CAR PARK OR SUICIDE BOMB CARRIED ON THE PERSON WHICH WOULD RESULT IN CARNAGE OF PEOPLE SHOPPING IN SOUTHGATE SHOPPING CENTRE, DESTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS, MASSIVE DISRUPTION OF THE MAIN ESSENTIAL TRANSPORT ROUTE IN AND OUT OF BATH AND THE LIVES AND LIVELIHOODS OF RESIDENTS AND VISITORS ALIKE, ALL WITHIN AN EASY ESCAPE ROUTE OUT AND BEYOND THE REACH OF POLICE AS EMERGENCY VEHICLES ALSO HAVE DIFFICULTY GETTING THROUGH TO SAVE LIVES. WE ALSO BELIEVE THAT BATH IS NOT THE STRATEGIC TARGET FOR TERRORISTS THAT B&NES COUNCIL BELIEVES

IT IS AND THAT THE IDEOLOGICAL ATTEMPT TO TURN BATH INTO A PEDESTRIAN ONLY CITY IS A MISGUIDED ATTEMPT TO TURN BATH INTO A FACELESS DISNEYLAND ATTRACTION WHICH WILL DESTROY THE VIBRANCY AND ATTRACTIVENESS OF BATH AS A PLACE TO LIVE, WORK AND VISIT. IT IS ALREADY BECOMING THIS THANKS TO THE LACK OF INTELLIGENCE AND THE LAWLESSNESS RE HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITY LAW WHICH B&NES IS ALREADY APPLYING.

2. QU: 'Please name streets you want to talk about'

AS THE SURVEY CONFINES US TO TALK ONLY ABOUT THREE SPECIFIC AREAS THOUGH AS SEEN ABOVE OUR COMMENTS EXTEND FAR BEYOND THESE AREAS, OUR ANSWERS ON THESE SPECIFIC THREE AREAS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

2.1 Cheap Street, Westgate Street, Saw Close, Upper Borough Walls:

THESE STREETS PROVIDE ACCESS TO OUR MAIN BATH ENTERTAINMENT VENUES ESP THEATRE, CINEMA WHICH WAS MADE INACCESSIBLE FOR BLUE BADGE HOLDERS FROM THE TIME THE CASINO WAS BUILT AND CAR PARK/DROPPING OFF POINTS REMOVED AND BARRED. THIS IS A SHAMEFUL INDICTMENT OF B&NES COUNCIL AND SHOWS A PARTICULAR LEVEL OF IGNORANCE AND DISDAIN FOR BATH'S LESS MOBILE RESIDENTS.

WE THEREFORE REQUIRE UNRESTRICTED ACCESS FOR BLUE BADGE HOLDERS AND THEIR DRIVERS/VEHICLES BETWEEN 8AM AND MIDNIGHT TO ALLOW DISABLED PEOPLE TO BE ABLE TO USE THESE MUCH VALUED VENUES ONCE AGAIN

2.2 Lower Borough Walls, Stall Street, Abbeygate Street, Abbey Green, Swallow Street (south), Bath Street, Hot Bath Street, Beau Street

AGAIN THE RESTRICTIONS SHOW A LEVEL OF IGNORANCE BY B&NES COUNCIL ABOUT BATH'S INHERENT CULTURE AND TRADITION WHICH MAKES BATH ATTRACTIVE AND DIFFERENT FROM OTHER CITIES. THESE STREETS PROVIDE ACCESS TO THE KINGSMEAD SQUARE AREA, THE BATH SPA, THE LITTLE THEATRE CINEMA AND OTHER VENUES, AS WELL AS FURTNITURE AND STATIONER SHOPS, RESTAURANTS, OUTDOOR MARKET AND OTHER FACILITIES ALL OF WHICH MY BLUE BADGE HOLDER FRIEND ENJOYED BEFORE B&NES COUNCIL RUDELY EXCLUDED HER AND OTHERS FROM THESE.

