

# OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)

3

## OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

<b>TITLE OF REPORT:</b>	On Street parking – permit and parking charge review
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Changes to on street parking permits (operation and charges) and an increase in on street paid for parking charges.
<b>SCHEME REF No:</b>	21 – 024A-G
<b>REPORT AUTHOR:</b>	Andy Dunn

### 1. DELEGATION

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Section 4** of the Constitution under the **Delegation of Functions to Officers**, as follows:

<b>Section A</b>	The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Divisional Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility....”
<b>Section B</b>	Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to: serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within his/her area of responsibility.
<b>Section D9</b>	An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator.

*For the purpose of this report, the Director of Place Management holds the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Orders.*

### 2. LEGAL AUTHORITY

This proposal is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which under Section 1 provides, generally, for Orders to be made for the following reasons, and in the case of this report specifically for the reason(s) shown below:

(a)	for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or	X
(b)	for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or	
(c)	for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or	X
(d)	for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property,	

(e)	(without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or	
(f)	for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs, or	X
(g)	for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality)	

### 3. **PROPOSAL**

3.1 To implement a range of proposals affecting on street parking permits and pay and display parking at all on street locations as outlined in Cabinet Report E3281, approved on 20 July 2021, and summarised below:

1. Introduction of emissions-based charging for residents permits
2. Visitor permits – charges and duration
3. Hotel permit review – changes to charges and operational use
4. Medical permit review – changes to charges and operational use
5. Trade permits review – new charges
6. On street pay and display charge review – new charges
7. Extension of permit operation and pay and display charges to include Sunday
8. Removal of the 10% on street paid for parking discount for residents

Details of these proposals are set out in Appendix A to G.

3.2 Also included within these proposals are amendments which aim to resolve minor issues within current on street Orders which are used to suspend parking places on the highway to support the local community and ensure the safety of the public. This amendment will ensure the council can continue to suspend areas of the highway where restrictions prohibiting parking are in place for specific needs and ensure that these areas can then be kept clear for enforcement of the suspension. Please see Appendix H.

3.3 Also included within these proposals are amendments to the orders which state that certain exceptions don't apply to the Blue Badge provision which will reduce the use of Blue Badge bays by non-Blue Badge holders which is permitted in the current orders. This is stated in the following addition to article 12 (which then becomes article 13 in the new order) which can be seen in Appendix I.

### 4. **BACKGROUND**

4.1 These proposals have been developed to improve air quality through a major shift to walking, cycling and mass transit and incentives to reduce the use of more polluting vehicles in order to secure the safer movement of pedestrian, bikes and e-scooter traffic on the highway by reducing the public health risks posed to them by air pollution. These proposals are also aimed to facilitate the achievement of strategic outcomes of local transport policy by reducing congestion and vehicle intrusion into neighbourhoods, and particularly residential neighbourhoods and align with the Council policy on Liveable Neighbourhoods.

4.2 Air quality impacts on pedestrian safety, managing traffic flows and availability of

parking are all significant issues in our region, particularly in the city of Bath. Whilst the proposals are a separate standalone scheme, they are complimentary to other projects aimed at addressing these issues, including but not limited to the following.

- a) Promoting a major shift to mass transport, walking and cycling, with incentives to reduce the use of more polluting vehicles, in accordance with the UK government National Air Quality Strategy
- b) Improving the safety of cyclists and pedestrians through active travel schemes which rebalance priorities on our roads and build on social distancing needs
- c) Introducing a Clean Air Zone in central Bath, to encourage less polluting ways of travelling around the city
- d) Liveable Neighbourhoods policy and work concerning reducing the effect of motor vehicles on neighbourhoods, particularly residential neighbourhoods.

4.3 As noted in the National Air Quality Strategy, measures designed to address air quality issues will often have a positive effect on climate change. Whilst these proposals are not justified on climate change grounds; it is anticipated that the proposed measures which are designed to (1) improve air quality in order to secure the safer movement of pedestrian traffic on the highway, and (2) meet traffic management purposes, will also significantly reduce the level of emissions that drive climate change, as a result, for example, of encouraging a switch to low emission vehicles.

4.4 To develop a fair and balanced package of proposals to meet traffic management and pedestrian safety purposes, regard has been given (to an extent permissible with the requirements under s.122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) to a range of issues which appear to the Council to be relevant, including potential impacts on residents; commerce; tourism; carbon footprint and air quality; and transportation.

4.5 As part of the On-Street electric vehicle charging strategy which forms part of the wider Liveable Neighbourhoods project, this will provide fresh thinking on how road space is used, providing the perfect opportunity to increase public on-street charging.

4.6 In February 2021, Single Member Decision E3253 approved proposals outlined in section 3 of this TRO report to first stage public consultation (proposals A-E) and statutory consultation (proposals F-H). The first stage public consultation for proposals A-E was held during April and May 2021, with consideration of the feedback and outcomes, including mitigating measures as appropriate outlined in cabinet report E3281 and approved by Cabinet on 20th July 2021 for statutory consultation.

## **5 SOURCE OF FINANCE**

Implementation of these proposals is to be funded by capital.

## **6. INFORMAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

Informal consultation was carried out with the Chief Constable, Ward Members and the Cabinet Member for Transport.

The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO report number 2.

## **7. OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS RECEIVED (following the public advertisement of the proposal(s))**

The objection / comments received have been summarised below with the technical responses in italics underneath each one. A full analysis of the responses can be found in Appendix J.

