Audley Grove TRO

Bath and North East Somerset Council

September 2026

Delivering a better world

Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
JW	SL	NR	HH

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Prepared for:

Bath and North East Somerset Council

Prepared by:

AECOM Limited
100 Embankment
Cathedral Approach
Manchester M3 7FB
United Kingdom

T: +44 161 601 1700
aecom.com

© 2026 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

AECOM Limited ("AECOM") has prepared this report for the sole use of **Bath and North East Somerset Council** ("Client").

AECOM shall have no duty, responsibility and/or liability to any party in connection with this report howsoever arising other than that arising to the Client under the Appointment. Save as provided in the Appointment, no warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by AECOM.

This report should not be reproduced in whole or in part or disclosed to any third parties for any use whatsoever without the express written authority of AECOM. To the extent this report is reproduced in whole or in part or disclosed to any third parties (whether by AECOM or another party) for any use whatsoever, and whether such disclosure occurs with or without the express written authority of AECOM, AECOM does not accept that the third party is entitled to rely upon this report and does not accept any responsibility or liability to the third party. To the extent any liability does arise to a third party, such liability shall be subject to any limitations included within the Appointment, a copy of which is available on request to AECOM.

Where any conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by the Client and/or third parties, it has been assumed that all relevant information has been provided by the Client and/or third parties and that such information is accurate. Any such information obtained by AECOM has not been independently verified by AECOM, unless otherwise stated in this report. AECOM accepts no liability for any inaccurate conclusions, assumptions or actions taken resulting from any inaccurate information supplied to AECOM from the Client and/or third parties.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 4
1.1 Scheme details 4
1.2 The TRO public consultation and questionnaire 5
1.3 Report structure 6
2. Methodology 7
2.1 Receiving responses 7
2.2 Analysis and reporting 7
2.3 Response overview 7
2.4 Respondent profile 7
3. Findings 8
3.1 Level of support for the proposed RPZ 8
3.2 Number of respondents commenting by category 8
3.2.1 Themes from comments about parking 9
3.2.1.1 Comments opposing the RPZ extension 10
3.2.1.2 Comments supporting the RPZ 10
3.2.2 Themes from comments about the finance 11
3.2.3 Themes from comments about access 12
3.2.4 Themes from comments about safety 12
3.2.5 Themes from comments about environment 12
3.2.6 Themes from comments about traffic 13
3.2.7 General comments and other themes 13
4. Information about the proposals 15
Appendix A Official TRO Public Consultation Questionnaire 16
Appendix B Audley Grove area Consultation Letter 22

1. Introduction

In November 2025, Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) Council carried out an informal consultation on a draft proposal for an extension to the residents' parking zone (RPZ) in the Audley Grove area. Overall, 42% per cent of respondents supported the initial plans from the informal consultation.

Following this consultation changes were made to the design including removing Edward Street from the proposals. B&NES held a formal Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation on the final, detailed plans for the zone, which ran from Thursday 9 to Thursday 30 July 2026.

B&NES will review the outcomes of this formal TRO consultation before making a final decision on whether to install the zone.

1.1 Scheme details

The final proposals were drawn up following careful consideration of feedback during the informal consultation held in November 2025, multiple site visits and an assessment of the types of properties included in the zone.

The proposed RPZ extension would operate 7 days a week, from 8am to 6pm. The features of the design are:

- Sufficient permit holder-only bays to prevent commuters and other visitors from parking in the zone for unlimited periods
- New double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) opposite parking bays, particularly on narrow sections of roads, to prevent congestion and improve road safety and traffic flow
- No dual-use bays or limited parking bays given that this is a residential area*.
- Removal of Edward Street (this street was originally proposed in the design).
- A small adjustment to double yellow lines on Audley Grove after a review of dropped-kerb applications

*Visitors to residential properties can use visitor permits to park in residents' parking bays. Trades people and medical and social care professionals can also purchase permits to park in residents' parking bays.

Figure 1: Map of Audley Grove area RPZ proposed changes



Source: bathnes.gov.uk/audley-grove-extension-rpz-26-public-consultation.

1.2 The TRO public consultation and questionnaire

The aims of the scheme and a full summary of the proposals, including an annotated map (Figure 1) and who would be exempted from the restrictions were available throughout the consultation at bathnes.gov.uk/audley-grove-extension-rpz-26-public-consultation.

