

OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)

4

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS – OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: South East Outer Bath Area TRO Review

PROPOSAL: Various Parking Restrictions

SCHEME REF No: 23-022

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:

Section A	The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Divisional Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility....”
Section 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.
Section D9	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 purposes 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	
(g)	for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of	

3. PROPOSAL

To implement various parking / waiting restrictions around the South East Outer Bath area.

4. BACKGROUND

A number of proposals for: No Parking At Any Time markings, Disabled Parking bays, Zone 9 Permit Holders Only parking, Dual Use Zone 9 Permit Holders and 2 Hours Limited Waiting, Zone 21 Permit Holder Only parking, Zone 21 boundary extension, No Parking Between Mon – Fri, 7.30am – 9.30am, 2 hour Limited Waiting 8am – 6pm, Bus Stop Clearway, extension of the Zone 3 boundary, Zone 21 dual use Permit Holder and 4 Hour Limited Waiting, Zone 21 dual use Permit Holder and 2 Hour Limited Waiting at various locations around the South East Outer Bath area were submitted to the Council by local residents, Ward Members and the Bath & North East Somerset Councils Traffic Management and Transport Planning Engineers. The reason behind these requests was to improve visibility and access for emergency and refuse vehicles, to allow for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles and to provide limited on-street parking provision. These proposals have all been considered by the area Senior Safety Engineer.

5. SOURCE OF FINANCE

This proposal is being funded by the Area Parking Review code TCJ0009S.

6. INFORMAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT

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

The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO report number 3.

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

The objection / comments received can be seen in Appendix 1 attached to this report and have been summarised below with the technical responses in blue italics underneath each one.

Plan 1 – Claredon Road, Widcombe, Bath (Disabled Parking)

Objections – 2, Support in part – 2, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- Whilst I do not object to a disabled space in principle, I am surprised that a disabled parking space is feasible in this location. The road is narrow at this point measuring approximately 297 cm (or 9ft 9 in) excluding the pavement. If one puts in a standard parking bay similar to those on the rest of Clarendon Road of 138cm (or 4 ft 6in), the size of a modern Mini (wing mirrors in) that only leaves 161cm (5ft 4in) for traffic to pass barely the width of a medium-sized van with its wing mirrors in! The newly re-marked spaces on Widcombe are 11cm wider (4.5in) making it even more narrow if this size of space is installed. I am uncertain if disabled spaces require even wider spaces to allow for passenger exit.
- The proximity to the sharp corner and existing parking used outside Chapel Cottage (who incidentally park on the pavement) will make it difficult for larger vehicles to pass.
- The Crescent and Clarendon Rd are a hot spot for damage to parked vehicles. Hardly a day goes past without damage to vehicles or walls / boundaries this proposal further increases this likelihood in its current form.
- The only way I could see that this would be feasible would be if the space allowed parking on the pavement. However, this does not seem appropriate (or allowed) and I think the proximity of the wall would make it difficult for the disabled driver or passengers to exit.
- The only practical alternative would be to put in a disabled space just round the corner under the willow tree. However, this would result in a loss of a residents parking space in area where there is already significant competition for spaces. I would also query the extent of use planned for this disabled space, presumably intended for visitors / volunteers in the garden. The footfall to the garden is extremely modest so I am not sure this would justify the loss of a space for existing local residents paying for permits.
- I would urge that the Highways department check the feasibility of this proposal before proceeding.
- Furthermore, we do not feel that this bay would be used if it were put in place due to the severe gradient coming down from Widcombe Crescent and the uneven pavements.
- We have also only recently bought permits to park within walking distance to our house, and feel it would not be fair to have this taken away from us.