The objection / comments received to the 21-day public consultation have been summarised below with the technical responses in italics underneath each one.

### **On Street Parking – Permit and Parking Charge Review – Public Consultation Findings**

**Responses Received: 395 of which Support – 31%, Partially Support – 29%, Object – 41%**

#### **Objections Main points raised:**

- **Proposals are unfair on those on lower incomes (24%, n=63)/ People cannot afford the extra cost (13%, n=35) / Cars kept on driveways should also be charged (3%, n=8):** Respondents felt that the proposals are unfair on lower income residents.

*We recognise that the timing of any proposed increase in costs is never welcome and that it has been a challenging time for many due to the impacts of Covid-19. However, we cannot ignore the need to act to progress measures which aim to improve air quality. No charges are applied retrospectively as the new charges will only apply at the point of purchase or renewal of a resident parking permit. It should also be noted that the purchase of a permit is optional as residents may choose to park in unrestricted areas outside of their residents parking zone or on the driveways where it is not possible for us to charge for parking.*

*The proposed charging structure for emissions based resident permits aligns with the Vehicle Excise Duty (VED), (commonly known as car or road tax) bands based on CO2 emissions, used by the DVLA. Charges will only increase for petrol vehicles that produce more than 130g/km of CO2 or use diesel fuel. You can find out your emission band online at <https://www.gov.uk/get-vehicleinformation-from-dvla>.*

*Based on current permit data, 1 in 3 vehicles will not be subject to any increased charges for their permit. Of those 2 in 3 vehicles that are expected to see a price increase, the average rise for a 12 month 'first' permit is approximately £25.*

*However, the council acknowledges that whilst there is no disproportionate impact, this does not mean that those in more deprived areas will not be impacted more by the increased charge and therefore following a further review, included within these proposals are permits with shorter durations of 3 and 1 months. If implemented, this will provide greater flexibility for the purchase and management of permits, whilst also helping to ensure they are not accidentally left to expire (subject to payment card details remaining valid).*

*Air pollution can cause or contribute to a variety of health conditions, particularly amongst the young and elderly. Each year in the UK, around 40,000 deaths are attributable to exposure to outdoor air pollution which plays a role in many of the major health challenges of our day. It has been linked to cancer, asthma, stroke and heart disease, diabetes, obesity, and changes linked to dementia. The health problems resulting from exposure to air pollution have a high cost to people who suffer from illness and premature death, to our health services and to business. In the UK, these costs add up to more than £20 billion every year. Source: Royal College of Physicians – “Every breath we take: the lifelong impact of air pollution” <https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/every-breath-we-take-lifelong-impact-air-pollution>.*

*There are over 300 premature deaths a year in the West of England due nitrogen dioxide emissions (Joint Local Transport Plan 4, West of England Combined Authority, 2020), whilst in B&NES 92% of nitrous dioxide emissions are from road traffic (Transport Delivery Action Plan for Bath Phase 1: Current and Future Report, Bath and North East Somerset Council, 2020). The proposals therefore seek to improve air quality through the application of the polluter pays principle.*

- **Emissions based charging is unfair (15%, n=41) / Diesel owners being treated unfairly (6%, n=15):** Some respondents felt that basing charges on the emissions of a vehicle is not fair as it does not consider the mileage of a vehicle. Diesel owners felt unfairly treated as they feel many diesel engines are now cleaner than petrol engines and diesels were advertised as a cleaner technology by the Government.

*According to DVLA statistics, in 2020 new petrol cars had average CO2 emissions of 149g/km, whilst new diesel cars had emissions of 165g/km, decreases of 4.1% and 0.4% on 2019 respectively. Average new car fuel efficiency has generally increased over the past two decades, however, this trend reversed in 2016 as new cars became less fuel efficient driven largely by an increase in the proportion of SUVs and other large vehicles (source: DfT Transport Statistics 2019). Furthermore, Euro standard data on a per vehicle level is not available to councils to allow automatic validation of compliance.*

*Whilst the new euro standards have ensured that diesel vehicles emit lower levels of NOx comparatively, they still emit higher levels of NOx and more particulate matter than petrol vehicles. The current Euro 6 emission standard for diesel vehicles registered from 2015 has a higher acceptable level of NOx at 0.08g/km compared to its petrol equivalent at 0.06g/km.*

*We acknowledge that some years ago, government policy was to encourage diesel vehicles as a more carbon-efficient fuel than petrol vehicles. We cannot ignore, that more recent evidence shows that diesel vehicles have harmful effects to health with higher emissions of NOx and particulate matter, which are now well publicised.*

- **Discriminates Elderly / Disabled (6%, n=15):** Some respondents felt the proposals were unfair on vulnerable persons such as the elderly or disabled due to their need for a motor vehicle for transportation.

