

OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)

4

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: North East Somerset Area TRO Review

PROPOSAL: Parking Restrictions

SCHEME REF No: 23 – 011

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 section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality) | |
|-----|--|--|

3. PROPOSAL

To implement various parking / waiting restrictions around the North East Somerset area.

4. BACKGROUND

A number of proposals for: No Parking At Any Time restrictions, 1 Hour Limited Waiting between 9am – 5pm, No Loading At Any Time, No Parking Between Mon – Fri, 8am – 9.30am and 2.30pm – 4pm, 30 Minute Limited Waiting, Mon – Sat, between 8am – 6pm at various locations around the North East Somerset area were submitted to the Council by local residents, Ward Members, Parish Councils 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.

5. SOURCE OF FINANCE

This proposal is being funded by the capital Parking budget, project code TC8302.

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 3.

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 and can be seen in Appendix 1.

Plan 3 - Beaufort Avenue, Welton, Midsomer Norton – No Parking At Any Time.

Objections: 3 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- No knowledge of any accidents caused by vehicles parking on the road in the area of the proposed double yellow lines.

- Vehicles parked act as a natural restriction thus preventing speeding up and down this part of Beaufort Avenue.
- No consideration of where vehicles displaced by the proposed double yellow lines will park.
- The proposed markings extend too far into Beaufort Avenue.
- The effect of removing the parking availability in Beaufort Avenue will result in cars moving further down the road and parking in Grace drive.
- The only "large vehicle" that frequents this stretch of road are refuse collectors - once a week. They are in the vicinity during quieter times for a matter of minutes. During the 9 years I have been a resident, I have never witnessed any obstructions preventing the safe manoeuvre of vehicles.
- Dropped kerbs cover 3/4 of the proposed route. Whilst there are mixed reports on the legality of parking on dropped pavements, it is nonetheless an offence. These dropped pavements (like most others) have served as a suitable deterrent for at least the past 9 years.
- No consideration has been given to the disabled or those challenged with mobility restrictions.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions (Double Yellow Lines) were requested by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer at the request of a local resident to prevent obstruction to larger vehicles. However due to the objections raised above and lack of supporting comments from the residents of Beaufort Avenue for this scheme it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site at this time and the proposal is removed from this Order.

Plan 4 – Publow Lane, Pensford – No Parking At Any Time.

Objections: 1 / Support: 1 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- If you put the amount of Double Yellow Lines down as per your proposal it will force more vehicles into the hall car park making it even more difficult for weekend lettings.
- Can the amount be reviewed please. I understand you need to do this from the village hall onwards towards the church, but some parking on the lane between the village green and the hall is fine and actually slows the traffic down from the usual grand prix circuit that is supposed to be a 20mph limit.
- It just needs another short section of Double Yellow Lines to allow for passing without people having to reverse too far. Mid distance between the existing lines outside the hall entrance and the small parking area in front of the Curo properties 6 to 11 on Publow Lane. This is what has been discussed at our

previous parish council meetings. I am a resident of Publow Lane and can assure you this would be better than your current proposal of all the way through on both sides.

Main points of support:

- We TOTALLY AGREE to NON-PARKING all way down Publow Lane, Publow Pensford as purposed in your plans.
- The area is totally agricultural and farm machinery, horse boxes and all the emergency vehicles need to be able to freely access Publow Lane.
- We find that people have no respect parking in Publow Lane and do not care about any farming and rural issues etc and we have longed for and asked for something to be done.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions (Double Yellow Lines) were requested by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer on behalf of the local Ward Member to prevent obstruction to larger vehicles accessing the lane. The purpose of the highway is for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles. There is no legal right to park on the highway and this can only be condoned where it is safe to do so. However due to the objection raised above regarding parking near the village hall, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are reduced in length on the western side and begin at a point in front of the gate to the recreation ground field and then continue as proposed along the length of Publow Lane to prevent obstruction to larger vehicles as the Lane narrows after the Village Hall. It is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions on the eastern side of Publow Lane are to remain as advertised and sealed within the Order.

Plan 6 – St Peter’s Road, Westfield, Midsomer Norton – No Parking At Any Time / No Loading At Any Time.

Objections: 4 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 2

Main points of objection:

- Collection is very stressful, and I absolutely hate it. I could never understand why two schools were built next to each other and limited parking for staff let alone parents.
- With the population getting bigger and school intakes getting bigger, the issue is only going to get worse. Maybe could we look at Fosse way school finishing around 2:30 reducing some for the traffic and getting them to open the gates at the back for the turning circle earlier to get the minibuses out of the estate.
- I don’t know what the answer is but taking parking away is only pushing the problem on to other roads.

