

Plan	Road / Street	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
	2 Bathwick Hill			X		I was sent a plan showing a proposed permit holders/4 hour limited waiting which extended from 6-9 Bathwick Hill. You can imagine my disappointment when the plans displayed for public consultation showed that the new restriction only extends as far as no.7 Bathwick Hill. We have exactly the same issues as no. 6-7 and if we are not included in the proposed scheme, it will make the parking situation outside our property even worse, as the amount of free parking will be reduced. There are 3 main issues on this congested stretch of Bathwick Hill which is close to the Cleveland Walk junction and on a bend in the road:1. Drivers parking their vehicles outside our property for long periods of time which deprives local residents and visitors of parking space. For example, we have had Aspect Builders park outside our property for up to 3 months when they have no use for a van. Similarly, we regularly see people park up and then go on holiday for two weeks taking advantage of the 'free parking'. On top of that there are of course the daily commuters who clog up the space for the whole day. 2. Drivers parking on the white line in front of our driveway gates so that it is impossible to exit our driveway. 3. The parking of commercial vehicles (typically vans), right up to the white lines outside out gates which, due to the vehicles height, makes it impossible to see the traffic coming up or down the Hill. Driving out of the gates safely is really a two person operation. There have also been two serious accidents outside nos. 9 and 8 Bathwick Hill. The first was in 2019 when a car crashed through our garden wall adjacent to the pavement (luckily no one was in the garden at the time it happened). This resulted in the rebuilding of 25metres of Bath stone walling. The second incident happened earlier this year when a car coming down the Hill clipped the passenger's side wing of our neighbour's car and drove off. The introduction of a dual use Zone A Permit Holders/2 hour limited waiting plan which extended to no.9 would greatly improve road visibility to allow the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles and go a very long way to solving the parking issues. I hope that you will be able to support the extension of the proposed scheme to include our property.
	2 Bathwick Hill			X		I am writing to you concerning the proposed Dual Zone A Permit Holders/2 hour limited waiting plan outside nos. 6-7 Bathwick Hill. I was sent a plan showing a proposed permit holders/4 hour limited waiting which extended from 6-9 Bathwick Hill. You can imagine my dismay when the notices which went up this week showed that the new restriction only extends as far as no.7 Bathwick Hill. We have exactly the same issues as no. 6-7 and if we are not included in the proposed scheme, it will make the parking situation outside our property even worse as the amount of free parking will be reduced. There are 3 main issues: 1. People parking their vehicles outside our property for long periods of time which deprives local residents and visitors of parking space. For example, we have had Aspect Builders park outside our property for up to 3 months when they have no use for a van. Similarly we have often seen people park up and then go on holiday for two weeks. On top of that there are of course the daily commuters who clog up the space for the whole day. 2. People parking on the white line in front of our driveway gates so that it is impossible to exit our driveway. 3. The parking of vans right up to the white lines outside out gates which makes it impossible to see the traffic coming up or down the Hill. I have photographic evidence of all these problems. The introduction of a Dual Zone Zone A Permit Holders/2 hour limited waiting plan which extended to no.9 would greatly improve road visibility to allow the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles and go a very long way to solving the parking issues. I hope that you will be able to support the extension of the proposed scheme to include our property.
	2 Bathwick Hill	X				The loss of resident parking in the Bathwick Hill, Zone 1 area is becoming a significant concern. Combining Plan 6 with Plan 2, along with the recent addition of a bike hanger station outside 6 Vane Street, will drastically decrease the available parking spaces for Zone 1 residents. This is compounding the reduction of parking spaces in this zone from implementing the current 3 coach bays spaces, to which 12 resident parking spaces have been lost. Resident parking spaces are already oversubscribed for zone 1.

	7 Brock Street		X		<p>As a resident of Brock Street, we, and several of our neighbours, were very inconvenienced by 2022 reinstatement of the two disabled bays on the eastern end of Brock Street and welcome this review. The reinstatement of these bays exacerbated pressure on Brock Street parking caused after the whole of the West terrace of The Circus was made 'Central Permit Holder Only' and so occasional parking was pushed onto Brock Street pay and display. The subsequent restriction of a further two out of 24 bays on Brock Street solely for disabled parking, unless residents, is creating immense pressure for residents of Brock Street. It would be helpful for these bays to be reviewed in the context of other disabled bays on Brock Street, Rivers St, Catherine Place many of which are often empty particularly overnight, suggesting they are not used by Blue badge residents. The eastern bays are very often empty overnight and for much of the day, while we and other residents are having to park some distance away. There are two cars that have used the bays periodically, who are presumably local residents who are blue badge holders. On other occasions, these cars are parked in general resident's bays, presumably closer to their place of residence. It may be preferable, given their mobility issues, to have designated parking outside their place of residence. However, this has the perverse effect of occupying a general resident's bay than any resident could use, while the disabled bays further from their residence are empty. Of course, any local residents with blue badges should be consulted for their views on parking, we would not presume to know what would best meet their needs. However, it would be helpful for the Council to consider whose needs the disabled bays are designed to meet. It seems the re-designation may not adequately meet the needs of local residents who are blue-badge holders, who exhibit a preference to park closer to their residence; or those residents who are not blue-badge holders by further increasing the pressure on limited bays; or visiting blue-badge holders who can park for free on single and double yellow lines where no loading ban applies (maximum stay of 3 hours) in any circumstance. We welcome review of the disable designation and at minimum plan 7 for one of the bays to be made available to central permit holders.</p>
	6 Pulteney Road	X			<p>I wish to make representation on the the proposal as above where it affects the re-designation of coach parking in Pulteney Road. I am aware of the pressures on the City from visitors and tourists, and I have read the 2017 Buro Happold report on coach strategy. The closure of South Keys for the Riverside development has certainly put pressure on coach parking because the current alternatives do not meet the demand. Weston Gate and Odd Down are underused and unpopular. There might be alternatives such as developing the Homebase site for instance which could offer drop off and long term parking with good facilities for rest and breaks for coach drivers. Pulteney Road lacks these. Objection Rationale: We live equidistant between the railway bridge and the roundabout at Bathwick Hill (where traffic moves slowly). Pulteney Road has a 30 mph limit, not enforced or monitored. I have written several times to the Traffic team with photographic evidence to illustrate the danger we face daily to exit our drive into unseen fast moving traffic because our sight line is often completely obstructed. The coaches are parked right up to the edge of our drive, (and often well over). We are moving into traffic coming from the right with no leeway to edge out. This is extremely hazardous, and often impossible to manoeuvre without a 3rd party standing on the road to indicate when it is clear and safe to move out. The situation is dangerous not just for us but for other road and pavement users such as cyclists and pedestrians. Our neighbours experience similar difficulty, and I have previously sent signed correspondence to the team to confirm this. Objection 1. This relates to the modifications to the current coach parking allocations put forward by the team. The new proposals offer to reduce the parking facility on our right to 1 coach and 1 minibus. The parking width is reduced to 2700 mms and the parking zone is to be shortened by 1500 mms. In practical terms this does nothing to alleviate the problem as our sight line is still completely obstructed; and the overlap from a coach chassis will still abut our exit line even when the wheels are in the zone because the coaches are so enormous. Thus I continue to request that the coach parking area is reduced by at least one full coach length to allow for residential car parking only. We can see over cars but we cannot see through coaches. This would reduce the overall Bath coach parking by one only - which cannot be considered a significant reduction, given the large number of coaches entering Bath; and would provide some more parking for local visitors. It would make our lives tolerable again. Objection 2 This concerns the 90 minute drop off. We live in the CAZ and we support all anti-pollution measures which improve our health and welfare. Coaches park for (at least) 90 minutes, when all they require for drop off is 10 minutes. There are no local facilities for drivers to rest or take a proper break with toilet facilities; in consequence they often idle their engines for long periods to use the interior heating or air-conditioning for their comfort, and that of returning passengers. This increases pollution and is entirely counterproductive to the regulatory requirements set central by government and locally by the Council. So coach parking in the whole of Pulteney Road should be for 10 minute drop off only, with no allowance for longer term parking. The term '90 minute drop off' is something of an oxymoron - it cannot be short and long term parking at the same time. Summary: 1) That the new proposals are modified to allow the removal of one coach length to the right of our drive. 2) That the remaining spaces allow for a 10 minute drop off only to ensure anti-pollution measures are met in the CAZ. We trust that these modifications will be acceptable in the spirit of Improving People's Lives.</p>