WE NEED ALL RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS AND PARKING FOR BLUE BADGE HOLDERS TO BE REMOVED FROM 8AM TO MIDNIGHT.

2.3 York Street

ACCESS IS NEEDED 8AM TO MIDNIGHT FOR ALL THE REASONS ALREADY GIVEN IN 2.1 AND 2.2. YORK STREET IS THE MAIN ACCESS POINT TO BRING MY FRIEND FROM HER HOME IN WIDCOMBE/BATHWICK BORDERS WITHOUT HAVING TO CIRCLE BATH MEANINGLESSLY SOMETIMES FOR HOURS ON END LOOKING FOR SOMEWHERE TO PARK FOR HER TO GET ACCESS TO SHOPS AT THE LOWER END OF TOWN. FOCUSING ON GENERAL TOURIST ATTRACTIONS ONLY SHOWS THE LACK OF KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND RESPECT THAT COUNCIL WORKERS/MEMBERS, PARTICULARLY THOSE WHO DO NOT AND HAVE NEVER LIVED IN BATH, HAVE ABOUT BATH AND WHAT MAKES IT ATTRACTIVE AND UNIQUE. B&NES COUNCIL NEEDS TO STOP DEGRADING BATH, ITS

RESIDENTS AND ITS CULTURE MAKING IT SPECIAL.
BLUE BADGE HOLDERS AND THEIR DRIVERS ALSO NEED AN EASY-TO-USE GUIDE AND MAP WHERE TO FIND ACCESS POINTS, PARKING SPACES, HOW TO CONTACT THE CCTV TEAM AND IF POSSIBLE HAVE MUCH MORE INTELLIGENT CCTV SYSTEMS WHICH RECOGNISE BLUE BADGE HOLDERS AND THEIR DRIVERS/CARS SO THEY ARE NOT CAUSED EXTRA GRIEF WITH RANDOM FINES ON TOP OF THE INSULTS THEY ARE ALREADY SUBJECTED TO. THIS SHOULD BE ADDED TO OTHER COMPLAINTS ABOUT PARKING EG THE UNACCEPTABLY HIGH COST OF VISITOR PARKING FOR DISABLED RESIDENTS OF BATH ON WHICH SUBJECT WE HAVE ALSO BEEN IN COMMUNICAITON WITH CHRIS MAJOR FOR SEVERAL YEARS, WITH NO RESOLUTION TO DATE.

PERSONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED

XX

Note we do not generally use email or internet and request all communications be made by post.

I am using email here only because of the short time allowed in which to respond, my friend having only received the letter sent her one week into the survey and my finding the letter some time later when she asked me to respond on her behalf.

B&NES SHOULD DO NOT STORE OR USE MY EMAIL ADDRESS FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.

Regarding Equalities Monitoring questions:

We are both female, both XX years of age. My friend XX is disabled. I am not but find the restrictions on parking in Bath city centre equally inconvenient so I can not also use the amenities I once did apart from weekly shopping at a time when the car park is not full at Waitrose, just once per week.

Both of us live independently in our own homes though I visit XX regularly as her main carer and friend and need B&NES visitor parking tickets to do so (at huge cost) except when I am taking XX out so can use her blue badge for that purpose as she can not now drive herself, even though I am also a pensioner on low income and a Bath resident with a fully paid up resident parking permit for my own area.

We have read the privacy notice and confirm we agree.