The council informed 300 residents of the TRO public consultation by letter on 9th July. A copy of the letter can be seen in **Appendix B** at the end of this report. The TRO was also publicised on the street and in the local press. The public consultation was open to everyone.

A drop-in event was also held at Weston Methodist Church on Monday 20th July 2026. The event provided members of the public an opportunity to meet the team and to ask questions about the design and how RPZs work, the costs of permits and who is eligible to apply. The event was attended by 5 people.

The TRO public consultation questionnaire was available on the council's website for the statutory 21 days from Thursday 9th July to Thursday 30th July with print and

alternative formats available on request. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in **Appendix A** at the end of this report.

1.3 Report structure

The structure of the report shows:

- The method of receiving and analysing responses.
- The findings for the level of support or objection to the proposals.
- Provided comments summarised to coded themes.

2. Methodology

2.1 Receiving responses

The TRO public consultation questionnaire was hosted on Appyway (https://consultation.appyway.com/bath-and-north-east-somerset/order/76ad783a-6111-4cf7-a0fc-25c4baf4a2cb) which was accessible via the council's website (bathnes.gov.uk/audley-grove-extension-rpz-26-public-consultation). To ensure inclusivity, the council accepted responses via email and the hard copy questionnaire as well as online.

2.2 Analysis and reporting

The public consultation was open to all and therefore respondents were self-selecting and made their own decision on whether to provide a response. This means findings should not be considered representative of the population, either for the Audley Grove area or Bath and North East Somerset. The purpose of this report is to summarise the views of those who responded and the main reasons why these views were held.

AECOM developed a robust framework to analyse the free text comments and ensure the frequency and strength of feeling is accurately reported. This process is known as coding; a list of themes was developed based on comments received. All responses received were read by a professional coder and grouped into themes, to allow meaningful analysis. Over 10 per cent of each coders work were checked as part of our quality control procedures.

Findings are reported by the number of comments made about each theme. It is important to bear in mind that a single response can have comments both in support and in objection to the scheme and raise concerns. A single response could mention more than one theme, and this explains why the number of comments may add up to more than the number of responses. It is important to bear this in mind when interpreting the public consultation findings.

2.3 Response overview

There were initially 30 responses to the consultation. One response was duplicated, with the respondent making a slight edit to their free text response, the first response provided was removed from the final data.

A final total of 29 responses were therefore included for data analysis.

2.4 Respondent profile

Postcode data was used to evaluate which respondents lived in the proposed RPZ and which lived outside it. All of the respondents were residents and most lived in the proposed zone (n=21), eight respondents lived outside the zone. Respondents were not asked to answer equality monitoring questions for this consultation.

3. Findings

This section describes the findings from the TRO public consultation survey.

3.1 Level of support for the proposed RPZ

Half of the respondents supported, and the other half objected to, the proposed RPZ extension (15 and 14 out of 29 respectively), as shown in Table 1.

Thirteen residents from inside the proposed RPZ extension area supported the proposals, eight objected. All but two respondents who lived outside the proposed RPZ extension objected to it.

Table 1: Level of support or objection to the proposal (N)

Level of Support	Live in the RPZ extension area	Live outside the RPZ extension area	Total
Wholly support this proposal	13	2	15
Partially support this proposal	0	0	0
Neither support nor object to this proposal	0	0	0
Partially object to this proposal	1	3	4
Wholly object to this proposal	7	3	10
Total: Wholly or partially support	**13**	**2**	**15**
Total: Wholly or partially object	**8**	**6**	**14**
Base: All respondents	**21**	**8**	**29**

3.2 Number of respondents commenting by category

This section shows the number of times each theme was mentioned in respondents' comments, arranged by category, using the list provided in the public consultation survey. More detail on the themes is provided for each of seven categories below. All 29 respondents provided a comment to the TRO public consultation.

Table 2: Number of comments provided for each category (N)

Category	Count
Parking	24
Finance	10
Access	8
Safety	4
Environment	3
Traffic	2
Other comments made which were not specific to a category	13
Total comments received	**29**

3.2.1 Themes from comments about parking

Table 3 shows the comments provided by 24 respondents on the theme of parking.

