

OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)

4

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: Oldfield Park and Westmoreland – Residents Parking Zone

PROPOSAL: Various Wating Restrictions

SCHEME REF No: 22 – 004

REPORT AUTHOR: Kris Gardom

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

2. LEGAL AUTHORITY

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

(a)	for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or	X
(b)	for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or	
(c)	for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or	X
(d)	for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property,	
(e)	(without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or	

(f)	for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs, or	X
(g)	for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality)	

3. **PROPOSAL**

To implement No Parking At Any Time, Permit Holder Only and dual use Limited Waiting / Permit Holder Parking in the Oldfield Park and Westmoreland area of Bath.

Details of these proposals are set out in-Appendix A

4. **BACKGROUND**

In 2020, B&NES consulted on the policy for the introduction of Liveable Neighbourhoods in Bath and North East Somerset. The aim of a Liveable Neighbourhood is to reduce the dominance of vehicles in residential areas, particularly through-traffic, whilst maintaining vehicle access to homes and businesses. This can be done through a range of measures including vehicle restrictions, traffic calming, one-way streets, and residents' parking zones.

These proposals have been developed to reduce the number of non-residents parking on residential streets in the Oldfield Park and West Moreland. These proposals are aimed at improving parking for residents and to discourage the use of the area by commuters as an informal park and stride or rail. These proposals are also aimed to facilitate the achievement of strategic outcomes of local transport policy by reducing congestion and vehicle intrusion into neighbourhoods, and particularly residential neighbourhoods and align with the Council policy on Liveable Neighbourhoods.

The initial proposals were presented to the local residents during a 4-week public consultation between 21st October and 11th November 2021. The results of this consultation showed Over a third (34%) of respondents support the Residents' Parking Zone with a further 16% saying they partially support, Therefore, all the comments received were fed back into a more detailed scheme design aimed at addressing residents' concerns to create an RPZ which best fit their needs. This final design which was developed in conjunction with the local Councillors was presented back to residents through the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process. During this TRO process residents were provided with another 28-day consultation period between 9th June and 7th July 2022, to comment further before the final decision is made by the Director of Place Management.

5. **SOURCE OF FINANCE**

This proposal is being funded by the Transport Improvement Programme TC9012S18.

6. **INFORMAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

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

The responses to the formal consultation can be found in TRO reports number 1 and 2.

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

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

The objection / comments received to the 28-day public consultation have been summarised below with the technical responses in italics underneath each one.

Oldfield Park and Westmoreland Residents Parking Zone TRO – Public Consultation Findings

Responses Received: 1062 of which Support – 16%, Partially Support – 10%, Object – 73%, Didn't respond – 1%

From responses received within the proposed zone boundary, 31% of respondents were in support, 13% partially supported and 55% objected to the proposals (Due to rounding to whole numbers, percentages may not total 100%)

Objections Main points raised:

- **Proposals will harm local businesses / ability to work (37%, n=274):**
Respondents felt that the proposals will negatively impact local businesses and employees' ability to get to work.
Limiting the availability of on street parking for long stay guests, where vehicles typically remain parked for long periods during the visitors stay, ensures a higher turnover of the limited parking availability in the area.
There is no charge for short term shopper or service users parking as the dual use bays are free for periods of up to 3 hours limited waiting in some locations.
- **People cannot afford the extra cost / cost of living increase (22%, n=165):**
Respondents felt that the proposals are unfair on lower income residents.
We recognise that the timing of any proposed increase in costs is never welcome and that it has been a challenging time for many due to the impacts of Covid-19. However, we cannot ignore the need to act to progress measures which aim to improve air quality. No charges are applied retrospectively as the new charges will only apply at the point of purchase or renewal of a resident parking permit. It should also be noted that the purchase of a permit is optional as residents may choose to park in unrestricted areas outside of their residents parking zone or on the driveways.

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

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

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

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

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

- **Will just move parking issues to other areas / streets (16%, n=118):** Some respondents felt the proposals would displace parking congestion into roads outside the borders of the proposed zone.

The Zone boundary takes into account the future displacement of vehicles. If only a section of a street is included within the zone boundary, the commuter vehicles displaced from the area within the zone will move into the next available area not within the zone. For this reason, areas of the City must be looked at on a zonal basis.

- **Negatively impacts access / attendance to church / local community (16%, n=115):** Some respondents also expressed concerns that the increase in parking charges or the limited number of visitor permits could reduce social contact.

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

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

In addition, the proposals for the Residents Parking Zone includes limited waiting parking where visitors can stay without a permit for periods ranging from 1 hour to up to 3 hours

- **It is a tax / money making scheme (12%, n=89):** Many respondents felt that the scheme is being implemented to generate revenue for the local council.