*We completed an Equalities Impact Assessments to assess and identify impacts to those groups with protected characteristics and those vulnerable individuals on low income and in deprived areas. This proactive first stage consultation allowed us to consider additional needs and feedback that we may not have considered, and we have since published an updated and revised Equalities Impact Assessment to ensure no group is disproportionately impacted.*

*Following consideration of feedback received from the public the Council introduced measures to mitigate the issues raised, including permits of short durations for 3 and 1 month which make the permits more affordable for residents who own more polluting vehicles.*

- **Will reduce social contact (3%, n=19):** Some respondents also expressed concerns that the increase in parking charges or the limited number of visitor permits could reduce social contact

*The council provides a limited number of visitors permits (1000 hours in all except the central zone, when 100 are available) to residents to allow visitors to park close to their homes. This helps to ensure, particularly amongst residents that are vulnerable or living alone, that they can receive guests.*

*These proposals do not seek to change the allocation of visitor permits available to residents in qualifying properties.*

*In addition, Residents' Parking Zones also include either pay and display parking (in central areas) or limited waiting parking where visitors can stay without a permit for periods ranging from 1 hour to up to 3 hours*

- **Residents should park for free/do not support increase (12%, n=32) / Keep locals parking discount (3%, n=9):** Many respondents felt that residents should get free parking with reasons including that they need to keep their cars near their home, they already pay taxes, and the cars are not creating emissions when stationary. A small number of respondents also commented that the parking discounts for Bath and North East Somerset residents should be kept (n=6).

*It is important to note that parking permit charges cannot be introduced for the purpose, whether primary or secondary, of raising revenue, even if this revenue was intended to be applied to fund projects meeting the purposes set out in The Road Traffic Regulation Act (1984) (RTRA 1984). The proposals are themselves the measure to address risks to pedestrian safety from air pollution and achieve its duty under s122 of the RTRA 1984.*

*Any surplus raised from on street charges must be applied for a purpose specified in section 55(4) of the RTRA 1984 and will be allocated to support the development of sustainable transport schemes in accordance with statutory obligations, such as Safer Routes to Schools.*

*Analysis of current permit data has identified that there is no disproportionate impact from these proposals to those living in more deprived localities compared to those in less deprived localities based on vehicle ownership. The proportion of vehicles impacted by the new permit proposals is consistent across all areas at 2 in 3 (or 69%), with the average additional charge for a more polluting vehicle being a modest £25.*

*All paid for parking in the city is centrally located and the provision of a discount for residents disincentivises the use of more sustainable forms of transport, or active travel, and encourages cars into the city centre.*

*We acknowledge that a parked vehicle doesn't generate emissions, and that in some cases vehicles may not be regularly used, or only used for short local journeys. However, the potential for daily usage of vehicles is present and the proposal allows for a simplified and consistent approach. Analysis undertaken for the Clean Air Zone identified, that 1 out of every 3-car journeys in Bath are made within the city, which equates to over 50,000 car movements on a typical weekday.*

- **Proposed changes will have no impact to air quality (8%, n=21) / Proposals have additional environmental impacts (6%, n=16):** Some respondents felt that the changes will not achieve the overall aims of improving air quality overall either in the city or in a more global sense

*The emissions-based permit proposals aim to improve air quality by encouraging the ownership of less polluting vehicles. Whilst the proposals are a standalone scheme, they are complementary to other schemes aimed at improving air quality; reducing congestion and vehicle intrusion in residential neighbourhoods; which include:*

- *Promoting a major shift to mass transport, walking and cycling, to reduce the use of more polluting vehicles, in accordance with the UK government National Air Quality Strategy*
- *Improving the safety of cyclists and pedestrians through active travel schemes*
- *Introducing the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) in central Bath, to encourage less polluting ways of travelling around the city to specifically address levels of harmful nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) following government directive*
- *Reducing the effect of motor vehicles on neighbourhoods, particularly residential neighbourhoods, aligning with our policy and work on Liveable Neighbourhoods.*

*Whilst there is no direct evidence available to show that these proposals will improve air quality; charging mechanisms are a well understood demand management restraint tool linked to price elasticity.*

*CO2 bands are used as a mechanism to improve air quality by reducing other harmful pollutants from a vehicle's tailpipe. Increased CO2 output from an engine is an indicator of increased combustion of fuel, and therefore other harmful by-products of combustion. It is commonly accepted that the burning of fossil fuels in internal combustion engines result in the production of harmful pollutants at the tailpipe and this is reflected in national policy and the Bath CAZ.*

- **Sundays should remain free (8%, n=22):** Some respondents felt Sundays should remain free with fears that charging would reduce social contact, others mentioned free parking on Sundays allows residents to attend religious services.

*The council provides a limited number of visitors permits (varying by zone) to residents to allow visitors to park close to their homes. This helps to ensure, particularly amongst residents that are vulnerable or living alone, that they can receive guests.*

*On street pay and display parking on Sundays was historically free of charge in Bath as no Park & Ride service operated on this day due to shops being shut. Now that the Park & Ride service operates 7 days a week, this proposal aligns the on-street charges to those of the Council's car parks to ensure that the cost of parking does not undermine the use of more sustainable alternatives such as the Park & Ride. This will ensure an increased availability of spaces for local residents and short stays, complementing other schemes to reutilise road space such as those implemented under the Council's liveable neighbourhoods' strategy.*

*Charges will only apply during the operational hours of the Park & Ride services.*

*The introduction of Sunday charging ensures that all religious groups are treated equally with payment required for parking in pay and display bays during operational hours.*

- **Will be harder for residents to park near their houses (12%, n=32):** There were also fears residents will not be able to park near their houses with some concerned that their access could be blocked entirely

*Resident permits are restricted to 2 per eligible property in all zones except for Bath central and Peasedown St John (which are restricted to 1 permit). Higher charges continue to apply to 2nd permits as a disincentive to purchase.*