Table 3: Number of comments provided per theme about parking (N)

Type of comment	Theme	Count
Supporting	Existing parking situation needs improving	12
Supporting	Will deter non-residents/commuters from parking in this area	11
Supporting	Will improve parking in the area	9
Objecting	Will cause parking issues / reduce parking capacity for residents	6
Objecting	Parking is not an existing issue/ residents have private off-street parking	6
Supporting	Parking will become easier	2
Objecting	Will cause parking issues/reduce parking capacity for visitors/commuters	2
Neither support nor object	Parking will not be affected	1
Total	**Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about parking**	**24**

Parking was the theme mentioned most often on the consultation. Some respondents stated that parking conditions in the Audley Grove area are currently poor, largely due to parking by non-residents. Several comments referenced hospital staff, airport users, commuters, students and visitors using the road for free long stay parking. Eleven residents felt that the RPZ would discourage non-residents from parking on Audley Grove. Six respondents disagreed and had not experienced a parking problem. The objectors commented that most properties have driveways,

garages or off-street parking and that residents are generally able to park outside their homes.

3.2.1.1 Comments opposing the RPZ extension

Parking is not an existing issue/residents have private off-street parking – Six respondents stated that an extension to the resident's parking zone is not justified because parking conditions on Audley Grove are generally acceptable, several respondents stated that most properties already have garages, driveways or other forms of off-street parking and reported that they were usually able to park close to their homes.

> *"There is no need for an RPZ as the vast majority of homes in Audley Grove have garages, off street parking or both."*

> *"We do not witness significant amounts of antisocial parking and the street remains calm and safe for children. Put simply there is no problem to fix."*

Will cause parking issues/reduce parking capacity for residents – Six respondents expressed concern that the proposed layout including parking bays and waiting restrictions would reduce the amount of available parking for residents, some respondents felt that existing parking arrangements allow residents to park without issue and that the proposals could result in fewer spaces being available. Two of these respondents also stated that it would cause problems for visitors.

> *"The proposed yellow lines in Audley Grove will reduce parking spaces for residents and visitors."*

3.2.1.2 Comments supporting the RPZ

Existing parking situation needs improving – Twelve respondents mentioned that parking conditions in the Audley Grove area are currently poor and require improvement. Respondents referred to parking by commuters and those living in other nearby RPZs. Several felt that these activities reduced the availability of parking for local residents.

> *"The current parking situation in Audley Grove is not satisfactory. The street is being used by so many as a free car park to the exclusion of the residents."*

Will deter non-residents/commuters from parking in this area parking – Eleven respondents stated that the proposed RPZ would discourage non-residents from parking on Audley Grove. The Royal United Hospital, Bristol Airport bus service and Locksbrook Campus were all identified as attracting parking demand for people who do not live in the area.

> *"We also have staff and visitors to the RUH parking here, as we are one of the closest roads without parking restrictions."*

Will improve parking in the area– Nine respondents felt that the introduction of resident parking controls would improve parking availability for local residents. Respondents commented that non-resident parking currently places pressure on available spaces and that the scheme would provide a fairer allocation of parking.

> *"I wholly support this proposal for RPZ on Audley Grove as it will resolve the parking difficulties, and safety problems associated with anti-social parking..."*

3.2.2 Themes from comments about the finance

Table 5 shows the comments provided by 11 respondents on the theme of finance.

Table 5: Number of comments provided per theme about the finance (N)

Type of comment	Theme	Count
Objecting	Concern about financial impact on residents	8
Objecting	Scheme is a waste of money/ costs too much	3
Objecting	Disagree with permit charges based on vehicle size/age	2
Supporting	Permits are affordable/worth the cost	1
Supporting	Free/discounted permits for residents or specific groups	1
Total	**Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about finance**	**11**

Concern about financial impact on residents – Eight respondents expressed concerns about the financial impact on residents.

> *"At a time when so many are struggling with the cost of living, in an already incredibly expensive area to survive, this measure would force an additional expense on residents which is not necessary in the first place."*

Scheme is a waste of money/costs too much – Three respondents specifically described the scheme as poor value for money or a revenue generating exercise.