Support in part main points raised:


- I'm writing as Clerk of Bath Quakers, which own and administer the Friends Burial Ground in Clarendon Road, Widcombe. We are naturally pleased that the Council has agreed that there is a need for a designated parking space for disabled drivers at that end of Clarendon Road. However, the site indicated by the arrow is not in the best place for a driver or passenger with mobility issues, as the steepness and narrowness of the road at that point - opposite

Chapel Cottage - would make it quite difficult, if not dangerous, for such a person to leave their car and get down the slope to the Burial Ground. We suggest that a spot ten yards or so further back down the hill, opposite the door to the Burial Ground, would be a better spot, as it would be flatter, and broader.

- As this is being proposed for Claredon Road which is on a slope and the burial ground is at the bottom of the road may I suggest that the parking space is put around the corner so on the level with the burial ground and it would be closer.

Response: The proposed Disabled Parking Bay on Claredon Road was requested by the Quaker Burial Ground Steward and supported by the Bath & North East Somerset Council's Parking Services Team. Due to the concerns raised above regarding the gradient and width of the highway in this location, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed Disabled Parking Bay is relocated to a new location at the bottom of the slope around the corner as indicated on the plan below. The carriageway width in this location is 5.7 metres which is sufficient to allow a vehicle to park off the footway and not cause an obstruction to the free flow of traffic on the highway. Vehicles currently park further along Claredon Road with the same highway width.

Plan 1 – Claredon Road, Widcombe, Bath - Amended proposal plan:



Plan 4 – Beechen Cliff Road, Lyncombe, Bath (No Parking At Any Time)

Objections – 3, Support in part – 2, Support – 1,

Objections main points raised:

- We wish to object to the proposal, on the grounds that as residents of one of the four houses down the alleyway opposite, we are dependent on these few remaining on-street spaces to park within a reasonable distance of our home. Placing yellow lines here would lead to the loss of much needed and greatly used parking spaces, potentially causing great inconvenience to the affected households on a regular basis.
- While we of course recognise the importance of safe access to all properties, it is important to balance this consideration with the needs of residents of Beechen Cliff Road who are reliant on on-street parking and who have no choice but to park on Beechen Cliff Road.
- This would be the sixth occasion in the past 9 years that the council have added new double yellow lines on Beechen Cliff Road where previously there were none. I do not feel that the needs of residents who need on-street parking have been taken into account.
- Should any more of the few remaining spaces on Beechen Cliff Road be lost, this could mean that the residents of houses down the alleyway would then need to walk at least 100 metres up the hill to Chaucer Road to get to their car. We do not feel this is fair or reasonable, as more than enough yellow lines have been added on the road already. Instead, we support the idea of identifying and creating permanent parking spaces on Beechen Cliff Road at suitable locations, so that those who need to park on the street can do so safely within a reasonable distance of their own homes.
- If implemented, this order would cause the loss of two or more zone 18 residents' parking places.
- The parking places that would be lost are for the use of those residents who do not have their own off-street parking and consequently have paid for residents' parking permits. We object strongly to the proposal that parking places should be discontinued just because they might cause occasional inconvenience to people who do have their own off-street parking.

Support in part main points raised:

- We hope that you will reject this application as it is currently shown on the map. However, we would not object if the map were amended so that it was clear that it referred only to the introduction of 2.1 metres of new double yellow lines opposite Stanley House, outside Sunnymount and measured from the end of Sunnymount's drive.
- Regrettably on 26/11/21 when the last changes were made to lining on Beechen Cliff Road, the linesmen put lines in that had not been approved under the 2021 TRO on both sides of the Sunnymount driveway. The Double Yellow Lines to the city side of Sunnymount were subsequently blacked out, but the single line extension on the other side of Sunnymount was not. There

was no TRO in 2022, so this year's TRO is the first opportunity to correct the lining.