*Furthermore, residents living in central areas where on street pay and display parking is available may find it easier to find a parking place as motorists who previously took advantage of the free all-day parking seek alternative options elsewhere.*

- **Will harm local businesses (7%, n=20):** There were fears the increase in parking fees could harm local businesses

*Limiting the availability of on street parking for long stay guests, where vehicles typically remain parked for long periods during the visitors stay, ensures a higher turnover of the limited parking availability in the central areas.*



*Charging mechanisms are a well understood demand management restraint tool linked to price elasticity, with evidence clearly shows that removing parking management and providing free parking is likely to reduce the availability of spaces and turnover and reduce the number of people able to visit and shop. This has a detrimental impact on the economy overall. Therefore, the regular review of parking charges and increases at least in line with inflation is means to stimulate turnover of spaces in high demand areas. National data sets show pedestrians and cyclists have higher spend on High Streets generally. For example, the Living Streets Analysis shows that people who arrive on foot to a High Street can spend x6 more than those who arrive by car -*

*<https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/3890/pedestrian-pound-2018.pdf>*

- **Support changes to hotel parking (6%, n=15):** Respondents commented that moving hotel parking to off-street carparks would help alleviate some of the parking issues, others also noted an increase in Airbnb's also adding to the number of cars on the road. Respondents also felt that digitising hotel parking could make it difficult to police.

However, some hotel owners **Do not support changes to hotel parking (3%, n=8)** feeling the new regulations could threaten their business and cause an increase in pollution if their residents choose to use taxis to travel from the car parks.

*Owners and managers of hospitality accommodation whose property is registered for business rates will be able to utilise the new electronic system and activate off street parking on behalf of their guests in periods of multiples of 24 hours running from midday to midday. The permit account holder will be charged by the council at the equivalent daily car park rate.*

*Limiting the availability of on street parking for long stay guests, where vehicles typically remain parked for long periods during the visitors stay, ensures a higher turnover of the limited parking availability in the central areas it also encourages them to travel by non-car modes including by train.*

*The current hotel parking permit terms and conditions require permit holders to charge no more than the pro rata daily amount to their guests for the use of the permit. This is typically between £0.20 and £0.50 per day depending on the number held. However, we are aware of significant abuse of this permit with permit holders charging rates of between £10-12 per day.*

*The low cost of pro rata charges for Hotel permits, between £0.20 and £0.50 per day depending on the number held, is significantly below the charges for city centre long stay parking and disincentivises visitors from using more sustainable forms of transport to visit Bath.*

*The council acknowledges that the hospitality sector, like so many sectors in the UK, has been affected by the COVID pandemic since March 2020. Government schemes have been available to support business impacted by the pandemic restrictions at a national level. It's not reasonable or fair for the council to provide subsidised parking and an economic advantage to*

*businesses with more desirable tourist locations close to popular tourist attractions in the centre of Bath, whether this makes it more convenient for, or the business more desirable to guests.*

- **Other comments** Some comments were made less frequently but nonetheless caused concern for respondents to the survey. Below is a list of comments that were given less frequently than those above. Note that some comments are not exclusive so may overlap with comments above:

- Proposals are a tax or money-making scheme (12%, n=31)

*Parking permit charges cannot be introduced for the purpose, whether primary or secondary, of raising revenue, even if this revenue was intended to be applied to fund projects meeting the purposes set out in The Road Traffic Regulation Act (1984) (RTRA 1984). The proposals are themselves the measure to address risks to pedestrian safety from air pollution and achieve its duty under s122 of the RTRA 1984.*

*Any surplus raised from on street charges must be applied for a purpose specified in section 55(4) of the RTRA 1984 and will be allocated to support the development of sustainable transport schemes in accordance with statutory obligations, such as Safer Routes to Schools.*

- Proposals will move issues to alternate sites (4%, n=11)

*Central Government released their “Bus Back Better” Strategy <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bus-back-better> . This national strategy sets out the vision and opportunity to deliver better bus services for passengers across England, through ambitious and far-reaching reform of how services are planned and delivered.*

*Work is underway at the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) to deliver the requirements of the strategy to ensure the West of England has the best possible public transport network that is both efficient and affordable. Accessibility remains a key consideration including the commitment to the requirements of the Public Service Vehicles Accessibility Regulations 2000 to ensure that all our buses are accessible. II. As part of the strategy we were required, as part of WECA, to produce a Bus Service Improvement Plan and submit it to Govt by 31 October 2021 as a bid for a share of £3bn Transformation Funding to provide ongoing support to the bus network during recovery and to improve the service offer.*

*B&NES continues to support what are classed as socially necessary bus services by approximately £1.4m per annum through a mixture of funding sources including revenue funding and section 106 money, paid via levy to the West of England Combined Authority who are the Local Transport Authority since the powers transferred in 2018. The council continues to attempt to identify additional funding mechanisms to support services further, but this can be challenging in light of other budget pressures.*

*Parking at the Park and Ride is free of charge. A range of fares are available for the bus travel into Bath which includes a group return ticket (2 adults with children under 16 free of charge) covering the whole day for less than the cost*

*of two individual tickets, or equivalent four- hour parking stay in the council's off- street car parks. Groups of up to five may also travel on the service, with unlimited travel on other services in the Bath zone, for £9, a 50% saving than the cost 5 individual tickets.*

*The council has ambitions, subject to relevant approvals, to operate later park and ride services and overnight parking at its park and ride sites to facilitate long stay visitor parking outside the city centre.*