> *"This is a disproportionate action which is basically a revenue-raising indirect taxation exercise to tackle what is at best a sporadic issue"*

Disagree with permit charges based on vehicle size/age – Two respondents objected to the proposed permit charging structure. One questioned that charging higher permit fees based on vehicle size or age was wrong and felt that the approach could unfairly affect some households.

> *"As older cars would incur a higher cost this would also impact the poorest in the community."*

3.2.3 Themes from comments about access

Table 6 shows the comments provided by 8 respondents on the theme of access.

Table 6: Number of comments provided per theme about access (N)

Type of comment	Theme	Count
Objecting	Negative impact on another road / area	6
Objecting	Unfair on elderly, disabled residents or carers	2
Objecting	Unfair on those unable to switch to alternative transport	1
Total	**Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about access**	**8**

Negative impact on another road / area – Some respondents were concerned that the proposal would displace parking onto neighbouring streets, particularly Edward Street and Locksbrook Road.

> *"Parking proposals for Audley Grove will adversely affect residents of Edward Street as the houses in question back onto Edward St and Audley Grove residents will park in Edward St rather than paying for parking in Audley Grove."*

3.2.4 Themes from comments about safety

Table 7 shows the comments provided by 4 respondents on the theme of safety.

Table 7: Number of comments provided per theme about safety (N)

Type of comment	Theme	Count
Supporting	Will improve safety with walking	2
Supporting	Will improve safety for children	2
Supporting	Will improve safety generally	1
Supporting	Improved safety when driving	1
Total	**Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about safety**	4

Four respondents commented on safety, concerns included vehicles blocking dropped kerbs, obstructing visibility and creating difficulties for pedestrians and drivers.

> *"Driveways are continually being blocked, meaning that it is difficult to safely drive on to the road as visibility is highly restricted."*

3.2.5 Themes from comments about environment

Three respondents commented on the theme of environment.

Table 8: Number of comments provided per theme of environment (N)

Type of comment	Theme	Count
Objecting	Loss of gardens to create off road parking will be bad for environment	3
Total	**Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about parking**	3

3.2.6 Themes from comments about traffic

Table 9 shows the comments provided by 2 respondents on the theme of traffic.

Table 9: Number of comments provided per theme about traffic (N)

Type of comment	Theme	Count
Supporting	Positive impact on transport	1
Objecting	Public transport is not convenient / not affordable	1
Total	**Total number of respondents who mentioned at least one theme about traffic**	2

Positive impact on transport One respondent commented that the proposal could help reduce unnecessary car journeys.

"It's good to discourage unnecessary car journeys"

3.2.7 General comments and other themes

There were some comments provided which were general or did not fit into any of the categories listed in the consultation questionnaire. These are shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Number of comments provided per theme which did not fit into any of the categories (N)

Type of comment	Theme	Count
Objecting	Previous consultations have been ignored	7
Objecting	Residents do not support the scheme	6
Objecting	Criticism of consultation/planning process	5
Objecting	Scheme is unnecessary / not needed	2
Objecting	Negative impact on residents	2
Supporting	Positive impact on the area/reduced anti-social parking	2
Supporting	Alternative suggestions/more measures needed	2
Objecting	Residents' views should carry greater weight than non-residents	2
Supporting	Positive impact on residents	1
Supporting	General Support	1
Objecting	Requests publication of findings/response	1
Total	**Total number of respondents who provided at least one other theme or general comment**	**13**

Previous consultations have been ignored – Seven respondents referred to earlier consultation results and expressed frustration that the scheme has been progressed.

"The initial consultation in 2025 found 42% of respondents supporting the proposal and 56% against. So why are BANES rerunning another consultation wasting valuable tax payers money and time?"

4. Information about the proposals

More information on the scheme and the TRO can be found at bathnes.gov.uk/audley-grove-extension-rpz-26-public-consultation.

The council's Liveable Neighbourhoods team can be contacted by emailing ln_rpz@bathnes.gov.uk, or by calling **01225 394 025**

Appendix A Official TRO Public Consultation Questionnaire

Audley Grove Area Residents' Parking Zone: Public consultation

Fields with * are mandatory fields. These allow the council to accurately record feedback and contact you if follow-up is needed. Avoid further identifying yourself or others.
All feedback will be considered before deciding how to proceed with the scheme, as explained in the public notice.