- I know funding is extremely tight but long term could we not move one school?
- This road provides a limited yet essential amount of parking space for residents and the local primary school. Westfield Primary School currently has no provided parking for parents and students. There is only street parking on the road adjacent to the school (thirty spaces often taken by staff) and a very small amount at the local recreational field (10-12 spaces). The school has approximately 430 students. The parking that is currently available on St Peters Road has already been reduced via double yellow lines, which proved to be a huge mistake as the parking only became more hectic with residents and parents from the school parking on those lines and sometimes mounting the curb in order to make space for other cars. Creating an 'absolute' no loading area will only add fuel to the fire in my opinion.
- I personally have never had a conflict over parking on St Peter Road, and only seen conflict due to some parking only double yellow, which your proposal will absolutely not stop, it will only cause inconvenience to those who abide by the law and are courteous to others.
- The houses on St Peters Road boast large driveways, great neighbours, and a well-kept local area. But most of all, the residents have the luxury of fantastic access to a fantastic school. I believe they must in turn accept that others would like to use that luxury. Parking rush hours must be expected and accepted when moving directly opposite two schools.
- We have tried the drop off and pick up solution Fosse Way school offer, but this adds a considerable time to our journey.
- St Peters Road is a short distance to walk with a disabled child (recognised by DWP as limited mobility, hence the blue badge) walking further makes her tire easily and she is a danger to herself and others. We have tried to walk down Longfellow Road, cross at the traffic light crossing, walk along the main road to the carpark by the playing fields. This caused considerable distress with the volume of heavy vehicles passing extremely close by.
- In section 9 for the decision, it says it “requires the Council to consider decisions that may affect people protected under the Equality Act”. You do realise that the timings open the council to significant risk of discriminating against the disabled community? I think it is fair to say that Plan 6 does not do this and will greatly affect the most vulnerable people in the area – Westfield Primary pupils and children with significant special educational needs that cannot access mainstream education who attend Fosse Way.
- It is not right to consider such a traffic proposal in order to appease a couple of disgruntled householders, who do not like cars parking near their properties for a short period of time each day during the school term time.
- By all means install no-loading restrictions in the purple lined areas on Plan 6. The entrance needs to be clear coming off the main road and the corners and

cul-de-sacs kept clear. This would keep the cul-de-sac clear by the footpath to Longfellow Road, which I think is the main issue the residents have in this instance. I urge you to address the minority faction, without penalising the majority of parents who are in my experience decent and reasonable people.

- We have suggested that a parking permit zone would help alleviate the pressure from staff and assistants at the school using the road as a car park, however, the yellow lines that are in place at the moment just don't work and have actually made the situation worse. They switch from one side of the road to the other, which might be interpreted as a speed limit restrictor, however it just causes a major headache for the recycling wagons, Bin Lorries, delivery people and the school bus for the disabled children needing transport for school.
- The parking is not policed at school times when most infringements occur, so it seems to be that it is only inspected outside of these hours, at which point the people parking on the road are our carers and school staff.
- Some of the residents have carers attending the properties on St Peters Road and it is not always possible for them to park on the drive if family are visiting at the same time.
- Permits would allow road parking whilst limiting these to householders and their visitors instead of open to the general public. Workmen also have to be able to park without being fearful of tickets. Several of the houses have gardeners which straddle the pavement and are there for a few hours.
- We have two carers at all times for our son who lives at home with us. We try very hard to ensure the staff park outside our house and not impact on the rest of the street, however this is not always possible.

Main points of support in part:

- As a resident of St Peter's Road, Westfield I am writing to express my concern and frustration on the decision to only introduce parking restrictions in half the road. Don't you think the whole road has the same problem! All you will do is force all the traffic into a small narrow cul- de-sac with a small turning area. Please can the proposal be extended to the whole part of St Peter's Road?
- This proposal is going to make the current problem even worse. I totally agree with the proposed restrictions, but they need to be applied to the ENTIRE cul de sac - it's not just the school drop off/pick up times anymore, school staff are parked here all day long.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions and No Loading At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Ward Member on behalf of local residents to improve access along St Peters Road due to parked cars obstructing the free flow of traffic. The purpose of the highway is for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles. There is no legal right to park on the highway and it can

therefore only be condoned where it is safe to do so. It is outside the scope and remit of this Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation to extend the restrictions any further along St Peters Road or to implement a Resident Parking Zone. Both these requests would need to be raised with the local Ward Member and submitted through a new TRO and consultation process. Relocating one of the schools or amending the operating times is again outside the scope and remit of this consultation process. Regarding access for disabled pupils, the Traffic Management Team contacted the Fosseyway and Westfield Primary Schools and we have been advised that all Fosseyway School parents can drop off and collect from within the school grounds, and the school frequently remind parents that they should be dropping off and collecting from their turning circle. The Traffic Management Team also contacted Westfield Primary school but did not receive a response. Double Yellow Lines allow Blue Badge Holders to be able to park for up to 3 hours while displaying their badge and a request for a Disabled Parking Bay on Longfellow Road opposite the school, would be considered if received from the local Ward Member within the next Area TRO Review. Vehicles can also stop on Double Yellow Lines to load and unload (but not where there are double yellow kerb ticks, which represent the No Loading At Any Time restriction). It is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions on St Peter's Road are implemented on-site with one slight amendment. The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions running in front of property number 22 are removed, extending from a point in line with the dropped kerb at the entrance to number 22 in a westerly direction to a point in line with the dropped kerb of property number 23. This will retain 3 on-street parking spaces for local residents, visitors, trades people and carers to use when required. It is the recommendation of this report that the rest of the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order as they were requested by the local Ward Member on behalf of local residents.

Plan 7 – Weeksley Lane / North Road, Camerton – No Parking At Any Time.

Objections: 1 / Support: 3 / Support in Part: 1

Main points of objection:

- Again, you are turning a blind eye to the real problem with traffic through Meadgate Camerton. Although you have put 20 miles speed signs through the village traffic still speed at 50/60 miles an hour and overtake coming down Tunley hill. There have already been many accidents through the village, all down to speed, someone will get killed one day for sure. I think the build outs on Red Hill work very well, why can't the same be done on Tunley Hill and the beginning of the village. Please do something before there is a real bad accident through Meadgate, the no parking zones you are proposing will not make a difference at all, total waste of money.

Main points of Support:

- The need for the restriction was identified by members of Camerton PC, specifically vehicles stopping just after the bend.

