

OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)

5a

OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS – DECISION (following objections)

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

TITLE OF REPORT: North East Somerset Area TRO Review

PROPOSAL: Parking Restrictions

SCHEME REF No: 26-050

REPORT AUTHOR: Traffic Management Team

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

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

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

3. **PROPOSAL**

To implement various parking / waiting restrictions around the North East Somerset area as requested by the local Ward Members, Parish Councils (of behalf of their residents) or Council Officers.

4. **REASON**

Please refer to the separate Statement of Reasons document attached to this report regarding TRO 26-050.

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:

Additional No Parking At Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on:

- Third Avenue, Westfield.
- Huish Close, Kilmersdon Road, Church Street, The Street, Keats Road, Longfellow Road, Grove Wood Road, Radstock.
- Beauchamp Avenue, Gullock Tynning, Chilcompton Road, Laburnum Grove, Berkeley Avenue, Vivien Avenue, Midsomer Norton.
- High Street, Scobell Rise, Scumbrum Lane, High Littleton.
- Clifford Drive, Purnell Way, Elm Road, Winterfield Park, Plumtree Road, Rudgeway Road, Paulton.
- Bath Road, Tunley.
- The Square, High Street, Timsbury.
- Dark Lane, Freshford Lane and New Road, Freshford.
- High Street and Priston Lane, Priston.
- Faulkland View, Wellow Lane, Eckweek Lane, Firgrove Lane and Hillside View, Peasedown St John.
- Bailbrook Lane, Lower Swainswick, Bath.
- Church Lane and Shaft Road, Monkton Combe.
- Main Street and Farrington Way, Farrington Gurney.
- Bathampton Lane, Bathampton.

Removal of No Parking At Any Time (Double Yellow Line) restrictions on:

- Church Lane, Monkton Combe.

Additional No Parking Between Monday – Friday, 8am – 5pm restrictions on:

- Keats Road, Radstock.

Additional No Parking On Verge At Any Time restrictions on:

- Wells Road, Wesley Ave, Fosseway Gardens, and Glebelands, Westfield.
- Winterfield Park, Paulton.

Additional Blue Badge Holders Only Parking on:

- Catherine Way, Batheaston.

Additional No Stopping On School Keep Clear Markings on:

- Kilmersdon Road, Radstock.

Removal of Free Parking Bays from Order to match what's on-site on:

- Church Street, Radstock.

Additional Permit Holder Only parking bay, operating 8am – 6pm on:

- Tynning Road, Bathampton.

It has balanced the various considerations and concluded that it is appropriate to promote these proposed restriction amendments to prevent obstruction of the highway, improve visibility splays at junctions and provide additional on-street parking provision. 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 restrictions 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 or modification of parking restrictions, 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 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

These proposals are being funded by the capital Area Parking Review budget, project code TCJ0009S.

8. **CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

The proposals require 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. Full responses and supporting comments can be found in the attached **Appendix 1**.

In consideration of the objections and comments which have been received, it is important to remember that the primary purpose of the public highway is for the safe passage and re-passage of vehicles. Whilst the availability of suitable parking for residents, businesses, and visitors is a sensitive and important factor, on-street parking can generally only be condoned where it is considered to be safe and appropriate.

Plan 2 – Beauchamp Avenue, Midsomer Norton

1 Objection

Main points of objection raised:

- When I bought this property the pull in areas on the deeds were for residents and visitors to this street only.
- People from other parts of the estate park here and cars are left sometimes for long periods of time.
- My husband is a blue badge holder. Can he apply for a disabled bay?
- There is a very lengthy bus stop bay outside which is used by a small bus a couple of times a week. Can this be reduced?
- Not enough on-street parking currently.
- Properties have more than one vehicle.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillors to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles and improve visibility splays around junctions. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised. Blue Badge Holders can apply for an advisory Disabled Parking Bay through our Parking Services Team.

Plan 4 – Clifford Drive, Paulton

2 Partial Objections / 1 Support / 1 Support in Part

Main points of objections raised:

- Parking is already insufficient for the number of homes on the estate.
- This will not be of any benefit to residents.
- Will encourage people to park in more dangerous and in inconvenient areas.
- It will lead to more accidents and vehicle damage as people will park and drive recklessly.
- Reducing the available parking spaces with this no waiting zone will also encourage residents to park in places that will block the road and could prevent emergency services getting to the residents at the bottom of Clifford Drive.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. As this removal of parking has the support of the local Ward Councillor and will create additional space for vehicles to manoeuvre at the end of Clifford Drive, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised.