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

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

- **Will be harder / residents will not be guaranteed a place to park near their house (9%, n=68):** Some respondents felt that the changes will not be effective unless it guarantees a place to park next to their home.

A Residents' Parking Permit does not guarantee a parking space on the street. The cost of the permit is a fee for membership of the scheme, not a payment for parking. Having a Residents' Parking Permit does not allow you to park illegally, for example on yellow lines.

- **Discriminates disabled / elderly (7%, n=55):** Some respondents felt the proposals were unfair on vulnerable persons such as the elderly or disabled due to their need for a motor vehicle for transportation.

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

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

- **Parking is not a problem (7%, n=54):** Some respondents that feel that the changes are not required due to parking for residents being readily available.

A survey was commissioned by the Council and carried out by consultants AECOM in late 2019 which concluded that a commuter presence does exist in the Oldfield Park and Westmoreland area of Bath as a result of displaced commuter vehicles from the adjoining Zone 18 introduced at the start of 2019.

- **Will reduce social contact / negatively impact visitors for residents (7%, n=52):** Some respondents also expressed concerns that the increase in parking charges or the limited number of visitor permits could reduce social contact.

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

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

In addition, the proposals for this Residents Parking Zones also includes limited waiting parking where visitors can stay without a permit for periods ranging from 1 hour to up to 3 hours.

- **Impact on community organisations:** an objection was received from the Genesis Trust, and both St Johns Catholic Primary School and Oldfield Park Infant School raised concerns about the proposals. This relates to the impact the scheme would have on their staff and volunteers. Under the terms and conditions of the council's permit scheme, businesses and other organisations are entitled to two permits used operationally for the business/organisation or its customers.

Genesis Trust runs a foodbank from premises within the proposed RPZ in Westmoreland and operates The Gateway Centre in Snow Hill, which is included within another proposed RPZ. Its site in Westmoreland includes its offices and the warehouse for the foodbank. Its staff and volunteers currently park in nearby roads since it only has off-road space for its two vans. There can be up to 20 staff and volunteers working at its Westmoreland site at any one time. The Trust has stated it may not be able to continue to operate if the proposed RPZ is implemented because many of its staff and volunteers do not live close enough to its sites to walk or cycle. It has stated that the amount of permits the council would provide is insufficient. It has a significant number of volunteers. Although they do not all work at the same time, even if the council were to make permits available, it states it would not be workable if those permits were allocated to specific vehicles. It advises that only a paper-based permit system would work and it would have to be for the number of staff/volunteers who need them. In addition to this, as a charity it has stated it could not afford the cost of permits.

The primary school has around 22 teachers, 24 teaching assistants plus support staff. It has no off-street parking. When the school was extended a number of years ago it included the provision of 17 spaces around the turning area as part of the associated highway works. The school is concerned that if permits are not made available for its staff it would be difficult to retain and recruit staff. In addition to this, it has not budget for parking permits.

Similarly, the infant school currently relies on on-street parking for its staff due to only have 5 off-street spaces and around 30 teaching and support staff.

Officers have met with representatives of the Trust and the schools to understand their operational requirements. Although it may be possible to provide a special type of permit for not-for-profit community organisations, permit numbers do need to be managed in order to help achieve the scheme objectives. That is, a reduction in commuter parking and encouraging more short journeys to be taken on foot, by bike or public transport. There has to be a charge for permits to cover the operational costs of running the permit scheme.

Chief Constable

There are no further observations to add to those already expressed, and shown on the "Officer Decision Report, Approval to progress TRO" provided.

Parking Services

No comment.

Ward Members within RPZ boundary

Oldfield Park:

Cllr Shaun Stephenson-McGall – With reference to the figures in Section 4, the responses from the Ward of Oldfield Park were more positive than those in Westmoreland. 45% supported with a further 18% partially supported the RPZ. 37% opposed.

I should note at this stage that it has been a very positive process for me as a Ward councillor with both the consultants and Council Officers being extremely helpful during this progress answers questions and inquiries and facilitating and attending meetings with local residents, local businesses and community groups and the School in the Ward.

I have represented Oldfield Park and its predecessor Ward, Oldfield, for many many years being elected first in 1999. And for most of this period I represented ¾ of Moorland Road.

High car ownership rates, including at many of the hundreds of HMOs in the Ward together with commuter parking are causing considerable pressure and strain on the area. Long term residents are those negatively impacted.

This issue alongside HMO / student / bad landlord issue compete to be the top issue in the Ward and the wider Oldfield Park area for over twenty years. Action is finally needed.