- With reference to the proposal to introduce no parking at Weekesley Lane/North Road Camerton REF Traffic Proposal 23-011 this measure is fully supported.
- I am writing to say how pleased we are that double yellow lines are to be considered at Meadgate. Over the last few years, we have seen more and more near misses and accidents on this dangerous corner. Unfortunately, people seem to think that it is safe to park on this bend, not only risking damage to their cars but also to the residents who are trying to exit their driveways.
- There are 7 driveways which exit on to this bend and most of us are unable to see anything coming around the corner. We had hoped that the new 20mph limit would help to slow the ever- increasing traffic on this road- sadly it has not. Although I am sure that many people will still park on double yellow lines, it is certainly a step in the right direction.

Main points of Support in Part:

- Whilst I support the aim of the local proposal here, I do believe most strongly that a proposed 'No Parking at Any Time Restriction' on the road shown as North Road, outside my property is not necessary because of the physical road shape on the inside of the bend. I fully support that the restriction should apply on Meadgate and Weekesley Lane. These areas are where casual and intermittent parking can severely impair vision of the junction for motorists and is a road safety issue. The introduction of physical measures such as road markings and signage on the road outside my property and within the Parish of Timsbury are an unnecessary expenditure at the time of severe financial constraint. I would like to see the proposal amended to remove the No Parking at Any Time variation and highway restriction along North Road up to the Timsbury/ Camerton parish boundary line.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were request by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer on behalf of local residents and the Parish Council to improve visibility splays and obstruction caused by parked vehicles near and around the junction. The request for buildouts falls outside the scope and remit of this Traffic Regulation Order and would need to be discussed with the local Ward Members and Parish Council by residents and a formal request raised and scored within the Transport Improvement Program for possible future funding. As we received only 1 objection to these proposals and 3 comments of support and 1 in part, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implement on-site as advertised and sealed within this TRO.

Plan 10 – Loves Lane, Timsbury – No Parking At Any Time.

Objections: 2 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- Greenhill House is currently a Leonard Cheshire home and is closing within a few weeks. This means that until the new owners and their proposals are put through the planning system, which could take many months or years then any changes to the highways are premature.
- We have lived close to Greenhill House for the last 17 years and have never seen or heard of an accident or incident relating to the parked cars.
- By placing a parking restriction at its proposed position the cars that are parked will be forced to park to the west down Loves Hill (a blind brow and bend) where the road narrows considerably, or worse east onto South Road where they will be parking also on a blind bend which will be extremely hazardous to all traffic using Loves Hill / South Road, not just a few cars that use Greenhill House.
- Immediately adjacent to the blind bend and a few years ago a car left the road and struck our house, it did so much damage that it was possible to see through a stone wall 3 feet thick into our living room. We are extremely concerned that forcing cars to park on the bend does could cause a repeat of that accident or any other type of accident.
- This proposal has come from a traffic engineer who has completely missed the wider dangers of the parking restriction.
- The parked cars are not the hazard that is suggested and when they are there serve to slow down the traffic into the village without the need for any further traffic calming measures.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were request by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer to prevent obstruction to the entrances of Greenhill House by parked vehicles to improve visibility splays when entering and exiting the property. Due to the objections raised above regarding the closure of Greenhill House and new planning consent, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not introduced at this time and removed from this Order and any required restrictions on the highway are picked up as part of the planning process for the new development on this site.

Plan 12 – Bailbrook Lane, Batheaston – No Parking At Any Time.

This proposal was removed from the Order at the request of the local Ward Member, with the agreement that an advisory White Keep Clear marking would be introduced on-site in front of the steps in its place.

Plan 13 – Wells Road, Westfield, Midsomer Norton – No Parking Between Mon-Fri, 8am – 9.30am and 2.30pm – 4pm

Objections: 2 / Support: 1 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- Our front gardens were purchased against our will by the council meaning that we do not have room to park off road in our front gardens, the entrance to the rear of our properties is much narrower than other terraces in the area only 2060cm wide and there is a very sharp bend at the back preventing many cars from accessing the rear of the terrace.
- On the A362 at Farrington Gurney the road has a barrier reducing it to a single carriageway in order for residents to park, how can we be treated so differently.
- If you stand for any length of time at the speed indicator by St Peter's Road, you would notice that over 50% of the cars travelling down this stretch of road are breaking the speed limit! the only thing slowing them down are our parked cars!! This is a long wide straight road, and it is a race track for some so unless you propose to have working speed cameras or speed bumps the safety of all pedestrians and motorists is put at risk. Our parked cars are a cheap traffic calming measure.
- I get the feeling that this is being imposed on us just so some parents can get their children to school by car a few minutes quicker.
- Some of my neighbours are elderly and have regular carers, where are they supposed to park, their time is very limited as it is, if they have to walk any distance it would affect their clients time and care.
- There isn't enough parking as it is for the residents of the terrace and without great personal cost and losing garden space (plus a depreciation in property value) it is impossible to create more.
- Where will all those cars go when they can't park there? It will force them into surrounding roads which are already full to the brim and overflowing with cars.
- There are planning applications approved within a one-mile radius in excess of 500 houses with absolutely no road relief which is madness! Most households will have two vehicles so the extra pressure on the local roads these new builds will bring is a scary thought.

Main points of support:

- I am emailing in support of the proposed parking restrictions on the Wells Road, as a resident of Inner Elm Terrace, vehicles park right up to the entrance of our road severely limiting visibility of traffic on the Wells Road, this presents a hazard when trying to pull out onto the main road.

Response: The proposed No Parking Between Mon – Fri, 8am – 9.30am and 2.30pm – 4pm restrictions were requested by the Westfield Parish Council. However due to the objections raised above regarding parking for local residents and increased traffic speeds along the A362, combined with the comments received from the local Ward Member Cllr Eleanor Jackson during the informal consultation of this TRO, requesting that this proposal is removed from the Order due to the limited on-

street parking stock, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented at this time and are removed from the Order.