- When I was councillor up until May 2023, I had extensive discussions with individual residents. There is inherent tension on what is an eighteenth-century lane between those with garages and driveways, who want to be able to get in and out, and those without garages and driveways who want to park as near to their homes as possible for valid reasons that include child provision, medical needs and having for job purposes to transport regularly boxes/equipment in and out of their cars.
- There is no plan detail on the website that I can see, but if the detail is as I requested after those discussions then I support the proposal as a compromise acceptable to most on the road which takes account of those, less stark now since the RPZ, competing needs:-
 - 1) the city side of Sunnymount's drive DYs to go no further than **2.1 metres** from the end of the Double Yellow Lines that was in situ until 26/11/21. A car parked in the Stanley House garage, with some manoeuvring, will be able to get out of the garage, provided these dimensions are kept to.
 - 2) The single yellow line extension that was wrongly lined on the other side of Sunnymount's drive is taken back to the end of the next slab. If 1) is achieved, then a car parked on the driveway of Sunnymount will have a considerably greater turning circle on the right-hand side of their drive. By extending the line on 26/11/21 regrettably a much-needed parking space between Sunny mount and Tongaat has been removed for all but the smallest of cars, this loss of parking was never the intention of any discussion.
 - 3) Clearly at the top of the road Stockland needs more room to get out of their drive on the city side. The parking space outside the length of road between Stockland and the Double Yellow Lines opposite Shirley cottage is not big enough for two cars but has ample room for one car/van. An extension of one kerb stone's length would have no detrimental effect on parking on that part of the road but would allow the users of the Stockland driveway more room to allow safe ingress/egress.
 - 4) AS on other roads in Bath, due to their historical origin, the exact dimensions make all the difference to something that will work and something that will cause problems with the competing needs.

Support main points raised:

- We welcome the proposal to add double yellow lines opposite the garage of Stanley House, Beechen Cliff Road.
- We are the owners of Stanley House and have never been able to use our garage (which has been there for over 50 years) successfully as cars parked opposite block access to it. After several attempts in the past, we gave up and ended up parking on the road. The introduction of the residents parking zone did not improve the situation as cars could still be parked opposite the garage.

We have tried using a “please do not park opposite the garage” sign which no one paid attention to.

- It is now really important to us to be able to access our garage as we would like to be able to buy a small electric car which will need to be charged/parked in the garage. We have not owned a petrol or diesel car for 14 years and now in line with Banes’ Climate Policy, want to go electric. We feel that we need to be able to buy a car now for various reasons, including in case of any emergencies that may arise in the future.
- We are the only house on the whole of Beechen Cliff Road who have off street parking (garage) but who cannot use it because we do not have yellow lines to allow access.
- If the issue with the proposed lines is that people who do not have off-street parking have found it convenient (as it is near to their houses) to park opposite our garage blocking our access can no longer do this, then there is ample parking on Chaucer Road and the surrounding residents parking zone (which does not block anyone’s access) which is very close. In reality, with the addition of the proposed lines, there would still be enough space to park two cars (as there is now), as the previous councillor, Winston Duguid, made sure of this, so it would make no difference to the number of spaces available anyway. Any objections about further reduced parking are incorrect and not valid.
- We are asking for the same consideration offered to our neighbours (the owners of Tresco Cottage and Shirley Cottage), who were both granted yellow lines opposite their garage/driveway, to be extended to us please.

Response: The proposed introduction of 2.1 metres of No Parking At Any Time markings opposite the garage entrance of Stanley House was requested by the previous Ward Member Cllr Winston Duguid to prevent obstruction to this property due to parked vehicles. The proposed restrictions will still retain parking on the southern side of Beechen Cliff Road, west of the garage entrance to Stanley House. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the 2 objections raised the proposed short section of No Parking At Any Time restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised. The minor corrections noted above by the previous Councillor Winston Duguid to match up the markings on-site with the sealed mapping tile will be picked up at the same time by the lining team.

Plan 5 – Summer Lane, Combe Down, Bath (No Parking At Any Time)

Objections – 2, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- The justification for the proposed extension of parking controls is given within the title of the plan which is to “prevent obstruction of the highway by parked vehicles”. It is noted that the proposals have been prepared in response to the

Ward Councillor and not in response to an otherwise understood or quantified highway efficiency problem.