- Will make life hard for multi car households (4%, n=10)

*Resident permits are restricted to 2 per eligible property in all zones except for Bath central and Peasedown St John (which are restricted to 1 permit). Higher charges continue to apply to 2nd permits as a disincentive to purchase.*

*The new scheme will still allow residents to manage and swap vehicles on their permit where they have pre-registered at the time of purchase. Four can be registered when the permit is purchased, with the charge based on the most polluting.*

- Visitor passes should be cheaper / more available (7%, n=19)

*Visitor permits are purchased in advance by residents and remain valid for 12 months from the date of purchase. This expiry is an important control to ensure that high number of visitor permits cannot be accrued which may lead to an accumulation of permits and a subsequent pressure on available space. Expiring unused permits after 12 months is an effective control to prevent this. Permits may be purchased in small bundles of 100 hours or 10 days (for paper permits) at a time to ensure unused permits are minimised. This bundle size is set at a volume that ensures consistency for both digital and paper types and is based on the lowest charge possible for paper permits where they must be posted to the recipient to ensure no additional handling and postage charges apply.*

*Permit income funds the provision of the resident parking scheme service. This includes the cost of administration, maintenance, and enforcement of parking restrictions across the zones. It must be operated on a cost neutral basis. We, therefore, do not provide refunds in the event resident or visitor parking permits are no longer required or expire after 12 months. A valid parking permit does not represent paid for parking or guarantee a space, it provides authorisation for parking within the terms and conditions of the on-street parking permit service.*

### **Chief Constable**

For information, our stance regarding Events on or affecting the highway is that, should an event taking place within a local authority area (in this case B&NES) require the removal of existing parking restrictions or implementation of restrictions where there currently are none, we would anticipate that to form part of the events' Traffic Management Plan.

We would anticipate that the event organiser would liaise with the highway authority and ourselves to either facilitate a temporary Traffic Regulation Order to cover that requirement or to liaise with the local authority Parking Services, as appropriate. That action would then be reflected in the Event Management Plan / Traffic Management Plan for the event.

### **Parking**

No comment.

### **Ward Members**

#### **Bathavon North:**

Cllr Kevin Guy – No comment.

Cllr Sarah Warren – I note the comments set out and recommend moving to implementation.

#### **Bathavon South:**

Cllr Neil Butters – No comment.

Cllr Matt McCabe – No comment.

#### **Bathwick:**

Cllr Manda Rigby – No comment.

Cllr Dr Kumar – No comment.

#### **Chew Valley:**

Cllr Vic Pritchard – No comment.

Cllr Karren Warrington – No comment.

#### **Clutton & Farmborough:**

Cllr Sally Davis – No comment.

#### **Combe Down:**

Cllr Gerry Curran – No comment.

Cllr Bharat Ramji Nathoo Pankhania – No comment.

#### **High Littleton:**

Cllr Ryan Wills – No comment.

**Keynsham East:**

Cllr Hal Macfie – No comment.

Cllr Andy Wait – No comment.

**Keynsham North:**

Cllr Vic Clarke – No comment.

Cllr Brian Simmons – No comment.

**Keynsham South:**

Cllr Alan Hale – No comment.

Cllr Lisa O'Brien – No comment.

**Kingsmead:**

Cllr Sue Craig – No comment.

Cllr Andrew Furse – No comment.

**Lambridge:**

Cllr Rob Appleyard – No comment.

Cllr Joanna Wright – No comment.

**Lansdown:**

Cllr Mark Elliott – No comment.

Cllr Lucy Hodge – No comment.

**Mendip:**

Cllr David Wood – No comment.

**Midsomer Norton North:**

Cllr Michael Evans – No comment.

Cllr Shaun Hughes – No comment.

**Midsomer Norton Redfield:**

Cllr Paul Myers – No comment.

Cllr Chris Watt – No comment.

**Moorlands:**

Cllr Jess David – No comment.

**Newbridge:**

Cllr Michelle O’Doherty – No comment.

Cllr Mark Roper – No comment.

**Odd Down:**

Cllr Steve Hedges – No comment.

Cllr Joel Hirst – No comment.

**Oldfield Park:**

Cllr Shaun Stephenson-McGall – I am supportive of all the changes outlined in the report apart from the following:

Appendix D – Hotel Permits

Independent guest house within Bath at the unique nature of the hospitably offer within the WHS and these measures will impact negatively on the viability of this important business sector within the city. There is a material difference between the concern over the availability of on-street parking and the impact of hotel permits in the city centre than elsewhere in the suburbs like Oldfield Park Ward where there is no conflict over availability of on-street parking in the existing RPZ 05, for example, along Upper Oldfield Park.

The Council needs to work with the Independent B&B sector to find an agreeable solution to parking but if all of the independent B&Bs disappear and become AirBnBs / party houses, which tend to entertain larger younger groups. the city will be worse off economically, culturally and may increase low level anti-social behaviour such as noise and waste / litter.

No changes to the existing scheme should be implemented until a workable and agreeable solution can be found with the independent B&Bs within the city.

**Paulton:**

Cllr Liz Hardman – No comment.

Cllr Grant Johnson – No comment.

**Peasedown St John:**

Cllr Sarah Bevan – No comment.

Cllr Karen Walker – No comment.

**Publow with Whitchurch:**

Cllr Paul May – No comment.