I note the loss of the Co-op Scala and its replacement as PBSA for around 100 students and the Wansdyke Business Centre becoming a Care Home. Both of these will cause increased parking stress in both Oldfield Park and Westmoreland wards.

We either do nothing like the last twenty years or do something positive ie the RPZ) this can be black and white issue for many, but my understand of my electoral, local businesses, community groups and the School together with the initial consultation response leads to support the scheme.

However, it is not perfect at this stage, what scheme is, and the inclusion of an early review of the detailed TROs at key locations is non-negotiable for me! The key ones in my mind are:

- Third Avenue (Moorfield Inn needs more visitor only and dual use bays)
- the roads adjoining Moorland Rd (these also need more visitor (shoppers) only and dual use bays)

I would suggest that Officers and the consultants work with the three local members, cabinet member and some key business representative from both the retail and hospitality sector within both Wards and develop a mutually agreed proposal to the TRO which was consulted on and this is put out for consultation as soon that is legally possible post the introduction of the RPZ.

We need to support and protect local businesses, both retail and hospitality, as much as we can given the Cost of Living crisis, and the forthcoming UK recession. This means getting the commuter parking out of the roads on which these businesses operate, rather than the status quo which places shopper, and customers to hospitality, in conflict with hundreds of commuters on a daily basis.

We also need to implement the RPZ to support the work we are doing as a Council to tackle the climate emergency (Yes, the Number One issue, full-stop for every human on this planet!) and thus encourage / force these commuters to use the park and ride or public transport, both of which could do with increased revenue!

I hope the Administration of the Council 2023-2027 will commit to a review of all the existing (and this new one for Oldfield Park and Westmoreland, if implemented) RPZ zones boundaries in the city and whether or not the current main set of policies (I know there is the one which is different the very core of the city centre) need to be refined to better reflect the whole city as more and more RPZs are established in more diverse communities.

Westmoreland:

Cllr June Player / Cllr Colin Blackburn – Please find Westmoreland Ward Councillors' comments on the combined Oldfield Park/Westmoreland RPZ Consultation 4:

In 4. BACKGROUND (par 3 line 7) it states: "This final design which was developed in conjunction with the local Councillors ...". We cannot really agree with this as we feel our comments both verbal and written were not listened to or taken notice of. We reiterate them here:

Whilst we are not opposed to having RPZs we feel that the size of this one is far too large and therefore unenforceable especially as there is currently a shortage of staff to deal with existing parking problems and far more would be needed to implement this scheme. This scheme is a replica of other city centre schemes but takes no consideration of the unusual local circumstances and no genuine engagement with individual residents on different streets has taken place to establish what issues they experience to allow a scheme to be developed on a more focused scale to support the residents' needs and get 'buy in' to the RPZ.

Paper permits would be far more beneficial from residents' points of view when checking on vehicles that they are concerned about. Paper permits are so quick and easy to spot and make it instantly clear whether a vehicle is legitimately parked. It must be remembered that our Ward of Westmoreland has a percentage of residents who do not have access to computers or smart phones. Due to the aforementioned shortage of staff, we also feel a lot of checking on vehicles will be up to residents who will basically become the first-stage enforcers.

Due to the differences between Westmoreland Ward and Oldfield Park, we feel they should be treated accordingly to take this into account. Westmoreland is far more built up, as well as having many more properties with multiple occupants. Ours is a two-councillor ward whereas Oldfield Park has only one councillor — this takes into account the number of constituents each councillor is expected to represent. In addition, Oldfield Park has many larger owner-occupied properties with driveways and garages. It also contains Oldfield Park Railway Station and the associated traffic that serves people using this important transport facility.

Our Ward also contains the Shopping District of Moorland Rd, which attracts many drivers and which we are desperate to preserve.

For the reasons stated above we do not feel a 'One size fits all' approach is the correct way to go.

We also feel Permits should continue to be in force later in the evenings as a lot of residents do not get back home from work until that time. Some streets would benefit from no restrictions during daytime but need restrictions evenings and weekends, which we feel has not been considered and the lack of positive feedback reflects the push back against the 'one size fits all approach'.

The price for the residents is too high, and this is made even worse now of course with the current cost of living crisis. Unless our residents gain a real benefit for accepting the installation of an RPZ, the price will become a major negative towards the administration.

It is obvious from the figures of support and objection that there is very little support for this scheme in its present form, and we would like it to be fundamentally reviewed across the area.

We did comment last time that the figures showing “partial support” could very well be taken as partial objection!