Summer Lane is a two-way single carriageway road with a typical width of circa 5.2-metres and accommodates a mix of informal on-street parking and formal parking bays occurring along its length in this vicinity. In this context, the road essentially operates with a series of informal give-take narrowing's, just as occurs in the location where the extension of parking restrictions are proposed.

Indeed, it is notable that formal on-street parking bays are provided alongside the Combe Down Primary School, some 150 metres east of the proposal scheme, where the kerb-to-kerb width is just 4.5-metres. However, within the immediate vicinity of our client's property (Mayflower), Summer Lane transitions from circa 4.2-metres to 5.5-metres opposite its junction with Byfield Place. The available width and therefore the potential impact on the operational efficiency of the highway alongside my client's property is therefore better than a nearby location where the Authority have implicitly accepted it appropriate to create formal parking areas which have the effect of permanently reducing road width.

By comparison, most of the remainder of Summer Lane, including alongside my client's property, experience temporary and fluctuating parking (and the associated narrowing effect) along its length. Thus, in view that the Authority and indeed the Ward Councillor are not proposing restrictions elsewhere along Summer Lane, where the road conditions could arguably give rise to greater friction to the free-flow of traffic, we contend that parking restrictions in vicinity of Mayflower are unjustified and onerous. Indeed, the Authority must be cognisant that the effect of the proposed parking controls would be to displace existing parking demand in that location. This would have the effect of reducing gaps in on-street parking which currently serve to facilitate the informal give-take operation along the length of Summer Lane, particularly during busier school drop-off/collection times. Consequently, the proposals would therefore worsen the efficiency of the highway in this location.


It is, however, accepted that some betterment could be provided to the operation of the highway around the junction of Summer Lane / Church Lane, but the extent of parking restrictions should be determined by the point on the highway where two opposing vehicles are adequately able to pass. In this regard, and by reference to Manual for Streets, this should be a point where the carriageway measures not more than 4.1-metres. This broadly occurs in line with the eastern edge of Number 70 Church Place, and which would therefore result in the extension of existing parking restrictions by just 3-metres. This is entirely nominal and would have no discernible bearing on the way in which drivers perceive or use the highway. For this reason, the changes would not be value for money and the Authority should, on this basis, cease their proposals in this location.

- I live on Summer Lane and currently park outside my property. I have a young family and it is important that I can park close to my property for obvious family reasons.

- The provision of parking outside my house naturally calms traffic and I am worried that no parking will cause increased driving speeds outside my house.
- The path in front of my property is narrow (1.0 metre) and my front door opens directly onto the public footpath. Not having parking outside causes me concerns over safety to my family as there will no longer be a barrier from moving vehicles. I therefore consider the proposals increase the risk of an accident to my family and therefore the justification for the proposals needs to be supported with appropriate evidence that outweighs this risk.
- The width of Summer Lane is typically 5.2m with parking on one side. Outside my property the width is up to 5.8m. I accept that the top of Summer Lane (where the road narrows to 3.9m) could have restrictions but it only makes sense to me to increase the amount of parking restriction only to where the road becomes 5.2m wide. This change occurs halfway along the road in front of my property.

Response: The proposed extension of the existing No Parking At Any Time restrictions on Summer Lane was requested by the local Ward Member at the request of local residents to prevent obstruction of the highway. Due to the objections raised and noted above it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed extension of the No Parking At Any Time restrictions on the northern side of Summer Lane are reduced by a length of 13 metres as seen on the amended proposal plan below. It is the recommendation of this report however that the proposed extension of the restrictions on the southern side remains as advertised. The amended proposal as shown below should be sealed within this Order and implemented on-site to prevent obstruction of the highway at its narrowest point.