**Radstock:**

Cllr Chris Dando – No comment.

Cllr Bruce Shearn – No comment.

**Saltford:**

Cllr Duncan Hounsell – No comment.

Cllr Alastair Singleton – No comment.

**Southdown:**

Cllr Paul Crossley – No comment.

Cllr Dine Romero – No comment.

**Timsbury:**

Cllr Douglas Deacon – No comment.

**Twerton:**

Cllr Tim Ball – I agree with Sarah on this one.

Cllr Sarah Moore – I understand that Blue Badge Holders will no longer be able to park in these bays if they are not residents. This will mean a number of BANES residents not being able to visit shops, doctors or dentists if they are within the zone.

Other than bringing our guidance in line with other UK cities, please can you provide the rationale for this decision as, although only affecting a smaller number of our residents, I do not agree with the removal of this allowance.

*Response: These proposals do not set out to make any changes to the use of parking places by Blue Badge holders.*

*The only changes affecting blue badge holders within these proposals is to remove the ability for a number of exemptions that apply to non-Blue Badge holders allowing them to use Blue Badge bays – for example, currently a blue badge bay can be used by scaffold trucks or any vehicle where loading and*

*unloading is taking place. The proposals remove this and therefore help to ensure the bays remain free for blue badge holders.*

**Walcot:**

Cllr Tom Davies – I support Richard

Cllr Richard Samuel – I note the comments set out and recommend moving to implementation

**Westfield:**

Cllr Dr Eleanor Jackson – We have just received an email about reductions in the service. The 178 Radstock to Bristol, which winds round the villages between Paulton and Keynsham is going, and this most unfortunate, although it rarely ran on time because of the ‘tractor factor’, getting stuck behind a tractor for miles, or an ancient cyclist. The service to the RUH is highly erratic, too, and there is no Real Time timetable at the RUH either.

Cllr Robin Moss – No comment.

**Westmorelands:**

Cllr June Player – No comment.

Cllr Colin Blackburn – No comment.

**Weston:**

Cllr Shelley Bromley – Whilst supporting these measures (as evidenced in my comment in the comments for ward members section), it is worth noting that there has more recently been a deterioration in mass transit provision (buses) due to the shortage of bus drivers and this may well be commented on by bus users.

Despite frequency of buses being reduced, as First said “to ensure buses run on time”, this isn’t the experience of bus users generally, especially in the evening, when a bus quite often doesn’t appear and by the time someone has waited for the next one, they could have been waiting over half an hour.

I’m commenting on this as someone who frequently uses the No 4 and 4a from the Centre to Weston and have also listened to comments from other passengers.

Anyway, I think this is worth noting as a more recent development.

Many thanks to all involved in running the consultation and analysing the data and producing the report.

Cllr Ruth Malloy – No comment.



**Widcombe & Lyncombe:**

Cllr Winston Duguid – “I need to pass on the concern of some of our residents. Those that have written to me number nurses, teachers and pensioners, who want to play their part in NO2 reduction and Net Zero by 2030. They want to purchase non premium charged cars when they can but feel it is not equitable that they are being hit when residents with driveways and garages are not. They point out that cars do not pollute when they are parked- they pollute when they are driven. They want to make one transition from what they have now to a non-fossil fuel car, but currently the charging infrastructure is not there to support their transition nor the skilled electric mechanics; the second hand car market is up an average of 25% in the last year; and there is no national scrappage scheme in place to make the transition affordable on their budgets. This is at a time when bus frequency is declining and they can't do their work, including child care, by Active Travel. They believe this is not the right time to introduce the premium for higher polluting vehicles, and that they are being unfairly targeted at this time.”

Cllr Alison Born – No comment.

**Cabinet Member for Transport:**

Cllr Manda Rigby – No comment.

**8. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Traffic Regulation Order is sealed.



Signature:

Date: 8<sup>th</sup> December 2021

Paul Garrod  
Traffic Management & Network Manager

**Appendix A - Parking Charges per Length of Stay for Paid For Parking Places (Standard Rate):**

Valid from:	TRO implementation date					
Valid to:	31 <sup>st</sup> December 2022					
	<b>Parking Charge per length of stay</b>					
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>

Street	Tariff band	30 mins	1 hr	1hr 30 mins	2 hrs	3 hrs	4 hrs
Alexandra Park	Park	-	-	-	£1.20	£3.30	-
Alfred Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	£4.80	-	-
Avon Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Bennett Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	£4.80	-	-
Brock Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	£4.80	£5.90	-
Caroline Place	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Catherine Place	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Chapel Row	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Corn Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Gay Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	£4.80	£5.90	-
Gloucester Road	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Grand Parade	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Great Pulteney Street	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Green Park	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Grove Street	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Guinea Lane	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Henrietta Road	1	-	-	-	£3.70	-	£5.90
Henrietta Street	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Henry Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
James Street West	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Julian Road	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Kingsmead	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Lansdown Road	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Laura Place	3	£1.90	£3.90	-	£5.60	-	-
Marlborough Lane	1	-	-	-	-	-	£5.90
Milk Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Milsom Street	3	£1.90	£3.90	-	-	-	-