Plan 16 – Gregory’s Tynning, Paulton – No Parking At Any Time

Objections: 4 / Support: 2 / Support in Part: 1

Main points of objection:

- It will not solve the problem it will just move the problem along the road which will then cause problem with the neighbours.
- Unfortunately, every household now has more than two cars and there's more children that will be driving in the future needing places to park.
- It's unfortunate that only one or two people have complained about the parking causing all this unnecessary upset in the community.
- The proposal will force traffic to park opposite our property causing severe obstruction for traffic coming into the close as well as our drive!!
- This needs to be reviewed because we will be affected considerably by the restriction of parking outside our property. We totally concur with the decision that vehicles should not be parking on immediate access to junctions and corners, but our concern is if this goes ahead, we will be affected more than anyone.
- Proceeding with no parking markings on the road will only encourage the vehicles to park elsewhere. This potentially being further around the corner of the grassed area, which has not proposed no parking markings by the council.
- If the proposed markings go ahead, and vehicles park elsewhere in the cul-de-sac how will an ambulance be able to access properties.
- Therefore, I ask you to reconsider the proposal or make additional changes so that the vehicles can park safely and to pass safely to gain access to properties and to ensure that our concerns are taken into consideration when highlighting to you that there are a number of residences that are clearly vulnerable that need access to their properties and certain services such as adapted taxi's, and emergency services.

Main points of support:

- Thank you for deciding to put Double Yellow Lines down on Gregory’s Tynning. At least now ambulances can get through to house. You omitted the corner as you come up the hill shown in photos. Can you please consider here too.
- We strongly support the introduction of No Parking At Any Time at the junction of Gregory’s Tynning and Britten’s Hill, Paulton. We live on Gregory’s Tynning,

and the introduction of these highway restrictions will enhance visibility for both drivers and pedestrians.

- We hope that the proposed restrictions will continue to the same point as the current single white line. There are dropped pavements on both sides of the road, and it is important that these sections of the road are not obscured or blocked by parked vehicles as this would make it hazardous to cross from one side of Gregory's Tynning to the other.

Main points of support in Part:

- I have no objection to the lines being on the corners and what looks like on the map down to my drive on the side of the road next to my property. It looks like the line proposed on the opposite side (around the grass verge) stops slightly shorter than the one around my house however I just wanted to check it does not come all the way down to the start of my drive. This would leave one space of kerb directly opposite my drive which would cause significant anxiety as people would no doubt take advantage of this one space. Lack of parking in this area sees people parking on the corners particularly at the weekends which I agree needs to stop.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the local Ward Members at the request of local residents to prevent obstruction and to improve visibility splays at the junctions. Vehicles should not park around junctions obstructing sight lines. The purpose of the highway is for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles. There is no legal right to park on the highway and it can only be condoned where it is safe to do so. As these restrictions were requested by and have the support of the local Ward Members it is the recommendation of this report that they are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order with the one slight amendment of extending the proposed restrictions on the western side opposite property number 2 by 5 metres in a northerly direction to prevent obstruction to the driveway access.

Plan 18 – Lansdown Crescent, Timsbury – No Parking At Any Time

Objections: 1 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- The bend is never used for parking.
- If the side is not available to park the front of house number 34 needs to be used to charge an electric vehicle.
- Emergency vehicles can still easily pass through, if need be, no obstruction is caused.
- Number 30 park their vehicle quite often on the other side; however, this doesn't seem to be a problem with the complainant, I have drawn this out on

the map and posted a picture as evidence. Proving that an emergency vehicle can still pass through.

- We have had regular complaints to the police and Curo in regard to this. The police have reiterated that there should be no reason why we cannot park at the front of our house, Curo have also said the same.
- The complaint is a territorial issue, this is not a reason to inhibit use of highway parking, we all share the same issue up and down the entire street and a common scenario on many roads.
- If this is to go ahead on the false premise of obstruction then the line I have also drawn, which is used daily will also need to have the yellow lines.
- I propose that the double yellows only be used on the corner. And not 10ft in front of the house. As I have mentioned there is no obstruction to other vehicles getting passed. Vans and delivery trucks have managed quite fine.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to prevent obstruction to the free passage of vehicles on the highway around the junction on Lansdown Crescent. As we only received one objection and these restrictions which are being proposed on safety grounds, it is the recommendation of this report that they are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within the Order.

Plan 19 – A37 Bristol Road, Whitchurch – No Parking At Any Time / 1 Hour Limited Waiting 9am – 5pm

Objections: 1 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- I am writing to object to the plans to restrict parking in the layby outside my house on Hursley Hill. These restrictions would impact greatly and reduce parking options for all the residents and any visitors or tradespeople who need to work on these houses. There are no parking options nearby for alternative options.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions running in front of property entrances and the 1 Hour Limited Waiting restriction operating 9am – 5pm, 7 days a week was requested by the local Ward Member. As all the properties in this location have large off-street parking capacity for visitors and trades people, the 1-Hour Limited Waiting provision within the parking bay on the A37 was requested to prevent all day commuter parking while still allowing this area to be used as a pull in rest stop for short periods and allow customers of the commercial garage on the opposite side of the A37 to be able to park. As this proposal only received one objection and was requested by 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 21 – Northend, Batheaston – No Parking At Any Time