Plan 5 – Summer Lane, Combe Down, Bath – Amended proposal plan



Plan 6 – Greenway Lane, Lyncombe, Bath (Extension of Permit Holder parking)

Objections – 3, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- I am the owner of 101 Greenway Lane and instigated the request of extending the parking bays in front of our property when the zones were first introduced. It went quiet for a long time and I assumed it wasn't being actioned. I would now like to retract the request if possible as it has proven manageable over time with the available spaces and would create a pinch point in the road.
- I should like to raise a concern about the proposed introduction of a further parking space in front of the garage of 101 Greenway Lane. My understanding is that the owners of 101 do not wish this to go ahead and I imagine they will state their reasons for this. My concern is that the current parking restrictions enable cars on our drive to be able to turn safely in and out of the drive on what can be a dangerous and blind corner in both directions (often with vehicles accelerating at high speed up or down the Lane). I suspect that the same is true of my neighbours at 92. Additionally, many larger vehicles such as lorries, delivery vans, ambulances and even larger cars (of which there are many passing in both directions to the Paragon School twice each day) struggle to round the corner/pass parked vehicles safely, frequently pulling onto our drive to park whilst making deliveries, or to ensure the flow of traffic. A further vehicle parked on this corner, especially a larger one, might make passing impossible.
- Manoeuvring in and out of my driveway is already difficult and would be made even more so especially at rush hours.
- Given its close proximity to a blind bend to the west it would create a traffic hazard for drivers approaching from both sides.
- At an already narrow point in the road, it would create a pinch point between the walls at the end of my driveway and the proposed parking bay. Existing damage to the walls of my driveway is proof of the difficulty experienced by drivers at this point especially by those of goods vehicles.

Response: The proposed extension of the Permit Holder Only parking bay on Greenway Lane was requested by a local resident to provide more on-street parking provision near to their property. As this request has now been retracted and due to the concerns regarding obstruction raised by other local residents above, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are abandoned and not sealed within this Order.

Plan 8 – Claverton Down Road, Claverton Down, Bath (No Parking Between Monday – Friday, 7.30am – 9.30am)

Objections – 1, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- I object to the introduction of the suggested no parking restrictions as I believe this will increase the speed of traffic along this section of road and make it more difficult to exit from Paddock Woods.

Response: The proposed No Parking Between Mon – Fri, 7.30am – 9.30am was requested by the local Ward Member to prevent obstruction to the free flow of traffic along Claverton Down Road during the peak morning rush hour period. Currently due to parked vehicles in these locations, which allow only a single lane of traffic to pass, long traffic queues are forming that are having an impact and knock on effect on the surrounding highway network. The main purpose of the highway is for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles. Parking is an obstruction of that right and therefore can only be condoned where it is safe to do so. It is the recommendation of this report that despite the one objection raised above that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.

Plan 13 – Wellsway, Odd Down, Bath (No Parking At Any Time)

Objections – 3, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- There are already no spaces available to park at times because of the big number of residents which live here so these restrictions are going to make it worse.
- For example my landlord didn't put a gate on the path next to his house so the kids can be safe playing but he choose instead to make it easy for everyone to access so we all can be better persons and just think about others not just what suites a single person.
- Parking is already very limited and reducing it further would clearly compound the problem.
- Although the proposal may marginally improve access and visibility for the few residents of the newly built houses at 500-504 it would worsen the parking difficulties for the many residents of the houses that front and park on the main road.
- For many, parking on the main road is the only option. It would be grossly unfair to penalise many residents who have lived in the area for many years in order to benefit the few residents of the new development.
- Rather than marginally improving access and visibility for residents of only 4 houses and creating problems for considerably more, a much better solution would be to introduce traffic calming in the area. Traffic calming would improve road safety for everyone over a bigger area and penalise nobody. It would also improve the safety of children walking to and from St Martin's

Garden Primary School and the adjacent playing fields. With slower moving traffic it would also improve air quality.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Ward Member on behalf of local residents to improve visibility splays when exiting onto the busy Wellsway. The purpose of the highway is for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles. Parking is an obstruction of that right and can therefore only be condoned where it is safe to do so. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that despite the 3 objections raised that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.