6	Pultney Road	X			<p>I am a resident living on Vane Street who struggles to find a place to park as it is, but these coaches are getting out of hand. Constantly parking in resident bays on Pultney South. I have sent Manda Rigby numerous photos of coaches in resident bays. I do not believe that this new proposition of extra coach bays on Pultney South is in any way going to help. Firstly it's going to slow down traffic in the area, cause more congestion, decrease the air quality that the council supposedly care about but I believe is greenwashing otherwise you wouldn't suggest more coaches here. Secondly it's going to attract more coaches to the area which I believe will increase the likelihood of them parking in resident bays. We never used to have this issue!!! I want to know what you're doing to protect resident parking - one space on Vane Street has already been removed in favour of a bike bay. Are you protecting resident spaces on Pultney South?</p>
6	Pultney Road	X			<p>I wish to object to Plan 6 part of proposal 23-012. "Plan 6 – Pultney Road, Bath – A proposal to introduce a new Coach Parking bay on the eastern side of Pultney Road and to shorten [sic] two of the existing Coach Parking bays on the western side by extending the No Parking At Any Time restrictions, was requested by the local Ward Member to improve property access. A separate review of the council's Coach Strategy will be taking place at a later date." 1. The loss of resident parking in the Bathwick Hill, Zone 1 area is becoming a significant concern. Combining Plan 6 with Plan 2, along with the recent addition of a bike hanger station outside 6 Vane Street, will drastically decrease the available parking spaces for Zone 1 residents. This is compounding the reduction of parking spaces in this zone from implementing the current 3 coach bays spaces, to which 12 resident parking spaces have been lost. Resident parking spaces are already oversubscribed for zone 1. The proposal fails to adequately represent or quantify the potential impact on resident parking. It is not clear how many resident parking spaces have been lost when accounting for all the changes in the area. By my estimation, these combined measures have/will result in the loss of approximately 15-20 parking spaces in the Bathwick Hill/Zone 1 area. This doesn't consider the loss of parking spaces due to bays for Bath Rugby coaches implemented a few years ago. Therefore, we strongly believe that any further reduction in resident parking in the area is unjustified and fails to adequately balance the interest of the residents and that of the city. 2. Proposal 6 contravenes with the recommendations made in the 'Bath Coach Parking and Pick-Up/Drop-Off Strategy Final Report 035699 24 August 2017, Revision 03', where it was recommended that only 3 coach bays are created on Pultney Road. As stated: "Pultney Road, the inclusion of the maximum 7 coach spaces would mean a significant loss of car parking. It is proposed, therefore, that no more than 3 coach bays are provided in that location, meaning a car parking reduction of only 12 spaces, which are pay and display/zone 1 residents parking spaces." 3. We note that proposal 6 states a review of the council's Coach Strategy will be taking place at a later date, but no time frame has been set. Therefore, we think it is inappropriate to further increase the number of coach bays on Pultney street without a review of the current coach strategy. 4. Coaches frequently violate parking rules on Pultney road. Attached are several photos of coaches parking erratically on Pultney Road, outside of their designated parking bays (taken in August 2023). This aligns with the concerns raised by Parking Services in 23-012 regarding the lack of adequate staff to oversee and enforce parking regulations on Pultney road. 5. Concerns regarding potential hazards. Bicycles on pavements: Since the introduction of the coach bays in the area, there's been a notable increase in bicycles using the pavement. It seems cyclists feel unsafe navigating past the large coaches on the road, compelling them to resort to sidewalks which poses its own set of risks to pedestrians. Blocked access and reduced visibility: Coaches often obstruct residents' access to their properties and drastically reduce visibility when they attempt to enter the road, creating potential danger hotspots. While Plan 6 is presented as a solution to the aforementioned concerns, we believe that in practice it will exacerbate the issues. As the old adage goes: "In theory there is no difference between theory and practice - in practice there is". By allowing more coaches, it adds to the congestion of an already busy road, increasing the chances of mishaps and accidents. 6. Coach parking has a significant detrimental environmental impact on Pultney Street and its residents. Pultney Road, a non-designated heritage asset located within a conservation area, is known for its tree-lined avenue that contributes to Bath's unique beauty. This old, beautiful avenue is</p>
15	Pultney Road	X			<p>I object to the introduction of zone 2 resident parking on Pultney Road South. The reasons for this being: 1) impact on the remaining free parking in the nearby area (eg. around Sydney gardens/ Bathwick st Mary church/ Tesco Bathwick hill. 2) Lack of use of the nearby paid parking on A36 between Sydney place and Vane street. The councils records will I am sure show that since introducing restrictions and charges on this stretch that the parking is not being used, unlike this parking which is similarly located and well used for access to courts, sports centre, cricket club, river walks and town. The same will happen to this stretch and not raise the revenue the council expect from installing restrictions. 3) loss of business for local businesses - e.g. customers of shops in town centre/ I will cancel my membership at Better leisure as it is too expensive/ time consuming to go to gym or pool on way home from work if I have to pay for parking/ walk from my home (there are no regular buses). 4) houses on this stretch have lots of private parking for multiple cars/ the coop funeral parlour has off street parking. 5) conflicts with aims to improve health/ lifestyles of residents as this free parking encourages sports facilities/ cricket pitch/ rec ground use of those on limited budget.</p>

5 Royal Crescent	X				<p>I am responding to the proposed changes to parking and parking restrictions in the Royal Crescent, Bath as set out in your letter dated 2nd August 2023 and also available on-line. Before I respond, I would like to point out that having discussed this matter with a number of my neighbours and the Royal Crescent Society, who represent the residents of the Royal Crescent in matters such as these, it would appear that whilst the occupants of No 29 have received a copy of your letter, your letter has not been received by all other houses in the Royal Crescent. From a quick check, the residents of house numbers 27, 26, 22, 13, 14, 12, 10, 5 and 2, and the Hotel at No 15/16 have not received any letters, all of whom are affected by your proposed changes. In addition, I cannot see a formal notice on the railings / lamppost near the affected areas. I have therefore forwarded your letter to the Royal Crescent Society, who will no doubt respond on behalf of all residents of the Royal Crescent. Our response: Having consulted with my fellow residents in No 29 Royal Crescent: 1. We strongly object to your proposed changes IF they involve the removal of any of the designated resident parking spaces outside No 30 Royal Crescent (The two spaces between the stone steps and the bollards at the western end of the Crescent in particular). 2. We will support your changes PROVIDED they involve the proper reinstatement of the resident parking spaces outside No 30 Royal Crescent AND clearly mark out the no waiting, no stopping, no loading at any time areas along the remaining sides of the road and along the bollards – thus protecting the safety turning circle originally put in place.</p>
5 Royal Crescent	X				<p>I fully support the need for a turning space at the western end of Royal Crescent since the closure of the access to Marlborough Buildings in 1997. When this was reviewed some years ago it was agreed that two parking spaces could be marked out immediately west of the stone steps outside no. 30, and in practice, it has been found that the remaining space is adequate even for large vehicles to turn. I therefore strongly object to the removal of those two spaces while supporting the remainder of the TRO, and request that the now faded markings are reinstated, with the old yellow lines within them removed, and with the other yellow lines in the turning area not only renewed but also enforced. It is common to see cars parked overnight in that area making turning difficult, especially for emergency vehicles.</p>