Objections: 4 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- We have lived on Northend for over 15 years and in that time traffic through the village has got faster and faster and more frequent. The five parking spaces in this location have always acted as a very simple low-cost traffic calming measure.
- The space outside number 26 acts as a deterrent to speeding drivers and given the fact that this village has elderly members, children and out of town walkers visiting Salisbury Hill etc. crossing along from this stretch on a regular basis, it is arguable the risks of removing this space given the traffic calming elements outweighs the benefits of removal.
- The limited spaces along by properties 18-26 that we have currently are an essential resource for elderly / disabled visitors who visit these properties (numbers 20-26) and who can park close to the property or be dropped off to the property by use of these spaces.
- The village of Northend has numerous amenities, a church, school, village hall and mikes meadow etc. The parking space outside number 26 is a valuable resource to the village that's allows the ebb and flow of both residents and visitors to be able to park within walking distance of properties as well as offering convenient and helpful parking options for those visiting the church, school, hall and mikes meadow for example.
- It must also be noted that when the recent resurfacing of the road in Northend was undertaken, an apparent mistake was made with regards to the repainting of the parking bays, where there were originally five bays, this was reduced to four without consultation of the local residents. In fairness with regards to the changes - Double yellow lines were added beyond number 26 where previously people had illegally parked along, when it was a white line. This solved any original 'pinch point' issues that may have ever existed, only last week I witnessed a fire engine came past with relative ease along this stretch making it clear that there was appropriate room for that vehicle. Therefore, in the space of 12 months the local council will have implemented the removal of two whole spaces from a small stretch of 5 spaces.
- MJ Church waste management have recently been carrying out Bin Collections at the School Further down in the village. I have noticed they send out their very largest waste collection vehicle (bigger than the council ones it would seem). And this passes the end space regularly, albeit with care and reduced speed - but with no problems whatsoever.
- The only issue during the last 17 years of living here was a pinch point that was beyond number 26 which did on rare occasions cause concern for the very large building supply trucks that visited developing houses building sites.

That pinch point was removed recently when the road was resurfaced, and the parking bay made shorter. Since that time there have been no issues with vehicles passing through at all. In fact, a fire engine passed by only last week.

- Parking in the village is at a premium for all the residents many of whom have young children.
- Since the increase in prices of parking in Bath we are finding non-residents parking to catch the bus into town for work and thus halving their costs for the day. This has become more and more popular as we have a cost-of-living crisis. The reason this is important is that the majority of the cars that have ended up blocking this road are by people not local to the area. If you feel you must remove this space – at least consider making that space (and that space only) a single yellow line – with no parking between 8-6/ or 8-6 and residents only.

Response: The proposed extension of the existing No Parking At Any Time restrictions on the eastern side of Northend, running in front of property number 26 by a distance of 3 metres was requested by the local Ward Member to prevent obstruction of the highway. The introduction of a Resident Only Parking area sits outside the scope and remit of this TRO consultation. The objections above regarding speeding of vehicles and the fact that parked cars act as a natural traffic calming measure is noted, however the extension of the existing Double Yellow Line restrictions by a distance of 3 metres will still retain 4 to 5 on-street parking spaces for local residents that will help reduce traffic speeds along Northend. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that as the proposal was requested by the local Ward Member to prevent obstruction of the highway to allow for the free flow of vehicles, that the advertised extension of the existing restrictions is implemented on-site and sealed within this Order.

Plan 24 – Northend, Batheaston – No Parking At Any Time

Objections: 1 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- I would like to object to the outlined proposal. It would take away at least 8 parking spaces opposite 50 through to 52a on a stretch of Northend that already has limited parking. Some has already been removed by the new double yellow lines outside numbers 50/50a, this would make it even worse. I could understand some restriction directly opposite the 2 driveways on the map (adjacent to 50a and 50) to help access but not for the whole stretch.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by Officers after a site meeting with local residents to prevent pinch points creating an obstruction of the highway when vehicles park on both sides of Northend. As we only received one objection to these proposals, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are introduced on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 26 – St Julian’s Road, Shoscombe – No Parking At Any Time, Disabled Parking Bay, Taxi Parking Bay, School Keep Clear marking Mon – Fri, 8am – 8pm

Objections: 6 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- Further restricting the parking outside of Shoscombe primary school will only exacerbate already acute issues at school drop off times.
- The existing zig zags are already ignored by parents and the school has never seriously sought to police the area by its entrance.
- To add additional restrictions is not only futile, but it would also go way beyond the drop off times and cause residents’ real inconvenience, simply moving the worst issues along St Julian’s Road where it is arguably even more dangerous (as it is narrower).
- The disabled parking bay, taxi bay and School Keep Clear markings are already in situ, the latter of which for several years, so this part is a retrospective proposal which has already been implemented.
- As there is no policing of the road all these areas regularly have cars parked on them; there is no actual deterrent not to. The school lunch van parks on the yellow lines for at least an hour every day with no consequence. The school have no powers to have vehicles removed.
- The only new proposal is a no waiting at any time restriction on the opposite side of the road to the school. Banning parking opposite the school at any time seems a wholly disproportionate response designed and targeted to inconvenience the people living opposite the school. The proposal will prevent stopping 365 days a year for the sake of 1 hour and 10 minutes on approximately 60 days of the year. It will make all deliveries for school and residents close to impossible and it will worsen the congestion when delivery lorries must park for longer further along the road as they are unable to “stop and drop”.
- Has the school identified an alternative area for its refuse collection as under this proposal the refuse lorry which collects at 5.30am every Tuesday will no longer be able to do so.
- The no parking restrictions will have a detrimental and significant impact on the running of the school. As a parent of children at the school it is a necessity for parents to park up drop off and pick up. This is unavoidable and short sighted. I would not let my 3-year-old walk any distance which I would need to if parking further away. Make more provisions for drop offs not less.
- I am happy to allow the disabled bay but whole heartedly object to the taxi bay which removes yet more spaces for parents to be able to safely pick up

children. Even if the bay was allocated to a taxi for a 10min window that would help rather than being out of bounds for what is 23hrs and 40mins each day - this is not a great use of road when space is at a premium.

