

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS – DECISION (following objections)

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: CRSTS Various Roads, City Centre, Bath**PROPOSAL:** Cycling and pedestrian measures, parking and loading restrictions**SCHEME REF No:** 25-052**REPORT AUTHOR:** Meg Collin**1. DELEGATION**

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Part 3, Section 4** of the Constitution under the **Delegation of Functions to Officers**, as follows:

Section A	The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Divisional Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility ..."
Section B	Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to: serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within his/her area of responsibility.
Section D9	An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator.

For the purposes of this report, the Director of Place Management 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 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which under Section 1 provides, generally, for Orders to be made for the following reasons, and in the case of this report specifically for the reason(s) shown below:

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

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

3. PROPOSAL

The introduction of segregated with-flow and contra-flow cycle lanes and measures, improved pedestrian crossing facilities, modified traffic signal junctions, general traffic management improvements, and revised loading and parking arrangements.

The proposals are shown on the drawings below, which also include the existing arrangements for clarity.

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 improved cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, and modified parking and loading restrictions. It has balanced the various considerations and concluded that it is appropriate to promote the proposed 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 proposal to introduce improved cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, and modified parking and loading restrictions, is 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 segregated cycle lanes, which is available upon request, along with generic Equality Impact Assessments for the other proposals. The Council has had due regard to the needs set out in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. It considers that the proposed Order 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

The scheme is funded through the City Region Sustainable Transport Scheme, awarded by DfT through the MCA.

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 Strategy and 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. Full responses and supporting comments can be found in the attached appendix 1.

4 responses were received, of which 3 were objections. Key issues and technical responses are as follows:

1. Impact of reduced loading provision on business operations.

This was raised by one business on Charles St and one on Upper Borough Walls. For businesses on Charles St, existing loading provision on Monmouth Place will be retained. There are no time restrictions on when this can be used, and it is considered sufficient for the businesses served. For Upper Borough Walls, it is recognised that, in spite of the addition of a loading bay on Upper Borough Walls within the scheme, there is significant loading pressures on this area due to a high number of businesses and the time restrictions imposed by City Centre Security. More data is required to understand the loading needs of this area and, as such, it is proposed to remove the proposals for the southern side of Upper Borough Walls (as indicated in recommendation below) from the TRO until data can be gathered and reviewed.

2. Impact of reduced lanes on traffic congestion on Green Park Road / Charles Street.

Green Park Rd/ Charles St is the only stretch that is currently two-lane (running northwards) within the surrounding road network. As such, it has been assessed that reducing this relatively short stretch (c. 150m) of two-lane road to one-lane (while retaining the bus lane turn into James Street West) will not have a substantial impact on traffic.

3. Impact of illegal e-bikes, e-scooters and mopeds.

It is recognised that this is an issue faced in Bath, however it is not considered that improvements to the cycle infrastructure are likely to worsen this issue.

4. Heritage impact.

Minimising any potential heritage harm is integral to the proposals, which increase the use of natural stone paving in the city centre area. It is considered that the proposals will enhance the public realm of Bath's historic city core in a way that is sensitive to its heritage. The Bath Pattern Book has been adhered to in the proposals to ensure alignment with the city fabric.

5. Risk of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.

The proposals aim to reduce the risk of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists by providing more segregated routes, clearer and better paved pedestrian areas and clearer signage.

Technical recommendations:

Following the consultation period, it is recommended to remove the proposed changes to double yellow lines for the following section of Upper Borough Walls, while further survey work and consultation is carried out assessing the need for and provision of loading area and blue badge parking bays.

It is the recommendation of this report that the rest of the proposed restrictions are sealed within this Order as advertised and implemented on-site.

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

Kingsmead Ward:

Councillor George Tomlin – No comment.

Councillor Paul Roper – No comment.

Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery:

Councillor Lucy Hodge – No comment.

11. RECOMMENDATION

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



Neil Terry
Traffic Management & Network Manager

Date: 05/02/2026

12. DECISION

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

Minor amendment to the Order:

Technical recommendations:

Following the consultation period, it is recommended to remove the proposed changes to double yellow lines for the following section of Upper Borough Walls, while further survey work and consultation is carried out assessing the need for and provision of loading area and blue badge parking bays.

Reasons:

For Upper Borough Walls, it is recognised that, despite the addition of a loading bay on Upper Borough Walls within the scheme, there is significant loading pressures on this area due to a high number of businesses and the time restrictions imposed by City Centre Security. More data is required to understand the loading needs of this area and, as such, it is proposed to remove the proposals for the southern side of Upper Borough Walls from the TRO until data can be gathered and reviewed.

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: 12/02/2026