5 Royal Crescent	X				<p>The Society fully supports the need for a turning space at the western end of Royal Crescent since the closure of the access to Marlborough Buildings in 1997. When this was reviewed some years ago it was agreed that two parking spaces could be marked out immediately west of the stone steps outside no. 30, and in practice, it has been found that the remaining space is adequate even for large vehicles to turn. We therefore strongly object to the removal of those two spaces while supporting the remainder of the TRO, and request that the now faded markings are reinstated, with the old yellow lines within them removed, and with the other yellow lines in the turning area not only renewed but also enforced. It is common to see cars parked overnight in that area making turning difficult, especially for emergency vehicles. We are concerned that notice of this proposal was sent only to a very limited number of residents, and that no notice was posted at the site. Because parking spaces are so limited relative to the number of parking permits issued, finding a space to park is often difficult, and any reduction of the space available is something that affects all residents in Royal Crescent. Please include the Society in any future dissemination of information on proposed changes, either by post or email to the addresses below.</p>
5 Royal Crescent	X				<p>I object to the enforcement of this order for the following reasons. The bays were introduced after the West end of the Royal Crescent was closed in the late 1990's. I was on the committee of the Royal Crescent Society at that time and consultation was made with the Highways Dept as to an appropriate area for emergency service vehicles to turn around. I have lived in the Royal Crescent for over 35 years and, on occasions, have seen a Fire Appliance turn round in that area with the aid of a Fire Fighter acting as banksman for the driver in accordance with established procedures. The problem about which the resident refers is not due to the designated parking bays but due to the white line markings having faded and cars parking beyond the designated area causing the problem to which the reference is made. It can clearly be seen by the thick line across the old double yellow line now showing through as to where the bay should end. All that is necessary is the reinstatement of the white markings and not the withdrawal of the end bay. The problem to which the resident refers will then be alleviated. There has been no direct consultation with Royal Crescent residents either by mail or by the posting of Notices in the street and I only found out about this via a member of another Residents' Association. I attach 3 photographs:- No 1 showing a Jeep type of vehicle parked just short of the end of the designated bay where you can see the marking on the double yellow line. No 2 showing that there is adequate turning space at what should be the end of the bay behind that vehicle when legally parked. No 3 showing a BMW Coupe, illegally parked, over that line restricting turning space. Once again, I would ask that the white lines designating the parking area are reinstated and the bays are not withdrawn after which, there should be greater enforcement.</p>

	5 Royal Crescent	X			<p>I understand that the Order referred to above will involve the removal of the two parking spaces immediately to the West of the steps, in front of number 30 Royal Crescent. Whilst I fully appreciate the need for adequate turning space at the west end of the Crescent, in my experience there has rarely been any problem with the space currently allocated for this purpose and there is absolutely no necessity to extend the space available for turning, by the removal of the two parking spaces in question. Finding a parking space for residents, in the Crescent, is already very difficult, at times and the removal of these two spaces will exacerbate the issue. I therefore strongly object to this proposal. However, I think it would be useful to refresh the double yellow lines in the existing turning area, to deter illegal parking and it would also remove some confusion if the defunct yellow lines in the current spaces, in front of number 30, could be removed and if the bays could be more clearly delineated, in white.</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>I am concerned with the proposal to remove 3 parking spaces along St Ann's Way for the following reasons (in no particular order of importance): 1. When cars are parked at that particular point in the road, other cars naturally slow down as their view is restricted (I have already noted in my short time here that St Ann's is used as a cut through to/from North Road and Sydney Gardens). Take these away and speed will increase. 2. These parking spaces make up a third of the available parking spaces for residents on St Ann's Way. As it stands we have 9 spaces to share between us. Most residents have two cars and 1950s garages not built for anything larger than an equivalent-aged mini traveller. My question - may I ask what you're proposing as a replacement? 3. I understand this is being proposed "on behalf of residents". Quite disingenuous. I'm a resident: Please take this email as my vociferous objection to the proposed removal of parking spaces.</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>The decision to progress this TRO, states "The Council's policy framework has been used as the basis to develop the scheme with full engagement with stakeholders across the area." As a resident who lives opposite the concerned parking strip, I strongly disagree that the residents affected have been engaged, nevermind fully. Furthermore, when it states that "The arguments both for and against the scheme were clearly identified and were considered fully as part of the decision making process..." what were these as it would appear to be based on "...to prevent obstruction of the highway" This is not a very comprehensive reason for the removal and should be specific to the specific restriction. Based on an average car size of 5m, the existing parking along the northern end of St Ann's Way will be significantly reduced with the removal of this 12m stretch. I would also point out that the driveways between No 11 and No 19 are only sufficient for one parking space, with a number of properties changing ownership recently, modern living typically results in 2 vehicles per household thus increasing pressure for parking on this road. Moreover, these particular properties have recently, and will continue to, modernise creating more traffic from tradespeople, albeit temporarily. These parking spaces are important for both residents and visitors alike and we need to ensure that an informed discussion is held with all residents of St Ann's Way, as this current proposal has not been communicated fully with us. The only means of communication was one notification on a single lamppost during the month of August when a lot of residents were on holidays. Based on the statutory minimum period of 3 weeks, and given it is peak holiday season, it would have been appreciated if the consultation period were extended by a couple of weeks. I would also argue that for the purposes of ensuring the notifications were visible for pedestrians, at least one more notification to the other side of the proposed restriction was displayed. In terms of possible solutions, there are two – firstly, a blue badge holder space is created which based on the existing residents in the vicinity wouldn't be used. Alternatively, a single yellow line clearly stating a defined period and in line with the resident needs, say a 12 hour window for example 7 am to 7 pm may work as the majority of the vehicle movements would be during the day? There is a scenario created that residents will park on the opposite side as the yellow line has worn away and therefore, technically, can park creating a chicane effect which I'm sure you would agree is not the intent of the Local Authority. Based on the lack of clarity and communication regarding Plan 3, I object to the proposed "No Parking at Any Time" for a 12 m section of parking. If this proposal is approved, I strongly believe it will cause significant tension within the community as all residents are aware of the original proposals from one household.</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>I am writing to object to the proposal for parking restrictions between 9-11 St Ann's Way, Bathwick. This proposal is unfair as it will take away much needed parking for residents and their visitors. Parking in St Ann's Way has become even more important because of the restrictions previously introduced further up beyond number 22 St Ann's Way where permit parking is now only available to residents of the Sham Castle Lane parking zone. This has unfairly disadvantaged St Ann's Way residents as it prevents them from parking in their own road. This latest proposal for parking restrictions between 9-11 St Ann's Way will further compound the problem and I do not agree with the justification provided that it will improve safety. Having lived in this road for over 20 years, I have not found that parking here obstructs the highway. Instead, the parking assists with traffic calming as it helps to reduce the speed of vehicles on this part of the road. Please do not introduce additional parking restrictions.</p>

3	St Anns Way	X				I am a resident of Ann's Way, Bath and I would like to make an objection to the parking restriction plan Reference No (23-012). This is on the grounds that residents on my side of the road only have max x1 parking space in their driveways and rely on the availability of some street parking for guest parking and for resident parking also as most houses have a second vehicle. Loosing x3 valuable parking spaces will cause a big problem for the street. This is especially true as the road currently has no resident parking so spaces are often taken by non residents parking and walking into town which already restricts resident parking on the street.
