

OFFICER DECISION REPORT – RAISED TABLE SPEED HUMP
Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) ‘Notice’

5a

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS – DECISION (following objections)

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: Royal Victoria Park, Bath

PROPOSAL: Raised Table Speed Hump

SCHEME REF No: 26-052D

REPORT AUTHOR: Sadie Cox-Alcuaz

1. DELEGATION

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Part 2 Section 2.35** of the Constitution under the **Delegations of Functions to Officers**, as follows:

Section A	The Chief Executive, Executive Director - Chief Operating Officer, Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility....”
Section B	Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to: serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within their area of responsibility.
Section D	An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator.

For the purposes of this report, the Director of Place Management and the Head of Highways Delivery hold the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Orders.

2. LEGAL AUTHORITY

This proposal is made in accordance with The Highways Act 1980 Section 90A which permits a highway authority to both construct and remove road humps in a public road, for which they are the highway authority, if the highway is subject to a legal speed limit for motor vehicles of 30 miles per hour or less or the road humps are specially authorised by the Secretary of State.

3. PROPOSAL

To introduce Raised Table Speed Humps in Royal Victoria Park, Bath

The proposals are shown on drawings attached as appendices to this report.

10011941-ATR-HGN-RVP-DR-CH-000111_P03

10011941-ATR-HGN-RVP-DR-CH-000112_P03

10011941-ATRL-HGN-RVP-DR-CH-000113

4. REASON

Please refer to the Statement of Reasons.

The Council has had in mind and discharged the duty (as set out in section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) so far as practicable. It has also had regard to the factors which point in favour of imposing the new raised table speed humps. It has balanced the various considerations and concluded that it is appropriate to promote these measures. The Council has also considered and discharged its network management duty under section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. It has concluded that the proposed raised table speed humps are consistent with that duty, having regard to its other policies and objectives.

5. IMPACT ON EQUALITIES

An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken in relation to the introduction of traffic management measures, which is available upon request. The Council has had due regard to the needs set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. It considers that the proposal is consistent with the section 149 public sector equality duty, which it has discharged.

6. IMPACT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The proposals are considered to have a minimal impact on human rights (such as the right to respect for private and family life and the right to peaceful enjoyment of property). However, the Council is entitled to affect these rights where it is in accordance with the law, necessary (in the interests of public safety or economic well-being, to prevent disorder and crime, to protect health, or to protect the rights and freedoms of others), in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate to do so. The proposal(s) within this report are considered to be in accordance with the law, necessary, in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate.

7. SOURCE OF FINANCE

This proposal is being funded through the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement programme.

8. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT

The proposal requires consultation with the Chief Constable, Emergency Services, Road Haulage Association, Freight Transport Association (Logistics UK), Parking Services, Waste Services, Ward Members and the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery.

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

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

The objections received have been summarised below with the technical responses in italics underneath each one.

Respondents were able to respond to this TRO via Appyway, by email and via letter. In total 36 individuals responded to this TRO consultation, which was hosted on Appyway. Via Appyway, respondents were able to indicate their level of support or objection, select one or more reason for their support or objection, and add free text to explain this further.

In this section, levels of support and objection will be reported along with respondents' reasoning.

Table 1 below shows the levels of support and objection among **36 individual respondents** in response to TRO 26-052D. In total **18 respondents supported or partly supported** the proposal, and **18 respondents objected or partly objected** to the proposal.

Support	Partly support	Neutral	Partly object	Object	TOTAL
16	2	0	1	17	36

Table 1: Levels of support and objection for TRO 26-052D

Respondents were able to select one or more reason for their support or objection and this is tabulated in table 2 below.

Reason	Support	Partly support	Partly object	Object
Access	3	0	1	2
Disturbance	1	0	0	4
Environmental	3	0	1	2
Financial	1	0	0	12
Other	0	1	0	3
Parking	2	0	1	7
Safety	16	1	1	8
Traffic	7	0	1	8

Table 2: Reasons for support or objection to TRO 26-052D

The following section details the free text responses received in objection to TRO 26-052D. Responses were grouped into themes and the number of times a theme was mentioned has been tabulated below.

TRO feedback relating to	Feedback	Number of references
26-052D crossings	Not required / low speed and volume of traffic	9
	No accidents or incidents have occurred in this location	2
	Increased pollution (noise and air)	1
	Costly / waste of money	7
	Will frustrate drivers	1
	Access by bike will be less appealing	2
26-052A cycle lane	Cycle lane is not required / not required as other routes exist / other routes are better	3
	Cyclists will have detrimental impact on pedestrians	1
26-052C parking	Believes Blue Badge parking has already reduced	1
	Reduction in Blue Badge bays will impact access	1

Table 3: Themes arising in free text responses in objection to TRO 26-052D

In responding to objections and comments on this TRO, reference has been made to the following local and regional policies, strategies and plans which are available using the following links:

- [*Corporate Strategy 2023-2027*](#)
- [*Active Travel Masterplan*](#)
- [*Movement Strategy for Bath*](#)
- [*Balancing Your Needs: A parking strategy for Bath & North East Somerset*](#)
- [*Residents Parking Strategy*](#)
- [*Journey to Net Zero*](#)
- [*West of England Joint Local Transport Plan*](#) (JLTP 4)

Officers' response to comments that the raised crossings are not required due to low speed and volume of traffic

Our aim is to improve accessibility for people walking and wheeling in the park.