First Name*

Last Name*

Email address*

Overall Response

☐ I wholly support this proposal

☐ I support this proposal, but would like the council to consider additional or alternative measures

☐ I neither support or object to this proposal, but would like the council to consider another related matter in this area

☐ I object to part of this proposal, but support or am neutral to other elements of it

☐ I wholly object to this proposal

Response Category

☐ Parking

☐ Traffic

☐ Safety

☐ Access

☐ Disturbance

☐ Financial

☐ Environmental

☐ Other (you will have the opportunity to provide more detail later)

Type of Responder

☐ Resident

☐ Business

☐ Visitor

☐ Stakeholder Group

☐ Commuter

☐ Other

Address

Postcode*

Address 1*

Address 2

Town/City*

County*

Additional Comments & Feedback

☐ * I understand that the information I have provided will be used by the council for the purposes of statutory consultation on Traffic Regulation Orders. Where appropriate, it may be anonymised and published by the council in reports on the outcomes of consultations. You can find out more information on how the council uses personal data and your rights below.

Council Privacy Policy

Bath and North East Somerset Council is registered as a Data Controller with the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). This includes general information about the types of personal data we process, what we use it for, and who we share it with.

The law

The processing of personal data in the United Kingdom is governed by legislation including the Data Protection Acts (1998 and 2018), General Data Protection Regulation (the "GDPR"), and other legislation relating to personal data and rights such as the Human Rights Act.

Under the GDPR we are required to provide Privacy Notices to inform people about the personal data we will use, how we use it and for what purposes. There are exceptions to the data protection laws which require us to share personal data wherever necessary for the purposes of safeguarding, law enforcement and prevention of fraud.

Your personal data – what is it?

"Personal data" is any information about a living individual which allows them to be identified from that data (for example a name, photographs, videos, email address, or address). Identification can be directly using the data itself or by combining it with other information.

What personal data do we use?

The personal data processed by the council in order to perform its official tasks includes:

- Names, titles, aliases, and photographs
- Contact details such as telephone numbers, addresses, and email addresses
- Gender, age, marital status, nationality, education/work history, academic/professional qualifications, hobbies, family composition, and dependants
- Social care records for adults and children in our care
- Financial identifiers such as bank account numbers, payment card numbers, payment/transaction identifiers, policy numbers, and claim numbers

Special categories of personal data

The personal data we process also includes sensitive or other special categories of personal data such as criminal convictions, racial or ethnic origin, mental and physical health records, details of injuries, medication/treatment received, political beliefs, trade union affiliation, genetic data, biometric data, data concerning and sexual life or orientation.

These types of data are described in the GDPR as "Special categories of data" and require higher levels of protection. We need to have further justification for collecting, storing and using this type of personal data.

We process special categories of personal data in the following circumstances:

- For the provision of social care to children and adults
- Where it is needed in order to carry out our specific legal obligations.
- Where it is needed for a matter of substantial public interest (such as in the case of a threat to public health)

Sometimes we may process this type of personal data in relation to legal claims or to protect your vital interests (or someone else's vital interests), and you are not capable of giving your consent. This also applies where you have already made the information public.

What do we use your data for?
The Council currently uses personal data for the following purposes:

- To deliver public services including to understand your needs, to provide the services that you request, and to understand what we can do for you and inform you of other relevant services
- To confirm your identity
- To contact you
- To help us to build up a picture of how we are performing
- To prevent and detect fraud and corruption in the use of public funds and, where necessary, for the law enforcement functions
- To enable us to meet all legal and statutory obligations and powers including any delegated functions
- To carry out comprehensive safeguarding procedures (including due diligence and complaints handling) in accordance with best safeguarding practice, from time to time with the aim of ensuring that all children and adults-at-risk are provided with safe environments, and as necessary to protect individuals from harm or injury
- To protect the use of public funds
- To maintain our own accounts and records
- To seek your views, opinions or comments
- To notify you of changes to our facilities, services, events and staff, councillors and other role holders
- To send you communications which you have requested and that may be of interest to you. These may include information about campaigns, appeals, other new projects or initiatives
- To process relevant financial transactions including grants and payments for goods and services supplied to the council
- To allow the statistical analysis of data so we can plan the provision of services