- Where is the support from BANES in keeping schools open and accessible. Why are parents always penalised for keeping their children safe at drop offs and pickups!
- Further restricting parking in the proposed way would only increase the problems of parents dropping off. There is also a risk created by parents parking on the corner directly behind the disabled parking bay. This causes limited vision to drivers coming out of the school car park and pedestrians. No parking lines here would be more beneficial than in the proposed area.
- Future planned development on St Julian's Road such as the houses proposed opposite St Julian's Farm will again increase traffic and add to the issue.
- The timings listed would impact upon School drop off and pickup. As I am sure you are aware there is limited parking available to parents and villagers in this stretch of the road (referring to the stretch along to School boundary) Parents successfully use the road in the mornings to drop their children off at the entrance to the school. This may involve them waiting for a minute or two whilst the child/children exit the vehicle safely, this method prevents parents from having to park their vehicles along the road which causes extra demand on those living by the school.
- The school has not requested the zone. - The parish council has not requested the zone, nor was it informed. Parking for residents outside their own properties will be hindered. Parking for local traders, refuse collectors and delivery drivers will be hindered.

Response: The proposed restrictions on St Julian's Road, Shoscombe were requested by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer to prevent obstruction of the highway caused by parked vehicles. Due to the objections raised above by local residents and parents of the school and not receiving any comments from the Shoscombe Parish Council or local Ward Member during the informal consultation of this TRO, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and are removed from this Order.

Plan 27 – Springhill Close, Paulton – No Parking At Any Time

Objections: 1 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- I object to the proposed plans as a resident of Springhill Close, this would reduce our already limited parking in the street. I feel that it is unnecessary to add these parking restrictions in such a quiet road.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer at the request of local residents to prevent parking within the turning head to allow larger vehicles such as refuse collectors to be able to manoeuvre. As we only received one objection to this proposal, which was submitted to prevent obstruction of the highway, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 28 – Church Hill, Freshford – No Parking At Any Time

Objections: 1 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- I would like to object to the introduction of a no parking at any time restriction outside the Church at Church Hill, Freshford. I believe there may be a case for the introduction of a disabled bay here to allow disabled drivers access to the Church through the new disabled ramp. The bay could be sited so that it does not restrict the ramp or the fire hydrant. But a double yellow line is inappropriate and unnecessary.

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the Churchwarden of St. Peter's Church, Freshford. The No Parking At Any Time restrictions (Double Yellow Lines) will allow disabled drivers with a Blue Badge to be able to park on these markings for up to 3 hours. The restrictions will keep the area near the church entrance clear from obstruction until required by a disabled driver wishing to access the Church grounds. These restrictions were considered the best approach and have the support of the Church. As we only received one objection to these proposals it is the recommendation of this report that the restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 32 – Waterloo Road, Radstock – No Parking At Any Time / Removal of No Parking At Any Time.

Objections: 4 / Support: 0 / Support in Part: 0

Main points of objection:

- I have to say I do not entirely understand your proposal, especially since it is a well-known area for sheltered accommodation with the presence of Pine Court and Chichester Place. As one might expect a number of residents in this area struggle with their mobility and utilize the services of carers. Enforcing such restrictions will only hinder the residents' ability to access their vehicles, which they rely heavily on to commute. By increasing the distance between their homes and their/their visitors' vehicles, you would be creating an additional barrier for those who struggle to walk short distances, while simultaneously increasing the risk of falls. On top of that, this will simultaneously make it even more difficult for carers to park nearby and provide the full service they seek to give.

- Since the recent development of the new Doctor's Surgery, Hope House, there has been a notable increase of traffic in the area which has made it progressively harder for residents and their visitors to park close to their homes. Even if the parking restrictions only spanned a short distance, it is crucial that you account for the fact that Waterloo Road is now typically a busy road for parking thus residents and their visitors will have to park even further away.
- Have you considered where can people who work in Radstock park all day? If we park in a 4-hour car park at Waterloo Road or 5-hour at Church Street space, the car then needs to move, what do we do if we can't find an alternative space in the other car park? If we park in a 4- or 5-hour space, we don't always have the time available to move cars after that time is up.
- Local residents impacted by yellow lines are likely to use all the all-day spaces in Waterloo Road, therefore leaving no spaces for worker or visitors.
- Have you considered the impact this will have on small business? With no parking, no one will use the businesses in the local area.
- This could have damaging effects on people's lives, mental health and the local area. As a member of staff at the Children centre team based in Radstock, our car is essential for the job role and the service to provide for BANES residents and therefore we have no other option but to attend work via car. We undertake home visits, carrying lots of equipment and therefore need car parking available within reasonable proximity and for a long period of time.
- Much as I appreciate the recent annoyance that parking issues must have caused local residents, they too will be greatly impacted by the no parking areas and will likely use the all-day parking by Hope House, thus making the situation even harder for those working in Radstock.
- I feel that there is the possibility that people are more likely to use the car park by the play area, and walk, but that will take up places aimed to cater for those using the play facilities, and/or cycle path, so that will create more problems (I thought the council had a fitness plan of some description which won't be supported by this possibility).
- I, along with my colleagues, need to use our cars for work on a pretty much daily basis so using public transport is not viable (not that there is any from where I live to Radstock anyway).