3	St Anns Way	X				I am writing to object to the above traffic restriction order on St Ann's Way, this is an application to remove 3 parking spaces on St Ann's Way. Firstly it must be noted that there is not enough available parking on St Ann's Way as it stands, reducing the available parking further will add to the frustrations residents suffer when friends, family and tradesmen visit and can't park. This in turn leads to people parking on existing double yellows causing a hazard. The demographic of St Ann's Way has changed, with younger families moving in, at least 3 in the last two years, these families will have children who will be learning to drive, our daughter is 18 and currently learning to drive, once she has a license she will buy a car, and will need to park it somewhere. In 8 months our son will start learning as well. Removing the spaces on St. Ann's way will encourage rat run drivers to speed, as the parked cars act as a traffic calming measure. This will increase the risk of accidents in the street, by creating two lanes before a blind corner where currently only one exists. I would also like to point out that there are 3 parking spaces on St Anns Way unavailable to residents as they fall into the sham castle way residents scheme, removing 3 more seems bizarre, I wonder why it is being proposed, there is a consensus amongst residents that we don't want to lose any more. The TRO states that this is being done on behalf of a request from residents, I wonder by how many and why, this information should be made public so residents can be consulted. The TRO states that it would be made (a) To prevent danger to persons using the road. In fact removing these spaces will increase the risk of speeding, as I said before. (b) For preventing damage to the road. There is no way it can be argued that parking on the road will damage it. (c) For facilitating the passage on the road of any class of traffic. This proposal will make no material difference to pedestrians, or vehicular traffic, except to encourage speeding. (d) For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic which is unsuitable. In fact removing these spaces will encourage parking on double yellows, as there will not be enough parking for residents needs. (e) For preserving the character of the road where it is especially suitable for people on horseback or on foot. As there is a perfectly good pavement and no regular horseriders, this clause is not relevant (f) for preserving the amenities through which the road runs. In fact if this TRO if enacted it will do the opposite to this as parking for residents will be removed. I would also like to point out that we have had no notification of this other than a notice posted on the other end of the street, as we live opposite these spaces, this is important to us, yet we have not been consulted or informed about this. This is a small part of a larger order, yet will have a massive negative impact on residents of St Anns Way, it would be wrong for this to be nodded through without proper consultation.
3	St Anns Way				X	The plan supplied regarding the above Traffic Management site implies that the whole of the parking area between No.9 and No.11 St. Anne's Way is under threat of removal. The original request was made requesting reversing space made available opposite No.14 requiring the removal of only one parking space. There is a campaign amongst residents in the area, created mainly by people who already have the facility for parking two cars on their premises, who are vigorously against the removal of all the parking spaces. We acknowledge that the parking facility is essential to several residents in the road and request some clarification regarding the proposed plan.
3	St Anns Way	X				Please note my objection to the proposals to reduce the number of cars that can park in St Anns Way. I object on the grounds that we will no longer be able to provide child care to my daughter-in-law who is an NHS GP as we will not be able to stay parked for long enough if at all. Why you should want to put jobs in jeopardy I cannot understand. Few people not connected to that area use it now as there is little enough on-street parking as it is.
3	St Anns Way	X				Based on the lack of clarity and communication regarding Plan 3, I object to the proposed "No Parking at Any Time" for a 12 m section of parking. If this proposal is approved, I strongly believe it will cause significant tension within the community as all residents are aware of the original proposals from one household. (Please see full letter in file)

	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>Objection in relation to the extension of No Parking at any time in St Anns Way. I utilise those spaces regularly. Our street is sandwiched between two different restricted parking zones which we cannot obtain permit for, and as such there is already a shortage of parking on our street. I am one of the many households with a small drive and rely on being able to park on our street. Otherwise the nearest non-permitted parking regularly available is a steep walk (with a pram) up on North Road. I note several residents of the street have made request for the street to become residents parking only, such is the demand of parking on our street. I can see from the council website the reason for this proposition was "requested by the local Ward Members on behalf of local residents to prevent obstruction of the highway" - However Living metres away and driving and cycling up and down this spot most days, with a workdesk overlooking this location, I have never seen any traffic, or obstruction caused. The only reason I can see for this being requested is by one of the neighbours who has just expended their driveway to facilitate room for their Land Rover, having more room to manoeuvre in and out. This is an unhelpful proposition. Please do not reduce our already insufficient parking on the street. This weekend for example, I could not park on my street, or the adjoining streets because the roads are permitted, so i had to walk probably 300m down the hill (and I will have to go back up). A reduced number of spaces will only make this worse (especially as I have a small child).</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>By making it as difficult as possible to contribute to the proposal it seems BANES is attempting to assuage the unreasonable demands of a what must be a minority of residents by 'getting these proposals in under the radar'. The TRO states the proposal is on behalf of 'several residents' but does not indicate the reasons. It is difficult to see how residents can make meaningful contributions without being able to fully consider the pros and cons of the proposal. To the extent removing these spaces poses some benefit to certain residents this must be weighed against the negative impacts of removing these spaces on the entire street and the neighbouring streets, which will be significant, both in the short and longer term. I would like to register my objection to this proposal on the following grounds using the purported reasons for the TRO.</p>
	3 St Anns Way		X		<p>Roads are for the safe passing and re-passing of traffic, in preference to parking. No 14 is the only right angle access without full road width access. This proposal would remove the dangers to traffic movement and access.</p>
	3 St Anns Way		X		<p>I am writing in support of the new proposed 'No parking at any time' on St. Anne's Way, Bathwick. The bends and the changes in elevation of the road, together with overhanging trees make this a blind corner when travelling north from Bathwick Hill towards Sham Castle Lane. An extension to the double yellow lines from the top of St. Mary's Close in a northerly direction would be a significant improvement.</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>I am a resident of number St Anns Way and have been informed of the above TRO to remove 3 parking spaces in the roadway just outside of my home, for which I would object on the following grounds: There has never been any difficulty in general traffic including refuse lorries being able to access and move freely along the roadway and do not believe any cars parked in the bays referred to in 23-012 cause any obstruction or danger to other vehicles or pedestrians. Removing the 3 spaces will not facilitate the passage of any vehicles any more freely as there will still be parked vehicles in the rest of the roadway further along. When cars are parked in the spaces (which is more often than not) they seem to act as a speed limiter – which, with young families now having moved into the street would be another concern – cars approaching from the direction of St Marys Close will slow down on approaching the bend, and then the parked cars. We believe the current set up (along with the 20 mph limit) aids the road safety. Considering the number of properties in St Anns Way and the 2 connecting roads (St Marys Close and St Catherines Close), we have very little on street parking available to residents and the removal of 3 spaces would not be helpful. The demographic of the street is changing as young families are moving into homes previously occupied by single elderly residents (3 properties in this year already) Before raising this objection and in order that we could consider the needs and requests of any other residents in the street, I approached our Ward Councillors to elaborate on why there was the need for the spaces to be removed; however unfortunately no further information has been made available – except those listed on the official correspondence (excerpt above). We were not made aware of any informal consultations to this proposal.</p>