Plan 14 – Perrymead, Widcombe, Bath (Zone 21 Permit Holder / 4 Hour Limited Waiting)

Objections – 1, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- This section of Perrymead is barely used for parking since the imposition of restrictions, presumably because the distance makes it impractical for city centre visitors and there are no immediately adjoining residents. I suggest removal of the permit holder designation. If it is necessary to restrict parking to 4-hour limit waiting seems appropriate.

Response: The proposed conversion of the existing dual use Zone 21 Permit Holder / 2 Hour Limited Waiting bay to Zone 21 Permit Holder / 4 Hour Limited Waiting was requested by the local Ward Members to provide longer short term on-street parking provision for visitors of local residents and trades people accessing local properties. As only one objection was received and removing the Permit Holder element would have a detrimental impact on local residents availability to park, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order and implemented on-site as advertised.

Plan 18 – Wellsway, Widcombe, Bath (Dual use Zone 22 Permit Holder / 4 Hour Limited Waiting)

Objections – 3, Support in part – 1, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- There are very few local amenities that people parking here will access. The four-hour zone will become a short term car park for shoppers in the city centre or visitors to Bath rugby as it was before the RPZ was introduced. One of the reasons that the RPZ was put into place was to prevent this sort of parking.
- Local residents will be displaced and either park in other areas of zone 22 or on the unrestricted other side of the road to the inconvenience of local residents.

- Four-hour parking zones are much harder to enforce than resident parking zones.
- (For example, if a car is parked at 8:00 a.m. and not seen by enforcement until 11:00 a.m. it may stay in place for seven hours before a fine is payable. This is a risk some drivers will take rather than risking a fine for a 10-minute stay in a resident parking area)
- I am a resident of Wellsway and I reject the proposal because it is not fair that most of the residents of Wellsway don't have anywhere to park in the favour of the other 4 residents which live in the new built flats.

Support in Part main points raised:

- The Wellsway Bath Residents' Association (WBRA) is broadly in favour of these proposals. Local community groups operating out of St Luke's Church and businesses such as the guesthouse and pub require time-limited casual parking in order to continue to thrive. However, there is concern that a four-hour parking period in the area outlined in Plan 18 will enable people to park for free and walk into town. This would compromise attempts to encourage alternative forms of transport and use of the Park & Ride and creates a two-tier parking regime: residents paying for a permit, visitors parking for free. An alternative solution would be to limit the parking period to 2 hours or to restrict the number of four-hour parking spaces to four. This provides the flexibility and reassurance to residents and businesses in the immediate area without encouraging the detrimental effect of casual non-residential parking.

Response: The proposed conversion of the existing Zone 22 Permit Holder Only parking on the Wellsway to dual use Permit Holder / 4 Hour Limited Waiting was requested by the local Ward Members to provide more on-street short term free parking provision for visitors and trades people accessing local properties. Due to the concerns raised above regarding the length of the Limited Waiting provision and the compromise put forward by the Wellsway Bath Residents Association WBRA. It is the recommendation of this report that the proposed 4-hour Limited Waiting element of these proposals is reduced to 2 hours. This will still retain free on-street parking for short term visitors and trades people requiring access to local properties but prevent vehicles from being left for longer periods, taking up valuable resident parking provision.

Plan 19 – Upper Bloomfield Road, Odd Down, Bath (No Parking At Any Time)

Objections – 2, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- The reason given for the proposal is to prevent obstruction of highway by parked vehicles. However, this is one of the few residential roads in Odd down where, in fact, the road is wide enough for cars to park and for two-way traffic to pass simultaneously.