We appreciate that this issue is a very difficult one and as mentioned before, we are not in principle opposed to it, but ask that it is completely reviewed and that our input is taken into account from the start.

Response: In early 2021 Councillor June Player asked for the initial proposed zone boundary to be extended to also include Inverness Road, Burnham Road and Vernon Park. The initial proposal plan was extended accordingly. The initial findings report outlining the feedback from the November 2021 public exhibition and 4-week public consultation was sent to Councillor June Player and Councillor Colin Blackburn on 10th March 2022 and a meeting was held with Officers on the 16th March 2022. No comments were received in writing at this point. The initial proposal plans were amended slightly to address a number of the issues raised by local residents. The new proposal plans for the Westmoreland / Oldfield Park Resident Parking Zone was then sent to Councillors June Player and Colin Blackburn on the 26th April 2022, where no comments were received. The formal draft Traffic Regulation Order was then drawn up and sent to both Councillors June Player and Colin Blackburn along with the amended proposal plans again for informal consultation on the 16th May 2022. On the 23rd May Cllr June Player raised concerns regarding the proposed operating times of the proposed Zone and asked if this could extend further into the evening or 24/7. It was explained that all Resident Parking Zones in BANES now operate during the same time period, which is 7 days a week, between 8am – 6pm, which are the hours considered to be appropriate for addressing commuter parking.

Cllr June Player / Cllr Colin Blackburn – We still feel this scheme is not right for the area and needs relooking at and reconsulting on.

On Page 4 - Under 'People cannot afford the extra cost/cost of living increase' - (Para 4) We would like assurance that the annual cost will remain the same whether residents choose to pay in monthly or three-monthly instalments or annually.

Our comments on the Amendments to the Proposals (page 10) are: -

Roads in vicinity of Moorlands Inn. Has the reason for originally putting in the double yellow lines now gone to enable this amendment?

Former Bath Press and Regency Laundry sites - we agree with this.

Dorset Close - disabled persons parking bay - we agree with this.

Dorset Close - 3-hour Limited Waiting parking bay - we agree with this.

Crandale Road - disabled persons parking bay - we agree with this.

Whilst we agree with some of the amendments, we feel the proposed scheme is still not right for the area to achieve the best for the residents.

Ward Members bordering RPZ boundary

Moorlands:

Cllr Jess David – My main concern is the overspill parking that will result from any new RPZ. Many residents on surrounding roads have raised concerns about this, in particular those on the Moorlands estate which already has parking issues. I believe Moorland’s ward will pick up much of the excess parking (from HMOs or other houses with more than 2 cars) – so this problem will not be removed, but just moved on elsewhere.

I believe that further work needs to be done to develop the RPZ into a scheme that more closely aligns with resident’s feedback.

I also think we need to look at a different approach to RPZs that better reflects the needs of residents in outer Bath – most people don’t want to see all parking prevented, just long-stayers/ daily commuters. I think we should explore other models such as shorter time periods of operation (e.g. just two hrs such as 10am-12pm), and also look at reduced charges for outer Bath.

Southdown:

Cllr Dine Romero – No comment.

Cllr Paul Crossley – No comment.

Twerton:

Cllr Sarah Moore – No comment.

Cllr Tim Ball – No comment.

8. AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSALS

During the consultation a number of suggestions for minor changes to the proposals were made. It is not possible to make significant changes to the proposals without re-consulting. However, minor changes can be taken forward. It is recommended that, if the decision is taken for the scheme to go ahead, the following minor changes should be made:

Requested change

Beckhampton Road (dual use bay opposite Faulkland Road) – change half of bay to permit only

Recommendation

This would be a significant change to the proposals and therefore cannot be taken forward without re-consulting.

Claude Terrace – include within the RPZ boundary

Legal Services state that this would be a significant change to the proposals and therefore cannot be taken forward without re-consulting.

Oldfield Lane - amend proposals because it shows a bay going across a rear vehicle access

Allowing vehicles to park here would block this legitimate vehicle access, therefore the layout needs to be amended to replace part of the bay with double yellow lines.

Junction road outside of old doctors' surgery – change dual use bay to permit holders

Since this is no longer an active surgery with appointments the dual use bay is not necessary and should be replaced with a permit bay.

Roads in the vicinity of the Moorfields Inn – more 3 hour bays

In order to provide more space that can be used by visitors to the pub it is recommended that:

- 2 short sections of double yellow lines in Oldfield Lane to be removed and replaced with dual use 3 hour and permit holder bays where it has been assessed as safe to do so.
- Dual use bay in Third Avenue outside of the pub to be changed to 3 hour bay.