Monmouth Place	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Monmouth Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Old King Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Pulteney Road	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	-	-
Pulteney Road	1	-	-	-	£3.70	-	£5.90
Queens Parade	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	£4.80	-	-
Queens Parade Place	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	£4.80	-	-
Queens Square	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Railway Place	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Rivers Street	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Rivers Street Mews	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Royal Avenue	3	-	-	-	£5.60	-	£9.00
Royal Crescent	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Royal Victoria Park	Park	-	-	-	£1.20	£3.30	£4.40
Russell Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	£4.80	-	-
Somerset Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
South Parade	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
St James Parade	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Trim Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Upper Church Street	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Walcot Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	£4.80	-	-
Walcot Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
Westgate Buildings	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-
William Street	1	£1.40	£2.60	-	£3.70	£4.80	-
Wood Street	2	£1.70	£3.50	-	-	-	-

Valid from:	1 <sup>st</sup> January 2023
-------------	------------------------------

Valid to:		31 <sup>st</sup> December 2023					
		<b>Parking Charge per length of stay</b>					
<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Street	Tariff band	30 mins	1 hr	1hr 30 mins	2 hrs	3 hrs	4 hrs
Alexandra Park	Park	-	-	-	£1.40	£3.60	-
Alfred Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	£5.10	-	-
Avon Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Bennett Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	£5.10	-	-
Brock Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	£5.10	£6.20	-
Caroline Place	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Catherine Place	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Chapel Row	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Corn Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Gay Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	£5.10	£6.20	-
Gloucester Road	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Grand Parade	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Great Pulteney Street	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Green Park	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Grove Street	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Guinea Lane	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Henrietta Road	1	-	-	-	£3.90	-	£6.30
Henrietta Street	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Henry Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
James Street West	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Julian Road	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Kingsmead	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Lansdown Road	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Laura Place	3	£2.00	£4.00	-	£5.80	-	-
Marlborough Lane	1	-	-	-	-	-	£6.30
Milk Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Milsom Street	3	£2.00	£4.00	-	-	-	-
Monmouth Place	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Monmouth Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Old King Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Pulteney Road	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	-	-
Pulteney Road	1	-	-	-	£3.90	-	£6.30

Queens Parade	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	£5.10	-	-
Queens Parade Place	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	£5.10	-	-
Queens Square	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Railway Place	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Rivers Street	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Rivers Street Mews	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Royal Avenue	3	-	-	-	£5.80	-	£9.40
Royal Crescent	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Royal Victoria Park	Park	-	-	-	£1.40	£3.60	£4.80
Russell Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	£5.10	-	-
Somerset Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
South Parade	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
St James Parade	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Trim Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Upper Church Street	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Walcot Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	£5.10	-	-
Walcot Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
Westgate Buildings	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-
William Street	1	£1.50	£2.70	-	£3.90	£5.10	-
Wood Street	2	£1.80	£3.60	-	-	-	-

Valid from:	1 <sup>st</sup> January 2024						
Valid to:							
		<b>Parking Charge per length of stay</b>					
<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Street	Tariff band	30 mins	1 hr	1hr 30 mins	2 hrs	3 hrs	4 hrs
Alexandra Park	Park	-	-	-	£1.60	£3.90	-
Alfred Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	£5.40	-	-
Avon Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Bennett Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	£5.40	-	-
Brock Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	£5.40	£6.50	-
Caroline Place	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Catherine Place	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Chapel Row	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Corn Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Gay Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	£5.40	£6.50	-
Gloucester Road	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-

Grand Parade	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Great Pulteney Street	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Green Park	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Grove Street	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Guinea Lane	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Henrietta Road	1	-	-	-	£4.10	-	£6.70
Henrietta Street	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Henry Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
James Street West	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Julian Road	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Kingsmead	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Lansdown Road	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Laura Place	3	£2.10	£4.10	-	£6.00	-	-
Marlborough Lane	1	-	-	-	-	-	£6.70
Milk Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Milsom Street	3	£2.10	£4.10	-	-	-	-
Monmouth Place	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Monmouth Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Old King Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Pulteney Road	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	-	-
Pulteney Road	1	-	-	-	£4.10	-	£6.70
Queens Parade	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	£5.40	-	-
Queens Parade Place	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	£5.40	-	-
Queens Square	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Railway Place	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Rivers Street	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Rivers Street Mews	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Royal Avenue	3	-	-	-	£6.00	-	£9.80
Royal Crescent	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Royal Victoria Park	Park	-	-	-	£1.60	£3.90	£5.20
Russell Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	£5.40	-	-
Somerset Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
South Parade	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
St James Parade	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Trim Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Upper Church Street	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-

Walcot Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	£5.40	-	-
Walcot Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
Westgate Buildings	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-
William Street	1	£1.60	£2.80	-	£4.10	£5.40	-
Wood Street	2	£1.90	£3.70	-	-	-	-

### **Appendix B – Residents Permits – Annual Charge:**

Residents Permits – Annual Charge					
		Permit Cost All vehicles except diesel fuelled		Diesel Vehicle Permit Cost	
		1st Permit	2nd Permit	1st Permit	2nd Permit
CO2 emissions (g/km)	0	£50.00	£80.00	£62.50	£100.00
	1-50	£100.00	£160.00	£125.00	£200.00
	51 – 75	£100.00	£160.00	£125.00	£200.00
	76 – 90	£100.00	£160.00	£125.00	£200.00
	91 – 100	£100.00	£160.00	£125.00	£200.00
	101 – 110	£100.00	£160.00	£125.00	£200.00
	111 – 130	£100.00	£160.00	£125.00	£200.00
	131 – 150	£105.00	£168.00	£131.25	£210.00
	151 – 170	£110.00	£176.00	£137.50	£220.00
	171 – 190	£115.00	£184.00	£143.75	£230.00
	191 – 225	£120.00	£192.00	£150.00	£240.00
	226 – 255	£125.00	£200.00	£156.25	£250.00
	Over 255	£130.00	£208.00	£162.50	£260.00
Engine capacity (where no CO2 emissions data is available)	0-1550	£125.00	£200.00	£156.25	£250.00
	1550-1950	£150.00	£240.00	£187.50	£300.00
	1951-2950	£175.00	£280.00	£218.75	£350.00
	Over 2951	£200.00	£320.00	£250.00	£400.00