How long do we keep your personal data?
The Council will only retain and store your data for as long as it is needed for the purpose for which it was collected, or as required by the law, or as dictated by best practice as recommended by the Information and Records Management Society (IRMS).
We will keep some records permanently if we are legally required to do so. We may keep some other records for an extended period of time. For example, it is currently best practice to keep financial records for a minimum period of 8 years to support HMRC audits or provide tax information. We may have legal obligations to retain some data in connection with our statutory obligations as a public authority. The council is permitted to retain data in order to defend or pursue claims. In some cases the law imposes a time limit for such claims (for example, 3 years for personal injury claims or 6 years for contract claims). We will retain some personal data for this purpose as long as we believe it is necessary to be able to defend or pursue a claim. We will endeavour to keep data only for as long as we need it, and this means that we will delete it when it is no longer needed.

What is the legal basis for processing your personal data?
The council is a public authority and has certain powers and obligations. Most of your personal data is processed under our “official authority”. This means that it relates to local government responsibilities which have been established in legislation. When exercising

these powers or duties, it is necessary that we process personal data of residents or people using the council's services. We will always take into account your privacy interests and rights.
We may process personal data if it is necessary for the performance of a contract with you, or to take steps to enter into a contract. An example of this would be processing your data in connection with the use of sports facilities, or the acceptance of an allotment garden tenancy. This also includes the use of your data if you are a council member of staff.

Consent and GDPR
When you are asked to consent to a data controller's use of your personal data this implies the controller is relying on "consent" as the legal basis for such use. The GDPR introduces new rules about relying on consent.
Consent may not be used as the legal basis for processing your personal data if:

- You do not have a free choice
- You have not been provided relevant privacy information (what personal data may be used, how, and why)
- Refusing consent may have a negative impact on you (this is the case where consent is a condition of receiving the service you want)
- There is an imbalance of power between the person and the organisation requesting the consent. This is likely when the organisation is a public authority (such as the council)
- The GDPR provides a more appropriate basis for processing (such as for processing by public authorities in the exercise of their tasks).

The Council does not generally request consent for using your personal data as, in accordance with the rules above, it is not a valid legal basis for processing involved in carrying out our official functions and tasks.
We will request your consent for us to provide the actual support service we may be offering you. This choice should be informed with relevant privacy information and we will always tell you about how and why we will use your information to provide the service before you decide whether you agree to receive it.

Sharing your personal data with other data controllers
As part of the council's statutory functions and official tasks, we may share personal data with other public authorities such as the police, health authorities, government departments and schools.
In order to deliver support and services to you we also work with:

- Community groups and volunteers
- Charities
- Other not for profit entities

We may share personal data with other local authorities or not for profit bodies with which we are carrying out joint ventures e.g. in relation to facilities or events for the community.

Sharing of "special categories" data with public sector partners
We only share sensitive personal data in limited circumstances, where we are required to do so by law or where it is necessary to fulfil our statutory obligations. This includes providing a range of public sector services for your health and social care, and the safeguarding of vulnerable children and adults. The sharing of personal data will include the linking of data sets held by the council, the NHS, and other public sector partners to comply with our statutory duties and to provide joined up services.

Sharing of personal data with external service providers
Your personal information may be shared with external service providers, contracted to act on our behalf, in order to provide the public services and support you have requested from us. We will only share information which is relevant and necessary for the provision of the service.
The council relies on various suppliers and service providers who process data on our behalf. These companies are “data processors” for the council. This means we instruct them, under contract, on their use and treatment of the personal data we are responsible for.
We must also ensure they have adequate security measures in place to keep the information safe. We will not pass personal data to third parties for marketing, sales or any other commercial purposes without your prior and explicit consent.

Sharing your personal data for prevention of fraud
We must protect public funds and may use personal information and data-matching techniques to detect and prevent fraud, to ensure public money is targeted and spent in the most appropriate and cost-effective way. To achieve this information may be shared with other bodies responsible for auditing or administering public funds including the Audit Commission, the Department for Work and Pensions, other local authorities, HM Revenue and Customs, and the police.