<p>7.14 & 7.15 7.18 & 7.19 7.44</p>	<p>We write on behalf of XX.</p> <p>We are writing in response to the consultation the Council is currently running on the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) proposed to limit vehicular traffic on the Cheap Street / Westgate Street / Saw Close / Upper Borough Walls loop to help protect crowded spaces in key areas of the city from vehicle borne threats. We have previously discussed these proposals with officers in respect of the XXXX XXXXX and we also responded to the January 2021 consultation on the matter - see attached.</p> <p>We understand that the TROs would restrict all traffic on Upper Borough Walls between 10am to 6pm, except blue badge holders/disabled and taxis/vehicles transporting blue badge holders. There would be exemptions for construction traffic, utilities and emergency vehicles for example. Vehicular access would be controlled by CCTV via the BANES central control centre. We understand there are now no traffic restrictions proposed on Upper Borough Walls for any vehicles between 6pm and 10am. We note that the proposed TROs would also change the parking and loading restrictions along Upper Borough Walls. The disabled parking would remain but it appears that the existing loading bay and ambulance bay The principle of the proposed security measures is supported, but the XXXX XXXXX of the XXX XXX XXX must be able to operate efficiently in terms of the deliveries it would receive such as linen, food and beverage, and the items to be collected from site such as laundry and refuse. XXX and XXX should also have a choice of means to access the XXX. Deliveries and Servicing</p> <p>We acknowledge that the TROs would permit the deliveries and servicing at XXXX between 6pm and 10am. However, the proposals remove the dedicated loading bay on Upper Borough Walls. We would like confirmation that there would be no additional loading restrictions and the loading / unloading could take place on the double yellow lines outside XXX. Otherwise, a new loading bay should be provided.</p>
---	---

<p>7.14 & 7.15 7.18 & 7.19 7.44</p>	<p>cont. It is crucial that the delivery and servicing vehicles can stop close to XXXX to be able to load/unload, to ensure XXXX operates effectively and the distances goods are transported between vehicles and XXXX are kept to a minimum to avoid impacting on the safety or amenity of other road users. XXXX XX XXXX</p> <p>The XXXX would not be anticipated to attract a significant number of vehicle trips largely due to its central location accessible by walking, cycling and public transport, but for XXX, a choice of means to reach the hotel should still be available which would include by private vehicle or taxi, for instance from the railway station. We are pleased to see that under the current proposals the mobility impaired could still access the hotel by vehicle at any time. However, the TRO would not allow private vehicle or taxi access to use Upper Borough Walls between 10am to 6pm except if carrying a blue badge holder. The drop-off and pick-up parking requirements outside of the secure area would therefore need to be provided as mitigation for XXXX to XXXX and other businesses effected nearby. These will need to be available close-by for those carrying bags. In our view, additional pick-up and drop-off facilities must be provided on New Bond Street, Trim Street, Barton Street or Monmouth Street.</p> <p>Other Matters</p> <p>We would also like to be reassured that the vehicle access protocol in place would allow for the construction and redevelopment XX XXX XXX, which could be complex.</p> <p>We wish to ensure that XX interests are being taken into consideration and that trips XXX can be accommodated effectively and without detriment to the wider road network, road users and the movement of people in the city centre.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City Centre Security TRO proposals and we are seeking reassurance that our views are taken on board.</p>
---	--

7.34 & 7.35

XX Response to the City Centre Security Consultation 23rd September to 14th October 2021

OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM

Since 2016 the advice from Avon and Somerset police and the anti-terrorism services is that the historic centre of Bath requires extra protection from the very real threat posed by terrorism. It is clear that the security measures must provide increased levels of security, as part of the Council's commitment to keeping residents and visitors safe.

OUR ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSAL

With regard to the proposed TRO for Blue Badge holders, carers and taxis transporting Blue Badge holders will be permitted with controlled, authorised access in Cheap Street, Westgate Street, Saw Close, Parsonage Lane and Upper Borough Walls 10am-6pm proposed access restriction - is NOT supported by XX. These streets should have a TRO for access restrictions for anti-terrorism purpose 10am to 6pm, similar to Abbey Green, Abbey Gate Street, Stall Street, Bath Street and Hot Bath Street

OUR PROPOSAL/ALTERNATIVE

XX fully appreciates that there is a need for access to the city centre for those with Blue Badges and for people with accessibility issues. We would propose that:

- *in recognition that there will be a reduction in access for Blue Badge holders, B&NES Council will increase the Blue Badge provision in all city centre Council car parks and will offer a reduced rate for use

- *any residents' priority parking scheme zones, are free of charge with time limit parking on double and single yellow lines where loading restrictions aren't in place, where it is safe to do so and not causing an obstruction, is free of charge, for up to 3 hours for blue badge holders

We want to increase security and make accessibility universal and the way to do to this is to:

- *provide Dial&Ride services so that access to Cheap Street, Westgate Street, Saw Close, Parsonage Lane and Upper Borough Walls is available

- *That B&NES Council better promotes services like Shopmobility and Dial&Ride

- *That B&NES place shopmobility points close to all car parks, some bus stops and train station to support those with accessibility issues

For City centre access for businesses and deliveries

To avoid congestion on the roads around the city centre, business owners must ensure deliveries are completed outside of footstreet hours. Exceptions to access restrictions

There are a limited number of exceptions for exceptional circumstances, including access for:

- emergency services

- emergency utility works

- security deliveries

- Dial & Ride vehicles

OUR PHILOSOPHY

XX aims are:

Accessibility rather than mobility.

Transport to be equitably accessible to all people irrespective of their age, wealth or disability, with local needs given priority over travelling greater distances.

Where mobility is desired or needed, to satisfy this through sustainable modes of transport.

Transport and its infrastructure to have the minimum impact on the environment.

Transport means should make use of sustainable and replaceable resources.

Degradation of community life by inappropriate transport modes, especially excessive car use, to be reduced and reversed wherever possible.

Transport should not endanger users or others and, where possible, should play a role in bringing about a more healthy population.

OUR ASSESSMENT OF OUR PROPOSAL/ALTERNATIVE

The proposed TRO particularly with reference to Cheap Street, Westgate Street, Saw close, Parsonage Lane and upper Borough Walls does not solve the accessibility issues and presently makes the public realm poorer, whilst leaving the city wide open to a terrorist vehicular attack.

The vision should be to encourage everyone irrespective of age, wealth or disability into this space by offering alternative transport options such as a Dial&Ride service and Shopmobility services.

B&NES Council presently prosecutes for the misuse of Blue Badges and it should be noted that the misuse of Blue Badges could lead to serious terrorist behaviour. It is not clear from this consultation how the blue badge drivers or taxis will be monitored.

The area around Seven Dials has been abandoned by the visually impaired and by space trainers due to its poor accessibility issues.

The proposed measures from XX should be seen as interim and that B&NES Council should be apply to the Leveling Up Fund to make the constituency of Bath accessible to all.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/levelling-up-fund-additional-documents>

Data shows that:

Disabled people are more likely to be in a household without access to a car and in households with access to a car they are less likely to be a driver.

40% of all households have no access to a car.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/972438/transport-disability-and-accessibility-statistics-england-2019-to-2020.pdf

7.6 & 7.7
7.34 & 7.35

Please accept this as an objection to the TROs being proposed for so-called security measures.

I believe the proposal to allow Blue Badge holders into Cheap Street/Westgate Street/Sawclose/Upper Borough Walls is wholly misconceived.

The closure of these streets to vehicles during the Pandemic has been an undoubted success, creating a pleasant and safe environment for all. Allowing private vehicles to enter them will undermine this, creating danger, pollution and inconvenience for all pedestrians but especially for the young and the vulnerable.

You wouldn't allow Blue Badge holders to drive down Union Street or through the Southgate Centre so why allow them here? It will mean also that it will be necessary to retain the infrastructure and road markings required for vehicles, removing the opportunity to turn this area of the city into a more attractive pedestrian-friendly environment.

Of course the needs of the mobility-challenged should be addressed but not in a way that is harmful to the majority. Blue badges are intended to provide parking benefits, not access to pedestrianised streets.