Permit charge for durations of 3 and 6 months is pro rata the annual charge shown (rounded up to the nearest whole pence)

### **Appendix C – Residents Permits – Monthly Charge:**

Residents Permits – Monthly Charge					
		Permit Cost All vehicles except diesel fuelled		Diesel Vehicle Permit Cost	
		1st Permit	2nd Permit	1st Permit	2nd Permit
CO2 emissions (g/km)	0	£4.79	£7.29	£5.83	£8.95
	1-50	£8.95	£13.95	£11.04	£17.29
	51 – 75	£8.95	£13.95	£11.04	£17.29

	76 – 90	£8.95	£13.95	£11.04	£17.29
	91 – 100	£8.95	£13.95	£11.04	£17.29
	101 – 110	£8.95	£13.95	£11.04	£17.29
	111 – 130	£8.95	£13.95	£11.04	£17.29
	131 – 150	£9.37	£14.62	£11.56	£18.12
	151 – 170	£9.79	£15.29	£12.08	£18.95
	171 – 190	£10.20	£15.95	£12.60	£19.79
	191 – 225	£10.62	£16.62	£13.12	£20.62
	226 – 255	£11.04	£17.29	£13.64	£21.45
	Over 255	£11.45	£17.95	£14.16	£22.29
Engine capacity (where no CO2 emissions data is available)	0-1550	£11.04	£17.29	£13.64	£21.45
	1550-1950	£13.12	£20.62	£16.25	£25.62
	1951-2950	£15.20	£23.95	£18.85	£29.79
	Over 2951	£17.29	£27.29	£21.45	£33.95

This permit charge applies only to permits purchased for a duration of 1 month

#### **Appendix D – Hotel Permits:**

##### Hotel Permits

- a. Only existing premises with a Hotel; Holiday Let; or Guest House permit will be eligible for Hotel permits from the date the TRO is sealed.
- b. Digital Hotel permit accounts are provided free of charge to eligible premises and eligible premises will be charged for each permit use in accordance with the permit terms and conditions.
- c. The use of a hotel permit is defined as the activation of a stay within the digital system for a specific vehicle for a period of up to 24 hours, and multiples thereof, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the permit.
- d. The Hotel Permit is only valid for use by vehicles in the location as specified within the terms and conditions.

#### **Appendix E – Medical and Social Care Permits:**

##### Medical and Social Care Permits

<b>Permit Charge</b>	
Annual	£100.00

#### **Appendix F – Visitor Permits:**

##### Visitor Permits

1. Where eligible, visitor permits are sold in bundles of 10 days/100 hours equivalent:

Digital – 100 hours  
Paper – 10 permits (day)



Paper – 20 permits (half day)

charges valid from:	TRO implementation date	1st Jan 2023	1st Jan 2024
charges valid to:	31st Dec 2022	31st Dec 2023	
Cost of a bundle	£1.50	£1.75	£2.00

### **Appendix G – Trade Permits:**

#### Trade Permits

charges valid from:	TRO implementation date	1st Jan 2023	1st Jan 2024
charges valid to:	31st Dec 2022	31st Dec 2023	
Charge for an inner zone stay (per hour)	£3.50 (£28 per day maximum)	£3.60 (£28 per day maximum)	£3.70 (£28 per day maximum)
Charge for an outer zone stay (per day)	£7.00	£7.50	£8.00

### **Appendix H – Suspension of prohibition of parking:**

#### Suspension of Prohibition of Parking

- (1) A police constable in uniform or any person authorised by the Council may suspend the use of the restriction whenever such a suspension is necessary
- (2) A vehicle must not be in a restricted area unless:
  - (a) Authorised to do so by the Council; or
  - (b) The vehicle is being used for fire brigade, ambulance or police purposes
- (3) A sign indicating that the area is restricted will be placed in or adjacent to the area when any restriction is in force.

### **Appendix I – exceptions which don't apply to the Blue Badge provision:**

xi. The following item is added to Article 12

12. (5) Article 5 (a), (b), (c), (e) and (f) does not apply to paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4).

## **9. DECISION**

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the objections / comments be:

a)	not acceded to and the Order as advertised be sealed.	
b)	acceded to in full and the proposal(s) withdrawn.	
c)	<p>acceded to in part and the following adjustments, being of minor significance; be included in the Order to be sealed.</p> <p><i>specify minor amendment to Order here:</i></p> <p>Removal of Appendix F - Visitor Permit charges.</p> <p>The proposed charges as advertised in this draft order and consultation document in error are removed and the existing charges for visitor permits are to remain in place.</p>	X

In taking this decision, I confirm that due regard has been given to the Council's public sector equality duty, which requires it to consider and think about how its policies or decisions may affect people who are protected under the Equality Act.



Signature:

Date: 09/12/21

Chris Major  
 Director for Place Management