	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>I wish to object to Part 1 of the above order as it applies to removing 3 street parking places from St Annes Way. There seems to be no justified reasoning behind this proposal. The only reasoning given is that it is "at the request of local ward members and local residents". I believe there are only a couple of residents in St Annes Way who support this proposal for personal reasons. Most residents in St Annes Way are against this proposal which will remove 3 of the 9 spaces currently provided and where it is currently difficult to find day time parking for residents and visitors to St Annes Way. My wife and I are elderly relatives of a St Annes Way resident and already struggle to park when visiting to provide childcare. It seems nonsensical to reduce on street parking for St Annes Way by a third when there is already insufficient spaces for residents and when there is increasing use/demand from residents due to larger and younger families moving into the street. Implementing the Order will make parking for residents and their visitors like us even more difficult. I ask you to remove that part of the order that applies to St Annes Way</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>I am writing to object to the above traffic restriction order on St Ann's Way, this is an application to remove 3 parking spaces on St Ann's Way. Firstly it must be noted that there is not enough available parking on St Ann's Way as it stands, reducing the available parking further will add to the frustrations residents suffer when friends, family and tradesmen visit and can't park. This in turn leads to people parking on existing double yellows causing a hazard. The demographic of St Ann's Way has changed, with younger families moving in, at least 3 in the last two years, these families will have children who will be learning to drive, our daughter is 18 and currently learning to drive, once she has a license she will buy a car, and will need to park it somewhere. In 8 months our son will start learning as well.</p> <p>Removing the spaces on St. Ann's way will encourage rat run drivers to speed, as the parked cars act as a traffic calming measure. This will increase the risk of accidents in the street, by creating two lanes before a blind corner where currently only one exists. I would also like to point out that there are 3 parking spaces on St Anns Way unavailable to residents as they fall into the sham castle way residents scheme, removing 3 more seems bizarre, I wonder why it is being proposed, there is a consensus amongst residents that we don't want to lose any more. The TRO states that this is being done on behalf of a request from residents, I wonder by how many and why, this information should be made public so residents can be consulted. The TRO states that it would be made (a) To prevent danger to persons using the road. In fact removing these spaces will increase the risk of speeding, as I said before. (b) For preventing damage to the road. There is no way it can be argued that parking on the road will damage it. (c) For facilitating the passage on the road of any class of traffic. This proposal will make no material difference to pedestrians, or vehicular traffic, except to encourage speeding.(d) For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic which is unsuitable. In fact removing these spaces will encourage parking on double yellows, as there will not be enough parking for residents needs. (e) For preserving the character of the road where it is especially suitable for people on horseback or on foot. As there is a perfectly good pavement and no regular horseriders, this clause is not relevant (f) for preserving the amenities through which the road runs. In fact if this TRO if enacted it will do the opposite to this as parking for residents will be removed. I would also like to point out that we have had no notification of this other than a notice posted on the other end of the street, as we live opposite these spaces, this is important to us, yet we have not been consulted or informed about this. This is a small part of a larger order, yet will have a massive negative impact on residents of St Anns way, it would be wrong for this to be nodded through without proper consultation.</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>I am writing to object to the TRO proposed for St Ann's Way namely the No Parking At Any Time restriction between house numbers 9 and 11, thus reducing the ability of St Ann's Way residents and their visitors (in particular health professionals, visitors with mobility issues and tradespeople) to park in the road. First, thank you for this consultation as, although this has been raised 'on behalf of local residents', it was not on my behalf. The reason given on page 5 of the TRO is 'to prevent obstruction of the highway', but I am struggling to see how parking here obstructs the highway any more than the rest of the parking along that side. The more general reasons given in section 2. Legal Authority have crosses against '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' and 'for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians)'. This situation has existed for as long as I have lived here (21 years) and I am not aware of any issues or incidents which introduction of this measure would help prevent. Conversely the parking tends to have the effect of calming the traffic so why would you take some of it away? If there are specific problems anticipated with regard to danger and obstruction rather than the generalised ones then surely these should be expressed? I feel I have no option but to object in order to find out why this is being proposed and whether there are any other solutions that could be explored that do not aggravate the existing parking arrangements.</p>

	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>My husband and I have been living in this Bathwick neighbourhood for some years now, and do not think the spaces should be removed for the following reasons: 1) The arrival of more families to the area has created the need for more parking spaces than the street even has. I'm sure you would not want to see families struggle to find parking near their home. It is unsustainable to remove parking spaces when they are so clearly needed. 2) The 3 car parking spaces make other drivers slower along this road as it is narrowed. Clearing the way by removing the spaces we believe would encourage drivers to pick up speed and therefore likely increase the level of traffic accidents. 3) I noticed the sign wasn't placed on the lamppost directly next to the area to which it is referring, but rather, much further down the street. This feels like the proposal has been sneaky, and this type of behaviour does not support our community values. These reasons above are evidence that removing the parking space would not be in the best interest of most current and of future residents. Furthermore, it would create difficulties and dangers, which contradicts the council's purpose to improve people's lives.</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>I wish to register my strong objection to Item 1 of Traffic Proposal reference 23-012 which proposes the removal of a three-car parking bay on St Ann's Way, and its replacement with double yellow lines. From my conversations with neighbours this proposal has come as a complete surprise to almost every resident, including myself, as we were completely unaware that the matter was even a topic of discussion. This is, in my opinion, an excessive and ill-considered proposal. It removes one third of the parking on this length of St Ann's Way. There are currently three separate three-car bays (9 spaces in total) and one bay would be removed entirely (leaving only 6 spaces). This scale of this loss of parking would have a very significant impact. The section of St Ann's Way between St Catherine's Close and Sham Castle Lane comprises primarily semi-detached properties (12 properties in total, relatively closely spaced) for which the driveways and garaging were designed in the era of one-car families owning the likes of Morris Minors, Austin A40s and, later, the original Austin Minis. Times and lifestyles have changed, greatly! Those same properties now need every possible on-street parking space to supplement their limited off-street parking (particularly for the odd-numbered properties on the left), The properties in the area generally have gradually evolved in terms of their accesses, with the old width-restricting concrete posts and steel gates being removed and driveways widened, but although this evolution will inevitably continue it cannot provide a substitute for on-street parking. To lose any existing on-street parking without in-depth discussion and justification would be highly regrettable, and detrimental to the needs of the majority of the residents of adjoining properties. I am submitting this objection in the context of having been involved with the parking deliberations in this vicinity for the past 36 years, both as an active