Could not additional disabled spaces be provided by, for example, converting the taxi rank in Westgate Buildings, opposite Tesco Express, to disabled, relocating the taxi rank to across the road, outside The Cork? And what about an electric shuttle service that could give the disabled access to a far greater area of the city? (See the attached – that used at Dyrham Park, also the Diablins used in Aix en Provence: <https://www.marvellous-provence.com/aix-en-provence/practical-information/how-to-get-around#diabline>)

Improving access for the mobility-restricted, such as blue badge holders, should not and need not impact on the welfare of the majority. There's an impression, though, that councillors and officers have succumbed to a campaign by a small, vociferous but unrepresentative group.

I fully support attempts to remove the dominance of vehicles in the city centre and to create a better pedestrian environment. Isn't the best way to achieve this set out at length in B&NES's Public Realm and Movement Strategy, a closely researched document that draws on best practice elsewhere and which follows extensive consultation? How, though, do the proposed security measures accord with the recommendations of the Bath Pattern Book?

It's clear that the Council's own accessibility reviewer has his doubts about the rationale behind the proposed security measures. (Bath City Centre Accessibility Study, Atkins), questioning why the national terrorism threat level should automatically be applied at local level and asking:

- What will the proposed measures do to prevent terrorist attacks that do not involve vehicles?
- If someone was wanting to introduce a bomb; would they not use other means of entering the areas other than a vehicle?
- Is footfall the only criteria that terrorists look for, and are not local concentrations of people, such as outside pubs, clubs, places of worship and waiting for buses outside the security area/zone just as likely to also attract hostile vehicles?

It must be clear to anyone that you can't stop terrorism with bollards; at most you can persuade them to choose a different target or method. And, in any case, almost all mainland terror attacks have involved terrorists on foot, not driving vehicles into barriers.

(iii) Drop-in sessions

Objections Report reference para.	Comments
7.8 & 7.9	There is confusion as the notice shows Beau Street/Bilbury Lane closed off.
7.8 & 7.9	Blue Badge parking
7.14 & 7.15, 7.48	How will residents deal with deliveries
7.14 & 7.15, 7.48	What would happen for supermarket deliveries or Amazon
7.14 & 7.15, 7.48	Booking deliveries before 10am or after 6pm is not always possible
7.14 & 7.15	This is an unplanned disadvantage for those who reside in the city centre
4.6 & 4.12	Will the closure times for York Street change?
7.14 & 7.15	Is any resident parking being lost?
7.14 & 7.15	Could loading bays be used for deliveries?
7.14 & 7.15, 7.48	The Council needs delivery proposals and to keep the residents informed of the procedure.
7.34 & 7.35	Can BB holders park on New Bond Street?
7.8 & 7.9	Go to the theatre and eat out first but cannot do this any longer due to an inability to get there despite having blue badges. We used to park in Upper Borough Walls by the mineral hospital but will not be able to do that.
7.20 & 7.21	Milsom street will that have access?

7.8 & 7.9	Ramps for my buggy as it can be difficult.
7.20 & 7.21	More charge points for electric cars
7.8 & 7.9	Will the BB parking by the Gainsborough hotel be affected?
7.2 & 7.3	The map is difficult to interpret
7.4 & 7.5 7.6 & 7.7	Has there been any actual tangible threat?
7.8 & 7.9	Disabled parking in Manvers Street is not easy to come out of in a wheelchair. Very little disabled parking and pay for parking is costly.
7.30 & 7.31	Will access be by number plate recognition?
7.18 & 7.19	Are you moving some disabled bays?
7.30 & 7.31	How will you communicate to people where you can go as people miss the signs?
7.8 & 7.9	The public sector equality duty – take steps to meet the needs where these are different.
Bath City Centre Accessibility Study by Atkins, 18 May 2021	With autism the ability to access the area will be a challenge
7.34 & 7.35	Are the churches in Bath on the radar?
7.34 & 7.35	How does a hearse get to the church or other vehicles for weddings or similar? Pre-pandemic 5,000 people coming to churches in the city centre and getting those people back helps sustain the churches. Displacement of disability parking effects all churches.
7.34 & 7.35	Communication is lacking. All churches are impacted due to the knock-on effect.
7.34 & 7.35	What about resident parking outside St Michaels?
7.34 & 7.35	Access for events such a funerals and weddings as there is a statutory right to use the church.
Suggestion noted	Make the bays in Wood Street residents and disabled bays in Quiet Street