Response: The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer after a site meeting was conducted with the Radstock Town Council who support these proposed restrictions. 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. There is no legal right to park on the highway. The proposed restrictions would cover the section of Waterloo Road opposite the junction with Pine Court on the northern

side and run adjacent to the parking on the southern side to prevent double parking and pinch points creating an obstruction. Parking in this location on both sides of the road due to the narrow width of the highway obstructs the free flow of traffic and therefore cannot be condoned. The other proposed location for the No Parking At Any Time restrictions is around the junction with Pritchard Mews. As vehicles should not be parking within 10 metres of or opposite a junction in accordance with the Highway Code these proposed restrictions do not remove any legitimate on-street parking spaces. They also run in front of 4 dropped kerbs and it is an offense to park in these locations already. Therefore, the net loss of official on-street parking spaces as a result of these proposed restrictions being introduced is minimal and will not have the impact on parking provision as highlighted above in the objections raised. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that as these restrictions were proposed on safety grounds and have the support of the Radstock Town Council, that despite the objections raised the restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

No Objections received to:

- **Plan 1 – Walley Lane / Wallycourt Road, Chew Valley – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 2 – Pows Orchard, Midsomer Norton – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 5 – Ridge Crescent, West Harptree – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 8 – The Dymboro, Midsomer Norton – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 9 – Avon Court, Batheaston – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 11 – Publow Lane, Pensford – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 17 – Greenhill Road / Greenhill Place, Welton, Midsomer Norton – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 20 – Goldney Way, Temple Cloud – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 22 – Cameley Road, Temple Cloud – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 23 – Cappards Road, Bishop Sutton – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 25 – Rotcombe Lane, High Littleton – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 29 – Paulton Road, Hallatrow – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 30 – Chilcompton Road, Midsomer Norton – No Parking At Any Time**
- **Plan 31 – Ham Lane, Paulton – No Parking At Any Time**

Response: As no objections were raised to the above proposals it is the recommendation of this report that they are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Chief Constable

Enforcement of waiting restrictions within the Bath and North east Somerset Council area rests with B&NES Parking Services. The proposals should meet the aspirations behind their introduction.

Parking Services

No comment.

Ward Members

Bathavon North:

Cllr Kevin Guy – No comment.

Cllr Sarah Warren – Scheme 24 (outside number 50) I would like recorded as having been requested by residents in discussion with council officers, and not by me. We believe there may have been a duplication of scheme number 21 (outside number 26). A car was destroyed in early spring when parked outside number 26 where the road is too narrow, so I requested a reduction of one space in the available parking at that spot, but we believe that that space was removed already at the time of the resurfacing in April, so a further space removal is not required. Can we please remove this scheme, as we believe, it may be a duplicate of work already completed?

Response: It is the recommendation of this report that proposal plan 21 is removed from this Order.

Bathavon South:

Cllr Fiona Gourley – No comment.

Cllr Matthew McCabe – No comment.

Chew Valley:

Cllr Anna Box – I support Chew Stoke's parish view to establish a TRO on Walley Court Road near the Chew Valley Lake. It has been raised on multiple times by residents and I am pleased this is being processed. I also have many comments from Bishop Sutton residents for Plan 23 with Cappards Road, which I support.

Cllr David Harding – I confirm my ongoing support for the TRO on Walleycourt Rd Dam (Plan 1), and my support for the TRO at the entrance to Cappards Rd, Bishop Sutton of which I was previously unaware (Plan 23).

Clutton & Farmborough:

Cllr Sam Ross – No comment.

High Littleton:

Cllr Ann Morgan – No comment.

Lambridge:

Cllr Joanna Wright – No comment.

Cllr Saskia Heijltjes – No comment.

Mendip:

Cllr David Wood – No comment.

Midsomer Norton North:

Cllr Michael Auton – As one of the local BANES Ward Councillors for Midsomer Norton North (which includes Welton), I was approached by around 12 residents living in Beaufort Avenue, Welton, who expressed very strong views regarding the possible installation of double yellow lines at the top of the road. I met them to discuss the issue, and after a comprehensive site visit, could see for myself what negative impact this would have on the traffic flow in the neighbourhood. We were all agreed that having double yellow lines would force cars to park further round the corner in Beaufort Avenue, obstructing the view of incoming drivers, and creating a bottle neck as the road was very narrow. This would be added risk to both car drivers and residents. I think implementing this TRO would be a waste of BANES Council time and money and would ignore the views of local residents. For this reason, I would like to add my voice to objecting to the installation of yellow lines as stated in this application.

Response: This proposal plan (Plan 3) has been removed from the Order due to objections raised.

Cllr Shaun Hughes – No comment.

Midsomer Norton Redfield:

Cllr Sarah Evans – No comment.

Cllr Tim Warren – No comment.

Peasedown St John:

Cllr Karen Walker – No comment.

Cllr Gavin Heathcote – No comment.

Publow & Whitchurch:

Cllr Paul May – No comment.

Radstock:

Cllr Christopher Dando – No comment.

Cllr Lesley Mansell – No comment.

Timsbury:

Cllr Shaun Stephenson-McGall – I have now received representation from local residents against Plan 10 outside Greenhill House, South Road, which on reflection I am more inclined to agree with.

Response: This proposal plan (Plan 10) has been removed from the Order due to objections raised.

Westfield:

Cllr Eleanor Jackson – No comment.

Cllr Robin Moss – No comment.

Parish and Town Councils:

Bathampton Parish Council – No comment.

Bathford Parish Council – No comment.

Chew Magna Parish Council – No comment.

Chew Stoke Parish Council – No comment.

Corston Parish Council – No comment.

High Littleton Parish Council – No comment.

Midsomer Norton Town Council – No comment.

Paulton Parish Council – No comment.

Peasedown St John Parish Council – No comment.