We are proposing four raised crossings along the route, set at the same level as the surrounding pavements, together with a fifth crossing at the entrance to the north-west access road.

The crossings are designed to provide a clear visual and physical indication that pedestrians are crossing both the cycle lane and the road at designated points, while the raised surface will encourage drivers and cyclists to slow down as they approach.

Providing a level crossing surface will also make it easier and more comfortable for people to cross, particularly wheelchair and mobility scooter users, people using mobility aids, and those with pushchairs or children on scooters.

Together, these measures are intended to provide safer and more accessible routes across the park for people of all ages and abilities.

The Active Travel Masterplan identifies the need to create a connected network that makes active travel a safe and attractive option for everyday journeys. The Movement Strategy also seeks to rebalance streets to support a wider range of users and improve sustainable travel choices. The scheme therefore supports wider strategic objectives beyond addressing traffic speed or volume alone.

Officers' response to comments that no accidents or incidents have occurred in this location

We are committed to providing infrastructure that reduces the chance of collisions.

Investment in active travel infrastructure is not solely dependent on collision history. The Active Travel Masterplan and Journey to Net Zero recognise the need to remove barriers to walking, wheeling and cycling, improve accessibility and encourage sustainable travel choices. And the council's Vision Zero commitment aims to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries while increasing safe, healthy, and fair access to street space.

Raised crossings can improve comfort, convenience and accessibility for users even where there is no evidence of previous collisions in these locations.

Officers' response to comments that the raised crossings will result in increased pollution (noise and air)

Any noise associated with vehicles travelling over the crossings is expected to be low given the 10 mph limit and lower volumes of traffic in the park area compared with the surrounding road network.

The wider purpose of the Bath Walking, Wheeling and Cycling Links programme is to encourage greater use of active travel for local journeys. The Journey to Net Zero Strategy, Movement Strategy and Active Travel Masterplan all identify increased walking, wheeling and cycling as an important means of reducing transport-related emissions, improving air quality and supporting healthier communities. The scheme is intended to contribute to those objectives.

Officers' response to comments that the raised crossings are too costly and are a waste of money

The scheme forms part of a strategic programme of investment in active travel infrastructure supported through regional and national transport funding.

Economic appraisal i.e. a costs-versus-benefit exercise showed that the Royal Victoria Park scheme is expected to substantially benefit the area in terms of public health, air quality, improved safety, reduced congestion on the roads and improvements in journey quality by people using the route.

The Active Travel Masterplan, Journey to Net Zero and West of England transport strategies recognise that investment in walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure delivers wider benefits including improved road safety, accessibility, health, air quality and reduced congestion. The proposal contributes to these long-term objectives.

Officers' response to comments that the raised crossings will frustrate drivers

Drivers are already expected to observe the 10 mph speed limit and drive with appropriate care for pedestrians and cyclists within the park. The raised crossings reinforce this low-speed environment by encouraging drivers to slow down at points where people need to cross.

The crossings are designed to improve safety and accessibility for all pedestrians, with particular benefits for children, people with pushchairs, wheelchair and mobility scooter users, and people using mobility aids. Any need for drivers to reduce their speed when approaching the crossings is therefore consistent with the existing 10 mph limit and the nature of the park environment.

The Council seeks to provide a balanced transport network that accommodates the needs of all users. The Movement Strategy, Parking Strategy and JLTP4 support measures that make walking, wheeling and cycling safer and more convenient whilst maintaining access for motor vehicles where appropriate

Officers' response to comments that the raised crossings will make access by bike less appealing

The segregated contraflow cycle lane for cyclists is designed to create a lightly trafficked, more direct two-way route for cyclists through the park with enhanced safety.

The raised crossings provide pedestrians safe, accessible points to cross the road and cycle lane, and will require cyclists and vehicles to slow down to allow pedestrians to cross.

By providing clearer and more accessible crossing points, the scheme supports the objectives of the Active Travel Masterplan by creating connected infrastructure that encourages walking, wheeling for everyday journeys.

The Council therefore expects the scheme to improve rather than reduce the attractiveness of active travel.

The following comments have been recorded and counted in this report, however officer responses are included in the Cycle Lane proposal report scheme ref. 26-052A:

- the Cycle lane is not required / not required as other routes exist / other routes are better
- cyclists will have detrimental impact on pedestrians

The following comments have been recorded and accounted for in this report, however officer responses are included in the Parking Restrictions proposal report scheme ref. 26-052C:

- Blue Badge parking has already reduced
- Blue Badge bays will impact access

10. **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM WARD MEMBERS AND CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT DELIVERY (in response to the above)**

Councillor George Tomlin – No Comment

Councillor Paul Roper – No Comment

Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery

Councillor Lucy Hodge –

My comment is Having reviewed the comments within this report, I am satisfied that all matters have been addressed in the Office comments. This proposal for raised table speed humps in pedestrian crossing locations will not only provide traffic calming but will also make it easier and safer for all park users to cross the road to amenities particularly wheelchair and mobility scooter users, those with pushchairs and children walking or scooting. Pedestrians will be more visible when choosing to cross in these locations. This approach enabling active travel is entirely consistent with our Active Travel Master Plan and Movement Strategy and I fully support the proposals set out within this report.

11. RECOMMENDATION

That the proposal as advertised is implemented.



Paul Garrod
Head of Highways Delivery

Date: 21/09/2026

12. DECISION

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the objections / comments be not acceded to and the proposal as advertised be implemented.

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

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

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



Chris Major
Director for Place Management

Date: 22/09/2026