7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15	Additional parking spaces there is concern about some of the placement. Could not find maps of exact locations for disabled parking spaces and if they are not finalised could the Council work closely with residents and business to decide locations.
7.8 & 7.9	(Westgate Buildings) St Michaels day Centre and residents if they are being picked up or dropped off they will be restricted there is on place with a dropped kerb that would be ideal for the BB bay.
7.8 & 7.9	Beau Street has resident parking but there will be no access between 10-6
7.34 & 7.35	St Michaels church – access to the Abbey for funeral and wedding vehicles
7.10 & 7.11 7.12 & 7.13 7.14 & 7.15 7.48	Deliveries and emergency access. Clear procedure in place for deliveries for residents between 10-6 and clear communication to effected residents. Procedure for emergencies, such as a plumber, 2 hours notice may not be possible.
7.2 & 7.3	Happy to support the project.
7.8 & 7.9	What's the PAN Report
7.8 & 7.9	Why is the decision being made before the PAN report is finalised.
2.1	The Director of Place Management will make the final decision
7.8 & 7.9 7.14 & 7.15 7.30 & 7.31	Talking with traders about BB parking and how this scheme effects their trade and deliveries. Deliveries are not always possible by 10am. Today a delivery driver had to drive around for an hour so he could stop. Impacts emissions.
7.6 & 7.7	Started for security reasons and I understand it still is. Yesterday at the P&R bus stop and a balloon went over that could have been a threat. These changes are expensive why not spend it on more CCTV and staff to watch this.
1 January 2022 subject to TRO implementation.	When would manual operation commence
7.8 & 7.9	What about those using hire cars
7.8 & 7.9	How does it stand with the DDA
Noted	Cyclists and E-Scooters do not seem safe and this needs to be considered.

7.8 & 7.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can we comment it is a bit chicken and egg and the information shows the member for accessibility etc have not made any comment. • Called on Friday and tried every phone in Highways, no one called back, I tried again yesterday but no one picked up their phone. Called back today but no direct number left so I could not call back. • TRO document – I understand that BB holders can be let in but you are not removing the no loading that is currently in place.
7.8 & 7.9	What if the area is at full capacity
7.53	• Still cannot park on Saw Close.
7.8 & 7.9	Spaces by Pizza Hut will they be available
7.53	Can we put disabled parking by Saw Close. parking near the theatre.
7.8 & 7.9	Can you send me a list of streets where BB bays are being provided
7.8 & 7.9 7.53	How long can we stay
1.1	Open in the evening
7.53	If you could look at releasing some loading restrictions that would help or reduce the restriction.

(iv) Petition

Objections Report reference para.	Petition clarification
7.4 & 7.5 7.14 & 7.15 7.26 & 7.27 7.28 & 7.29 7.47	<p>XXX. Once the LibDem Ring of Steel has been put in place I don't know how I will be able to function within it. There are many students living within the Ring of Steel and students being students, everything is always last minute.</p> <p>I believe the risk is totally hypothetical and I don't have any faith in the LibDem run council. For me this will create difficulties looking after clients but I firmly believe the whole project is a waste of time and money. If terrorists choose ,to attack Bath, they will do so with or without the LibDem Ring of Steel. It will do harm to businesses inside the Ring of Steel. This is just a bicycle motivated scheme and has nothing to do with terrorists in my opinion.</p>