Publow and Pensford Parish Council - The Parish Councillors in Publow with Pensford PC are concerned about the blanket application of double yellow lines throughout Publow Lane (plans 4 & 11). This is a problem area because there is not enough suitable parking for Village Hall events when there is something on, or on a sunny day when people are out enjoying the countryside and the river in Publow. This results in inconsiderate parking throughout this lane and causing blockages when people meeting each other. Removing the ability to park on any of Publow Lane will create a bigger problem elsewhere as the people will still come and need somewhere to park. We believe there needs to be sections of the lane which parking is allowed, but sections of double yellow that create passing places when cars meet in opposite directions. This blanket approach is likely to mean that the double yellows are ignored, or other areas of the Parish will become worse. It is also requested that there is an area of the lane between the village hall and Pensford Village that is kept clear of restrictions as residents regularly need to

park there on a daily basis as the area around the village green is so tight for parking near residents' homes.

Response: Due to the objections raised above regarding parking capacity near the village hall, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are reduced in length on the western side and begin at a point in front of the gate to the recreation ground field, retaining valuable parking for local residents and then continue as proposed along the length of Publow Lane to prevent obstruction to larger vehicles as the Lane narrows after the Village Hall. It is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions on the eastern side of Publow Lane are to remain as advertised and sealed within the Order. Parking can only be condoned where it is safe to do so. The primary purpose of the highway is for the safe passage of vehicles. Publow Lane is a narrow section of highway and therefore not appropriate for parking along most of its length.

Radstock Town Council – No comment.

Shoscombe Parish Council – No comment.

Stowey Sutton Parish Council – No comment.

Cameley Parish / Temple Cloud Parish Council – Re Plan 22, Cameley Road: Temple Cloud with Cameley Parish Council object to the proposals due to the potential impact to both residents and the doctor's surgery from the loss of parking for visitors to the doctor's surgery.

Timsbury Parish Council – No comment.

West Harptree Parish Council – No comment.

Westfield Parish Council – No comment.

Whitchurch Village Council – No comment.

Swainswick Parish Council – No comment.

Cabinet Member:

Cllr Manda Rigby – Cllr Manda Rigby - I am happy with the recommendations in the reports.

8. RECOMMENDATION

That the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised is adjusted as described below and sealed.



Paul Garrod

Date: 11/09/2023

Traffic Management & Network Manager

9. **DECISION**

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the objections / comments be acceded to in part and the following adjustments, being of minor significance; be included in the Order to be sealed.

specify minor amendment to Order here:

Plan 3 - Beaufort Avenue, Welton, Midsomer Norton

However due to the objections raised above and lack of supporting comments from the residents of Beaufort Avenue for this scheme it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site at this time and the proposal is removed from this Order.

Plan 4 – Publow Lane, Pensford – No Parking At Any Time.

However due to the objection raised above regarding parking near the village hall, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are reduced in length on the western side and begin at a point in front of the gate to the recreation ground field and then continue as proposed along the length of Publow Lane to prevent obstruction to larger vehicles as the Lane narrows after the Village Hall. It is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions on the eastern side of Publow Lane are to remain as advertised and sealed within the Order.

Plan 6 – St Peter’s Road, Westfield, Midsomer Norton – No Parking At Any Time / No Loading At Any Time.

It is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions on St Peter’s Road are implemented on-site with one slight amendment. The proposed No Parking At Any Time restrictions running in front of property number 22 are removed, extending from a point in line with the dropped kerb at the entrance to number 22 in a westerly direction to a point in line with the dropped kerb of property number 23. This will retain 3 on-street parking spaces for local residents, visitors, trades people and carers to use when required. It is the recommendation of this report that the rest of the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order as they were requested by the local Ward Member on behalf of local residents.

Plan 10 – Loves Lane, Timsbury – No Parking At Any Time.

it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not

introduced at this time and removed from this Order and any required restrictions on the highway are picked up as part of the planning process for the new development on this site.

Plan 12 – Bailbrook Lane, Batheaston – No Parking At Any Time.

This proposal was removed from the Order at the request of the local Ward Member, with the agreement that an advisory White Keep Clear marking would be introduced on-site in front of the steps in its place.

Plan 13 – Wells Road, Westfield, Midsomer Norton – No Parking Between Mon-Fri, 8am – 9.30am and 2.30pm – 4pm

However due to the objections raised above regarding parking for local residents and increased traffic speeds along the A362, combined with the comments received from the local Ward Member Cllr Eleanor Jackson during the informal consultation of this TRO, requesting that this proposal is removed from the Order due to the limited on-street parking stock, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented at this time and are removed from the Order.

Plan 16 – Gregory’s Tynning, Paulton – No Parking At Any Time

As these restrictions were requested by and have the support of the local Ward Members it is the recommendation of this report that they are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order with the one slight amendment of extending the proposed restrictions on the western side opposite property number 2 by 5 metres in a northerly direction to prevent obstruction to the driveway access.

Plan 21 – Northend, Batheaston – No Parking At Any Time

Response: It is the recommendation of this report that proposal plan 21 is removed from this Order at the request of the local Ward Member.

Plan 26 – St Julian’s Road, Shoscombe – No Parking At Any Time, Disabled Parking Bay, Taxi Parking Bay, School Keep Clear marking Mon – Fri, 8am – 8pm

Response: The proposed restrictions on St Julian’s Road, Shoscombe were requested by the area Senior Traffic Management Engineer to prevent obstruction of the highway caused by parked vehicles. Due to the objections raised above by local residents and parents of the school and not receiving any comments from the Shoscombe Parish Council or local Ward Member during the informal consultation of this TRO, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and are removed from this Order.

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.

The Council's policy framework has been used as the basis to develop the scheme with full engagement with stakeholders across the area.

I further note that the issue of deciding whether to implement any scheme is a matter of broad judgement, taking into account the wider transport and climate aims of the Council rather than a purely mathematical analysis on the numbers of positive or negative responses.

The arguments both for and against the scheme were clearly identified and were considered fully as part of the decision-making process before I made the final decision as set out above.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Major', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Chris Major
Director for Place Management

Date: 23/09/23