- The bus stop is at the far end of this restricted area, and buses have no need to wait there for long periods of time, having just come straight from the park and ride stop where drivers are able to stop for breaks or get back to their correct timings.
- If there are concerns that a large vehicle parked opposite the bus stop could temporarily prevent the passage of traffic or emergency vehicles, then a small section opposite the bus stop could be made into a restricted parking zone, with plenty of space for parking 3 or 4 cars nearer Oolite road.
- The mobile library van also uses this place and many older people rely on it for library access. There are very few other safe places the van could stop nearby.
- I was informed by the local councillors that one reason for this proposal was due to complaints about noisy vehicles from the elderly residents of The Green. Leaving a parking zone near to Oolite Road would mean that any noisy vehicles would not be directly outside the residents' houses.
- The map given in the proposal gives a misleading perspective and is not representative of how much space is actually available to pass parked buses.
- My reason for objecting the proposal is a concern that further restricting the parking in this area, next to a busy convenience store, will result in increased dangerous parking further up the road and on the corner of Oolite road, which is a daily occurrence. The current parking restrictions are not adhered to and there is no enforcement, so creating more restrictions is not going to solve the problem.
- There are a few aspects to my objection but in summary there appears to be no particular problem that this part of the proposal seeks to solve yet it is likely to create a number of problems for local residents and visitors.
- Upper Bloomfield Road is fairly wide with good sight-lines and by my observation not particularly busy or fast and it would appear that prohibiting parking along much of that road will have a combination of 3 adverse unintended consequences:
 - [1] displace parking onto less suitable residential streets.
 - [2] increase unlawful parking.
 - [3] without an increase in resource for parking enforcement this element of the proposal will not have the desired effect.
 - [4] There is a likelihood that parking on the grass areas of (Upper Bloomfield Road, Odins Road and Wansdyke Road) will increase - it is rare now - which will degrade the valuable greenspace in the local area and increase the need for resources for enforcement.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions on the eastern side of Upper Bloomfield Road was requested by the local Ward Member to prevent obstruction of the highway. The purpose of the highway is for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles. Parking is an obstruction of that right and can therefore only

be condoned where it is safe to do so. As we only received 2 objections to these proposals and they have the support of the local Ward Member, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 20 – Clarks Way, Odd Down, Bath (No Parking At Any Time)

Objections – 5, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- 4 housemates and I are residents on this road - we are University of Bath students and all of us have cars. When choosing a place to live, we settled on Clark's Way because it was further out from town and as such a cheaper option for us to rent. With it being further out, we have less reliable bus routes and as such all have cars now to transport to and from university.
- We have renewed the tenancy for the next academic year also, on the basis that we have accessible transport to and from university. With the proposed changes to parking regulations on Clark's Way, we will have nowhere to keep our cars and as such no way of getting to and from campus. In addition, I personally have a disability and a blue badge to prove this. It's for this reason even more so that I need to have somewhere to keep my car so that I can get around accessibly. Equally, we all have part-time jobs in order to support our studies which require us to drive to and from - if we have no place for our cars, we have to consider the financial impact of losing work.
- We urge you to reconsider your proposal - we know that many other households on our road are students who rely on street parking too, and this change will significantly impact not only the accessibility of travel for all but also the safety of the road we live on.
- The no parking should be adjacent to the houses on Clark's Way and not the nursing home. Also, with cars parked all along Clark's Way adjacent to the houses turning onto Clark's Way from Orchid Drive will be unsafe with reduced visibility.
- I would also like to make it aware that with a significant area of possible parking spaces being removed, this would create a safety hazard within our area as it would result in dangerous parking and a lack of space for cars to fit safely on the roads.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions on the northern side of Clarks Way was requested by the local Ward Member to prevent obstruction of the highway. Due to the objections raised above regarding the impact on local residents and disability groups, due to off street parking provision in this area being limited, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed length of these restrictions are re-assessed and the current proposals not implemented at this time and are removed from this Order.