Oldfield Lane cul-de-sac – change from permit bays and double yellow lines to 'permit holders only past this point' signage

This arrangement, suitable for short lengths of road such as this, enables residents to park where they currently do without the need for marked bays or double yellow lines, therefore recommend making this change.

Former Bath Press and Regency Laundry sites – amend RPZ boundary

Recommend amending the boundary of these current vacant sites which are awaiting development so that future properties within them are not entitled to permits.

Roads in the vicinity of St Bartholomew's Church – provide more dual use bays & more 3 hour bays

In order to provide more space that can be used by visitors for the various services, clubs and events that take place in the church it is recommended to:

- Change the dual use bay in front of the church in King Edward Road to 3 hour bay.
- Change the two Second Avenue 2 hour dual use bays to 3 hour dual use and change the First Avenue 2 hour dual use bays to 3 hour dual use.

Dorset Close – disabled persons parking bay

Recommend that the parking space in the bay at the southern end of the close nearest to the entrance to the school be changed to a disabled persons parking bay to assist disabled visitors to the school.

Dorset Close –3 hour
Limited Waiting parking
bay

Recommend to provide additional short term
parking for visitors and parents.

Crandale Road – disabled
Persons parking bay

Recommended to provide an additional Disabled
Bay near to the high street.

First Avenue – remove
dual use bay in order to
prioritise parking for
residents

Recommend against this change because each
street is being provided with some dual use spaces
to ensure some space is retained for non-permit
holder use. Although it is accepted these will be
used at school times for pick-ups, these bays also
benefit residents because their short term visitors
can park without needing to use their visitor permits.

All roads – provide more
dual use bays to help with
visitors to Moorland Road
shops

This would be a significant change to the proposals
and therefore cannot be taken forward without re-
consulting. Most of the side roads leading into
Moorland Road and others nearby have dual use
bays in the proposals.

Change the operating
hours of the RPZ

This would be a significant change to the proposals
and therefore cannot be taken forward without re-
consulting.

Cabinet Member for Transport:

Cllr Manda Rigby – For a very long time there have been requests for an RPZ in this area as residents have struggled to park anywhere near their homes due to a combination of HMOs with multiple cars, and those using the area as a commuter car park. I'd like to thank all those who have engaged with this process as we have all worked to firstly propose a scheme and then take on board as many of the suggestions as possible to make it as good as possible. This scheme helps achieve our adopted policies around reducing the dominance of vehicles in residential roads. I am therefore in favour of proceeding with this scheme.

9. RECOMMENDATION

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



Signature:

Date: 28/11/2022

Paul Garrod
Traffic Management & Network Manager

10. DECISION

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

a)	not acceded to and the Order as advertised be sealed.	
b)	acceded to in full and the proposal(s) withdrawn.	
c)	<p>acceded to in part and the following adjustments, being of minor significance; be included in the Order to be sealed.</p> <p><i>specify minor amendment to Order here:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oldfield Lane - amend proposals because it shows a bay going across a rear vehicle access. Double Yellow Lines would be placed across the lane entrance instead. • Junction road outside of old doctors' surgery – change dual use bay to permit holders as doctors surgery is no longer in use. • Roads in the vicinity of the Moorfields Inn – more dual use 3 hour limited waiting and permit holder bays introduced replacing sections of Double Yellow Lines where it has been assessed that it is safe to do so. • Dual use bay in Third Avenue outside of the Moorfields Inn pub to be changed to 3 hour limited waiting bay. • Oldfield Lane cul-de-sac – change from permit bays and double yellow lines to 'permit holders only past this point' signage. • Former Bath Press and Regency Laundry sites – amend RPZ boundary to not include these areas. • Change the dual use bay in front of the St Bartholomew's Church in King Edward Road to a 3 hour limited waiting bay. • Change the two Second Avenue 2 hour dual use bays to 3 hour dual use and permit bays. 	X

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change First Avenue 2 hour dual use bay to a 3 hour dual use and permit bay. • Dorset Close – parking space in the bay at the southern end of the close nearest to the entrance to the school be changed to a disabled persons parking bay and an additional 3 hour limited waiting bay added at the northern end of the existing School Keep Clear markings. • Crandale Road – Dual Use bay shortened and replaced with an additional Disabled bay at the southern end. 	
--	--	--

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 Councils Liveable Neighbourhood Policy has been used as the basis to set out our approach in developing the schemes with full engagement with stakeholders across the area.

I further note that the issue of deciding whether to implement Residents Parking Schemes 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 decision as set out above.



Signature: ...

..

Date:29/11/2022

Chris Major
Director for Place Management