participant and an observer. Our property is bounded approximately equally by St Ann's Way and St Catherine's Close, although the address is St Catherine's Close. My involvement peaked in 2005, when a highly contentious decision regarding continuous single yellow lines in St Catherine's and St Mary's Closes was 'called in' by Councillors for scrutiny. In that instance, although the decision was determined to have been properly made from a purely technical perspective, in reality it was immediately and comprehensively revised (with residents' full involvement) to include a significant number of specific unrestricted parking bays in the two Closes, of which almost all still exist today. Returning to the present proposal, in addition to providing much-needed parking the current bay, which is typically occupied during both daytime and evenings, serves a role in traffic calming. Unfortunately St Ann's Way is a 'rat run', in particular between Bathwick Hill and King Edward's School (via St Ann's Way, Sham Castle Lane and Cleveland Walk, then vice-versa), for both parents and car-driving pupils. Despite St Ann's Way having a 20mph restriction, drivers routinely ignore this, drive too fast, and cut the corners through the 'joggle' between St Ann's and St Catherine's Closes. The presence of the current parking bay contributes to reducing overall speeds and corner-cutting. While on the subject of parking in St Ann's Way, there is a previous and arguably also ill-considered decision which merits re-visiting. This is the decision to include the large parking bay (approximately 20m) on St Ann's Way at the Sham Castle Lane end to be within the Residents Parking Scheme for Sham Castle Lane. This decision was made at a time when the age profile of households was considerably older than it now is, with lower occupancy (i.e. less and smaller families than now) and typically one car per property if at all. With hindsight, there was insufficient discussion and scrutiny of the consequences of that decision. Those consequences include that in practice the 4-car bay is used virtually exclusively by one property which fronts onto Sham Castle</p>
	3 St Anns Way	X			<p>We are residents of St Ann's Way and wish to comment on the above proposal as it affects St Ann's Way. Although we have adequate parking we would like to add our points on behalf of neighbours who are not in such a fortunate position. 1. We are concerned that the loss of these three spaces would have a significant impact on the availability of parking in the street especially for those residents whose driveway will accommodate only one car. There are several such properties, most of which have new owners and who expect the parking to remain as it was when they purchased the house. With this proposal their visitors and tradespeople would find it much harder to find somewhere to park. 2. The houses all have garages but they were built in the 1950s when cars were considerably smaller, and are now unsuitable for modern vehicles. 3. The proposal would be a permanent loss of amenity to the road which could not be reinstated at a future date. This appears to be a disproportionately inconvenient solution to a minor problem which is likely to create other unforeseen problems in the long run. 4. We have lived here for over 40 years and the availability of these spaces has been useful for all the residents. Unfortunately the extensive introduction of RPZ in Bathwick Hill has had a knock on effect but one that is manageable.</p>

	3 St Anns Way	X			I object to the removal of parking space on St Ann's Way. I have recently moved to this area and it is obvious that parking spaces are in short supply and in frequent use. I use these spaces on a daily basis. There is adequate space along this road to allow for this permanent space and it seems very unreasonable and illogical to remove this and introduce further restriction. There is no counter measure proposal to mitigate this loss of amenity and I can see no benefit from the proposal.
	3 St Anns Way	X			I am a resident of number St Anns Way and have been informed of the above TRO to remove 3 parking spaces in the roadway just outside of my home, for which I would object on the following grounds: There has never been any difficulty in general traffic including refuse lorries being able to access and move freely along the roadway and do not believe any cars parked in the bays referred to in 23-012 cause any obstruction or danger to other vehicles or pedestrians. Removing the 3 spaces will not facilitate the passage of any vehicles any more freely as there will still be parked vehicles in the rest of the roadway further along. When cars are parked in the spaces (which is more often than not) they seem to act as a speed limiter – which, with young families now having moved into the street would be another concern – cars approaching from the direction of St Marys Close will slow down on approaching the bend, and then the parked cars. We believe the current set up (along with the 20 mph limit) aids the road safety. Considering the number of properties in St Anns Way and the 2 connecting roads (St Marys Close and St Catherine's Close), we have very little on street parking available to residents and the removal of 3 spaces would not be helpful. The demographic of the street is changing as young families are moving into homes previously occupied by single elderly residents (3 properties in this year already) Before raising this objection and in order that we could consider the needs and requests of any other residents in the street, we approached our Ward Councillors to elaborate on why there was the need for the spaces to be removed; however unfortunately no further information has been made available – except those listed on the official correspondence (excerpt above). We were not made aware of any informal consultations to this proposal. Thank you in advance for taking the time to look into this matter further and I hope my objections will be taken into consideration.
Additional Proposal Plan	Terrace Walk	X			Please may I register my objection to the proposed permanent implementation of the no waiting / no loading parking restrictions in Terrace Walk, Bath. Please can the Council divert its attention from being anti-car, anti-business and permit businesses to at least be able to trade? You will note from the photo's attached that ALL the loading bays and double yellow lines are being used. Thankfully, some of the parking officers can see the madness in this Council's existing restrictions and let businesses unload quickly. If you are going to implement this, please can you advise where all these vehicle delivering/unloading are supposed to go?
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoad Road		X		VinVineyards Residents' Association strongly supports this proposal Reference 23-012, to Introduce Central Permit Holder Only parking in lengths of Upper Hedgemoad Road, Bath. The Central Zone has a very high proportion of resident permit spaces to parking bays (and that is with only one vehicle permit allowed per household, while residents in other Zones can have two). The whole road was allocated from unrestricted parking to Zone 15 some years back, and this change would greatly help residents of the Central Zone, particularly those on the eastern side of the Zone where parking is especially limited.eyards Residents' Association strongly supports Item 4 of this proposal Reference 23-012, to Introduce Central Permit Holder Only parking in lengths of Upper Hedgemoad Road, Bath.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoad Road		X		I am writing to support this proposal on the letter with the above reference. This does accurately reflect my views on this point. It is clear to me that the parking spaces are currently much underutilised, especially when compared to the spaces in Ainslie's Belvedere and Caroline Place and the Central Zone as a whole. It could only be beneficial to have some of these spaces available to Central Zone permit holders and it seems very unlikely there would be any negative impact to Camden Zone residents.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoad Road		X		I am writing to support the proposal that half of the parking bays in Upper Hedgemoad park road should be central zone status. Since the whole road was given to zone 15 it is hardly used. At all times of the day there are 20-30 unused bays-these photos were taken at 7 pm today, 8 /8/23-there are nearly 30 unused bays. It seems extremely unfair that the central zone has so few parking spaces, compared to zone 15 which is a far wider area, with already ample parking. There has been enough time to monitor how this road is actually being used ,or not-the proof that it is not being used by zone 15, are the number of unused bays at all times. As one of the last shop owners on Belvedere, I am finding it more and more difficult to live and work from my premises-I need to park to load up my car with heavy curtains, poles and materials, and when clients come to the shop it is impossible for them to park. I pay business rates, council tax and a residents parking permit, and although the council says it wants independent shops in the center of Bath, there is absolutely no encouragement or support from them. I hope you will take into consideration the people who actually live here, and who try to make Bath a vibrant, working city.

Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		Please could you note my support for this proposal which is to change some of the parking spaces in Upper Hedgemoor Road to Central Zone Permit Holder Only. It would really make life a lot easier for those of us on Ainslie's Belvedere who spend evenings driving around the northern part of the central zone trying to find a space whilst there are many empty spaces at the Lansdown Road end of Upper Hedgemoor Road every evening. If Camden residents object to the proposed change, then they should go and look at the road any evening at 7pm when most people are home after work and see the unused spaces for themselves. I would like to see you note my support for point 4 which is to change some of the parking spaces in Upper Hedgemoor Road to Central Zone Permit Holder Only. It would really make life a lot easier for those of us on Ainslie's Belvedere who spend evenings driving around the northern part of the central zone trying to find a space whilst there are many empty spaces at the Lansdown Road end of Upper Hedgemoor Road every evening.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		I would like to write to say how much I would support upper Hedgemoor being rezoned to Central zone for parking. There are precious little spaces for us to park near our houses and they are mostly available for visitors as well. Upper Hedgemoor has many many spaces always and rarely used. It would be a huge benefit for us to have this added to central zone to avoid the aimless driving round in circles trying to find a spot within walking distance of our houses.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		I am Chairman of Ainslie's Belvedere and Caroline Place Residents' Association and thus represent the 35 members of this Association.. At our most recent meeting, we discussed the proposals we had made earlier through our Lansdown Ward Councillors and the minutes record that we all fully support the proposal in Paragraph 4 of your letter reference 23-012 dated 2 August 2023 to introduce Central Permit Holder Only parking in the lengths of Upper Hedgemoor Road. As you well know there is a paucity of resident only parking spaces in the Central Zone, not least in Ainslie's Belvedere, Caroline Place and Belvedere and the allocation of a few more spaces will not solve but will certainly help alleviate this problem. We know that many the existing parking spaces in Upper Hedgemoor Road (Zone 15) are underused, even at peak times of the day and in the evenings.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		Since the designation of the stretch of this road to area 15, I have observed that less than half the available parking spaces have been taken up. As a resident of Caroline Place (Central zone) it would seem logical, and very useful, to us to redesignate the park side of this quiet road for our use. Since we have only one parking place per household allotted in Central Zone, Upper Hedgemoor, Park side, would be a great resource for residents. I do hope this proposal will have your earliest consideration.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		I am writing to support the proposal to extend the Central parking zone into part of Upper Hedgemoor Road. Until recently this area was outside the controlled parking scheme, and thus available as overspill parking when I visited my parents locally. It was then added to Camden zone but is now little used, while the Central zone nearby has become increasingly congested with residents and visitors trying to park. Extra parking is urgently needed for Central, particularly in this locality. I therefore support the proposal.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road	X			I would like to object to the proposal of making parking central permit holders only along hedgemoor road. This is due to the limited space for permit number 15 holders to park in when this proposal goes through. I live in alpine gardens and with this proposal people who would usually park in hedgemoor road will be forced up to the already full stretch down gays hill leading to no parking for lots of residents.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road	X			I am writing to object to the proposals in relation to Upper Hedgemoor Road for the reasons set out below. Zone 15 cannot afford to lose spaces as it is already oversubscribed for the road space available. The spaces in Upper Hedgemoor Road are typically used as overspill when more congested roads are full. There is no justification for adding further spaces to the central zone which is already one of the largest zones. I promoted changes in this location only a few years ago that removed free parking and returned the spaces to zone 15. There is no reason why further changes are required so soon. This particular consultation is also flawed in that notification has not been issued directly to zone 15 permit holders all of whom are directly affected. The council should email all permit holders encouraging them to respond.

Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		As a resident of nearby Caroline Place (and a previous supporter of the free parking that existed on Upper Hedgemoor Road), I am writing to lobby for as many spaces as possible to become part of the Central Zone and residents only. My reasoning is 1. As we hold a Central residents' parking permit we frequently COMPETE with visitors that pay and park on Central Zone spaces. 2. We often can not park anywhere near our home day or night. 3. Upper Hedgemoor Road is very close to our house and is directly linked by the Drumway steps to Caroline Place. 4. If you look at the houses on Upper and Lower Hedgemoor Road quite a few have garages and/or off street parking so lessening their requirement for parking spaces on the road. 5. Since the spaces were changed from free parking to the Camden Zone, they are frequently EMPTY. 6. These parking spaces are empty both day and night which seems to prove there MUST be ample parking for Camden residents in this area of Hedgemoor Park. Because of these 6 reasons, I hope you seriously will consider changing the Upper Hedgemoor Road parking spaces to Central Zone RESIDENTS ONLY
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		I am writing in support of Order - 23-012 - Central Bath Area TRO Review - Proposed Parking Restrictions: "Introduce Central Permit Holder Only parking in lengths of Upper Hedgemoor Road, Bath" I live locally and frequently struggle to park our small car near our house, there always appears to be spare parking on Upper Hedgemoor Road so it would seem appropriate to transfer some of this parking to a zone with a higher need. I have written to our local councillor on this matter in the past so I am pleased to see it come up as part of this review.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		I'd like to add my name to the many who support the change from Zone 15 to Central Zone of the parking spaces along the stretch of Upper Hedgemoor Rd. above Hedgemoor Park. These car spaces there are NEVER fully used by residents of Zone 15 whereas Caroline Place and Ainslies Belvedere spaces are ALWAYS full weekends and evenings. It is only fair that those unused spaces in Upper Hedgemoor should be transferred to Central Zone from Zone 15. It would be of great benefit to Central Zone permit holders and no sacrifice to Zone 15 permit holders.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		I am a resident of Caroline Place and have a resident parking permit. Unfortunately, I am rarely able to park my car in Caroline Place or even in the near vicinity. This causes me considerable stress and certainly has a negative impact on being a resident of Bath. a) The Caroline Place bays are usually full. b) Cars using the bays often don't move for weeks at a time or longer. c) The three bays at the end of Caroline Place are virtually unusable. Parking there leaves the car at risk of being scraped or the wing mirrors knocked off. d) People park selfishly. It is possible to park three cars in the two bays in the lower part of Caroline Place but only if drivers are considerate. Please paint individual car-sized bays in these sections for clarification. e) As the bays are dual use i.e. Resident and metered parking, many people visiting Bath now use our road to park for long periods of time. Finally, the bays in Upper Hedgemoor Park are underused and usually empty along the whole stretch. I am sure the residents of Zone 15 would not be impacted by this change. Thank you for considering these changes, they would have a dramatic impact on our lives.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road		X		Since the designation of the stretch of this road to area 15, I have observed that less than half the available parking spaces have been taken up. As a resident of Caroline Place (Central zone) it would seem logical, and very useful, to us to redesignate the park side of this quiet road for our use. Since we have only one parking place per household allotted in Central Zone, Upper Hedgemoor, Park side, would be a great resource for residents. I do hope this proposal will have your earliest consideration.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemoor Road	X			Thank you for the letter and the proposed parking changes, specifically, introducing Central Permit Holder Only parking in lengths of Upper Hedgemoor Road Bath. We have been online as directed and we can't see which portion of this road is referred to? As two permit holders for zone 15 who park here every day, we are concerned that there will still be enough parking for zone 15 permit holders? May we ask if you have assessed how many permits are held on Upper Hedgemoor Road and nearby Camden Crescent for zone 15 in arriving at this proposal?

Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemead Road		X			I fully support his Traffic Order proposal. However I would like to make a couple of comments: When the parking spaces at the Lansdown Road end of Upper Hedgemead Road (UHR) were changed from free parking to RPZ only, at the same time the double yellow lines were extended to widen the road to allow the safe passing of cars that otherwise met in the single track area at the top of the road, and to enable access for emergency vehicles. This is very beneficial. However at present that area of the road available for parking is rarely fully parked during the day. I would request that the width of the road is reassessed to check that it will still accommodate emergency vehicles and other wide vehicles when the spaces are fully used. I mention this because cars, particularly SUV's are much wider than they were even a few years ago which may impact this safe passage. This should be taken into account. I did ask whether this section of UHR could be for Central Permit Holder parking only at the time, but was told it would be too confusing to have 2 different RPZ 's in one stretch of road. As the Central Zone is so over-subscribed I am pleased about this proposal but I hope it will be clearly signed to avoid confusion.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemead Road		X			I would like to support the proposal that Upper Hedgemead Park Road should be given to the central zone. I am one of the few traditional upholsterers left in Bath, and I work with Anne Le Coz on various projects. I collect and deliver large pieces of furniture and rolls of fabric to her shop and it is almost impossible to park anywhere near her shop. If at least there were parking spaces on that road, it would certainly help. Whenever I have driven down there, there always seems to be plenty of empty spaces. How is this a good use of valuable resources.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemead Road		X			I write in connection with the TRO consultation you are conducting regarding parking on Upper Hedgemead Road. We strongly support the proposal in Para 4 to allow central zone residents to park on the road. Currently this area is rarely used under the current zoning arrangements and would be of great benefit to those living on Caroline Place and Ainslie's Belvedere where residents parking is always scarce.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemead Road				X	We have lived in Ainslies Belvedere for 26 years we had a permit taken away from us and used to park in Upper Headmead all the time it was also great for family and friends as we have elderly relations who cannot walk very far so it was so convenient. Since you have zoned it it is always empty and the zone it was given to had plenty of parking. You are really making it impossible for people to have a easy time parking in Bath.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemead Road		X			I am writing in support of the proposed change to parking restrictions referred to above. I live on Caroline place, right next to Hedgemead road; Caroline Place is a small street, and there's a shortage of parking spaces, in addition, the street narrows to a dead end, so some of the available parking bays here can often become inaccessible due to poorly parked or too large vehicles. I frequently drive home from work only to have to turn around and head out of town again and to the 'park and ride' in order park up, whilst at the same time there are always vacant parking spaces on Hedgemead road, so close to my home. I would be so grateful if this proposal was passed.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemead Road		X			I am writing to lend my name in support of Order 202 - 23-012 - Central Bath Area TRO Review - Proposed Parking Restrictions: "Introduce Central Permit Holder Only parking in lengths of Upper Hedgemead Road, Bath" It would benefit the already stretched Central zone significantly, especially as I frequently see this area underused.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemead Road		X			I am writing to support the proposal to extend the Central parking zone into part of Upper Hedgemead Road. Until recently this area was outside the controlled parking scheme, and thus available as overspill parking for Central. It was then added to Camden zone but is now little used, while the Central zone nearby has become increasingly congested with residents trying to park. Extra parking is urgently needed for Central, and from a financial point of view, extending Central, which is more expensive than Outer, will increase revenue to the council. I therefore support the proposal.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemead Road	X				Previously, the roadside parking at the Lansdown Hill end of Upper Hedgemead Road was unrestricted and heavily occupied, not least because someone was using it to store vehicles for trade, so, including it in RPZ 15 was positive - the existing RPZ 15 allocation was often fully occupied too and the Extended RPZ 15 relieved the pressure. I anticipate that should it go to the central zone, in zone 15 we'll be back where we were before. Also, regarding central zone parking, an element of the pressure on central zone parking in this part of Bath is from airbnbs rather than from residents and their visitors and perhaps it's best not to further enable airbnbs. Regarding the changes to parking in Upper Hedgemead Road, a temporary factor is that in January 2020, planning permission was granted for a new building at 18 Alpine Gardens with the intention that during the build phase there would be enough parking for the workforce in Upper Hedgemead Road. I suggest at least that any local reduction in zone 15 parking is postponed until work on the new building is completed.

Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemean Road		X			I'd like to add my voice in support of TRO 23-012, which refers to the introduction of CZ Permit Holder Only parking in parts of Upper Hedgemean Road. I am a long term resident and property owner in Ainslie's Belvedere, and have frequently noticed unused space in Upper Hedgemean Road. I believe that allowing CZ permit holders to use that space would help alleviate the parking problems that we face in Ainslie's Belvedere.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemean Road		X			As a resident of Ainslies Belvedere I would like to register my strong support for the introduction of Central Permit Holder Only change to lengths of Upper Hedgemean Road. At present that part of Upper Hedgemean Road is underused and rarely full, whereas Ainslies Belvedere and Caroline Place are often full, and are also used by local B&B and Air B&B customers, which can make it difficult for the local residents to park near their properties.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemean Road			X		understood about permit allocations, fair point. May I flag a quite different concern/objection? The end of Upper Hedgemean Road towards Lansdown Road, is a substantial bottleneck that results in cars mounting the pavement every hour to pass one another (as reversing onto a main road is a bad option, and reversing backwards into a curved line of parked cars appears tricky). When I'm a pedestrian along here, I literally run to get out of the way! Making this area a central parking zone will increase this type of traffic, cruising for a spot to park (just as used to happen when the area was one of the last bits of free parking in Bath). If you do go ahead with the zone, it would be worth reducing it by one car space on the park side to ensure cars approaching the bottleneck can reverse more easily.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemean Road	X				I am concerned about the extension of central permit parking allowing central residents to park outside the central area into Upper Hedgemean road. My concerns are that when all the spaces are full, we have very few other streets to park anywhere near our property. The other streets are already under pressure and residents from other streets are often seen parking in Upper Hedgemean road at busy times. There are no car parks near by. So we are left with no option but to drive around the area waiting for a space to become free. Before the RPZ was in place there was parking all along Upper Hedgemean road and it created a hazard to pedestrians as part of the road is single track and cars passed each other using the pavement. The removal of site lines and reduction in passing places on the road is only going to make this difficult junction more hazardous. I think the council should focus on making this area safer for pedestrians and make the difficult decisions to limit car parking where it causes a hazard to pedestrian safety.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemean Road		X			I am very much in support of the change from Zone 15 to Central Zone of the parking spaces along Upper Hedgemean Road, above Hedgemean Park. These car spaces there are NEVER fully used by residents of Zone 15 whereas Caroline Place and Ainslies Belvedere spaces are ALWAYS full weekends and evenings. It is only fair that those unused spaces in Upper Hedgemean should be transferred to Central Zone from Zone 15. It would be of great benefit to Central Zone permit holders and no sacrifice to Zone 15 permit holders.
Additional Proposal Plan	Upper Hedgemean Road	X				I'm writing to with regard to Order 202 reference 23-012 to register our objection. introducing Central Permit Holder Only parking on Upper Hedgemean Road which has been Resident Permit Holder Only parking for zone 15. The grounds for our objection are that Upper Hedgemean road is often the only road where parking is available for zone 15 residents when other zone 15 roads are full; changing it to Central zone parking would deprive the residents who live close to this road of this parking space. There is increasing pressure on parking spaces on Belgrave Crescent and adjacent roads so Upper Hedgemean Road is frequently the only place we can park.
Total:		35	25	3	2	