Plan 22 – Bloomfield Drive, Odd Down, Bath (No Parking At Any Time)

Objections – 1, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- This would mean that we, at this end of the street, would lose 3 valuable spaces.
- If this is being proposed because of people parking on the double yellows during school pick up time, then this proposal would not solve any issues here. Parents already park on the double yellows and will continue to do so if the double yellow lines were extended, it's not policed so there's no consequences to them doing so. People will continue to park on the double yellow lines, or it will encourage parents to park in front of the various driveways at this end of the street which will cause further frustration for the residents.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions on the western side of Bloomfield Drive were requested by the local Ward Member to prevent obstruction of the highway for larger vehicles due to parked cars. As we only received one objection to these proposals and most of the properties in this location have off-street parking provision, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 23 – Prior Park Road, Widcombe, Bath (Extension of Zone 3 and Zone 3 Permit Holder Only parking)

Objections – 2, Support in part – 0, Support – 0,

Objections main points raised:

- I object to this proposal as being unnecessary. If there was a problem for residents parking it would be reflected in the use of spaces in Perrymead which is not apparent.
- We currently we fall into zone 21 and your proposal is changing the boundary for us to move from Zone 21 into ZONE 3. Can I ask for this to be reviewed urgently as we do not want our house and therefore our parking options to be moved from zone 21 to zone 3. The reasons for this are as follows. 1. We have been in zone 21 for the last 18 months and this has been very good for the security of my car 2. On regular occasions my car has been damaged either by vandals or by cars coming down Ralph Allen Drive and hitting my car when parked 3. The proposal to move our house to zone 3 would likely restrict our ability to park, we can rarely park in the area that is to be included into Zone 3 now, therefore if this area is full we would be required to park further down Prior park road, there is rarely empty spaces now and therefore the likely ability for me to park will be limited. 4. I have one permit in zone 21 and this has allowed me to park my car in Lyncombe Vale for the last 18 months without vandalism or damage.

Response: The proposed extension of Resident Parking Zone 3 in an easterly direction further along Prior Park Road to its junction with Perrymead and the reallocation of the property know as Welton Lodge from Zone 21 to Zone 3 was requested by the local Ward Members to provide the residents boarding Prior Park Road with more on-street parking provision near to their properties. As 2 objections were received from local residents who would be effected by this change to the Zone boundaries, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed changes are not sealed within this Order and not implemented on-site.

No Objections received to:

- Plan 2 – Wellsway, Odd Down, Bath**
- Plan 3 – Prospect Road / Macaulay Buildings, Widcombe / Lyncombe, Bath**
- Plan 7 – Perrymead, Widcombe / Lyncombe, Bath**
- Plan 9 – Beechwood Road, Combe Down, Bath**
- Plan 10 – Church Street, Widcombe / Lyncombe, Bath**
- Plan 11 – Entry Hill, Widcombe / Lyncombe, Bath**
- Plan 12 – Mulberry Way, Combe Down, Bath**
- Plan 15 – St Lukes Road, Widcombe / Lyncombe, Bath**
- Plan 16 – Summer Lane, Combe Down, Bath**
- Plan 17 – Entry Hill / Wellsway, Widcombe / Lyncombe, Bath**
- Plan 21 – Bloomfield Road, Odd Down, Bath**

As no objections were received to these proposals it is the recommendation of this report that they are sealed as advertised.

8. APPROVED FOR CIRCULATION TO WARD MEMBERS AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS

Please note that this report has been circulated to provide you with an opportunity to consider any comments and/or objections which have been received in response to the public advertisement of the proposal(s), along with the officer response to each.

Any comments which you may have will be added to the report to be considered by the Director for Place Management, Chris Major, prior to his decision regarding the sealing, or otherwise, of this TRO.



Paul Garrod
Traffic Management and Network Manager

Date: 1st December 2023