Sharing your personal data to protect vital interests
We may also use personal information to identify and assist individuals whose vital interests are threatened, and /or who need additional support during emergencies or major incidents, for example emergency evacuation.

Data Protection Principles
The council is committed to adhering to the principles established in data protection law in its use of personal data. This means the use of your data should be:

- Lawful and transparent
- Used for the specified purpose (collected only for valid purposes that we have clearly explained to you and not used in any way that is incompatible with those purposes)
- Accurate and up to date
- Kept only as long as necessary for the purposes we have told you about and any other legal requirements we have
- Secure from unauthorised access, misuse or loss

Electronic Communications
We reserve the right to monitor and record electronic communications (website, email and phone conversations). There are a number of reasons why we may do this including staff training, and recording conversations for detection, investigation and prevention of crime. We will inform you if your call is being recorded or monitored.
Any email sent to us, including any attachments, may be monitored for security reasons and making sure they comply with our information governance policy. You have a responsibility to make sure any email you send to us is within the bounds of the law. Emails that we send to you or you send to us may be retained as a record of contact, and your email address stored for future use in accordance with our record retention schedule.

Appendix B Audley Grove area Consultation Letter

Dear Resident,

Re: TRO Public Consultation: Audley Grove area (extension to Residents' Parking Zone 26)

We are inviting your feedback on the final proposals to extend Residents' Parking Zone (RPZ) 26 in the Audley Grove area during a formal consultation running from **9 to 30 July 2026 at 5pm**.

After considering feedback from the informal public consultation in Autumn 2025, we have updated the design so that Edward Street is no longer included in the RPZ as originally proposed. Feedback indicated that the parking pressures on this street were not substantial enough to justify an RPZ and that the inclusion of Edward Street would significantly reduce parking capacity.

Besides the removal of Edward Street and a small adjustment to double yellow lines after a review of dropped-kerb applications, the proposals remain unchanged and are shown on the enclosed map. Detailed designs are available using the interactive online map and at our drop-in event (more details below).

Why we are proposing an RPZ

Recently, there has been more pressure on parking in the area, making it difficult for residents to find spaces close to their homes. The RPZ aims to prioritise parking for residents, reduce commuter parking and improve safety, while also catering for the needs of visitors, local businesses and tradespeople.

About Residents' Parking Zones

Residents and businesses that meet eligibility criteria can buy permits to park during the zone's operating hours (8am–6pm, Monday to Friday).
Zones typically include:

- Permit-holder only bays or areas, clearly marked on the street
- Short-stay bays for visitors near businesses and amenities
- Double yellow/single yellow lines to improve safety and visibility
- Concessions for Blue Badge holders and advisory disabled bays

Permit eligibility, how RPZs work, and indicative costs based on the current tariffs are explained on our consultation webpage. **Please note that permit prices are currently under review,** and more information about this can be found online.

How to take part in the consultation

From **Thursday 9 July,** please visit our consultation webpage at **www.bathnes.gov.uk/AudleyGroveRPZ** (or scan the QR code) to:

- view the detailed design on an interactive map
- learn more about how RPZs work and the costs of permits
- complete the short online survey (with free text for your comments)

The consultation closes at **5pm on Thursday 30 July 2026.**

Consultation drop-in event

You can speak with an advisor in person or view large-scale maps, at our drop-in event at **Weston Methodist Church on Monday 20 July from 3pm to 7pm.**

If you have accessibility needs for the drop-in event, please let us know in advance.

Get support
If you need help accessing the survey or viewing the interactive map, or if you'd like the information in a different format (e.g. printed, large print), support is available from local B&NES libraries and information centres, or you can contact us using the information below.

- Email **LN_RPZ@bathnes.gov.uk**
- Call 01225 394025 and ask for a call back from a team member.

If you cannot access the online survey and wish to respond, you can write to us quoting: Audley Grove TRO Consultation 26-045 to: Traffic Management Team, Bath and North East Somerset Council, Lewis House, Manvers Street, Bath, BA1 1JG. Please clearly state whether you support or object to the proposal and your grounds.

Thank you for taking the time to share your views. We will consider all feedback before deciding whether to extend the zone later this year.

The Liveable Neighbourhoods Team
Bath and North East Somerset Council