Plan 5 – Gullock Tynning, Midsomer Norton

2 Objections / 1 Support / 1 Support in Part

Main points of objections raised:

- Parking is already a tumultuous issue in the area.
- Not enough on-street parking space to go around.
- Restricted parking for longer hours isn't going to solve the issue but simply move it to another area of town.
- Already not enough parking on South View Place.
- Implementing more restrictions on Midsomer Norton High Street and Gullock Tynning will mean that residents will not be able to park.
- This will restrict the number of visitors we can have to our home.
- Permit holders should be considered prior to more restrictions.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Midsomer Norton Town Council to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised.

Plan 7 – Scobell Rise and Scumbrum Lane, High Littleton

1 Objection

Main points of objection raised:

- This is a pointless restriction that will only affect residents who live here.
- People only ever park on one part of the proposed restriction; I have never seen anyone park on the other corner or park in any way that would cause a safety issue.
- No one parks on the pavement opposite for any length of time as the lane isn't wide enough.
- We won't be able to get deliveries as vans would need to park too far away from our houses,
- Elderly residents need their shopping delivered.
- Many of the terraces have one parking space but more than one vehicle which is a necessity as public transport is so poor.
- Where are visitors supposed to park as Scobells already has limited spaces due to driveways and dropped pavements.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to prevent obstruction of residential properties when entering and exiting their off-street parking provision due to vehicles parked opposite, and to provide better visibility splays around the junction. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised.

Plan 8 – Bath Road, Tunley

4 Objections / 1 Support in Part

Main points of objections raised:

- This will cause more cars to bunch together in the middle of Tunley, causing far more hazardous driving conditions.
- There is limited on-street parking in Tunley.
- This will cause additional difficulties in finding safe parking places given the number of residents that have cars.
- You will be aware there is very little practical public transport in Tunley, so the use of a car is important to many residents.
- Households have multiple vehicles that need to be accommodated on street.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Dunkerton Parish Council to provide better manoeuvrability for larger vehicles by removing a small section of parking. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that as the proposed restrictions have the support of the local Parish Council, they are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised.

Plan 9 – Chilcompton Road and Laburnum Grove, MSN

1 Objection / 1 partial Objection / 1 Support in Part

Main points of objections raised:

- We live in old cottages with some having parking for only one vehicle, meaning houses with 2 or more vehicles have nowhere to park other than the road.
- Banning parking on Chilcompton Road/ Laburnum Road will only make the surrounding roads a lot busier as people will need to park their cars somewhere.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to improve visibility splays and obstruction around the junction due to parked vehicles. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised.

Plan 10 – Berkeley Avenue, Midsomer Norton

2 Objections

- The displaced cars will be parked around my house, probably blocking access to my driveway, difficult enough already with cars parked opposite it.

Main points of objection raised from local Ward Councillor:

- The cumulative effect of the Berkeley Avenue and Vivien Avenue proposals is likely to result in a significant increase in displaced parking on Clevedon Road and surrounding streets.
- I do not believe the combined impact of these proposals has been adequately assessed. Before any intervention is progressed, a full and detailed assessment should be undertaken to consider existing parking demand, displacement effects, road safety implications, and the impact on nearby residents.
- I also note that the report states that these proposals were brought forward at the request of a ward councillor. For the avoidance of doubt, I was not the ward councillor who made that request.
- I apologise for the late submission of this objection, but the contents of the report and the reference to ward councillor support only came to my attention within the past week.
- In summary, both proposals would have a negative impact on the area by creating additional and unnecessary parking pressures and reducing accessibility to Willow Brook Walk for some residents. The displacement of vehicles onto less suitable positions within Vivien Avenue and Berkeley Avenue is likely to increase congestion and, in some locations, create visibility issues for residents accessing their driveways. There is also likely to be a detrimental impact on surrounding cul-de-sacs through additional displaced parking.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to prevent obstruction of the highway. However, as the local Ward Member is not in favour of these proposals, as highlighted above, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and not sealed within this Order.

Plan 11 – Vivien Avenue, MSN

6 Objections / 3 partial Objections

Main points of objections raised:

- Most cars parking are dog walkers some very elderly who live in the far end of the estate and can't walk the whole way.
- Surely people should be encouraged to use the greenway and picnic benches.
- Why change something that has worked fine for years.
- This is totally unnecessary.
- I have never encountered a problem at this location.
- This will cause unnecessary parking problems.
- At the most extending the parking ban by another car length by the electric substation would be acceptable, it does not need extending any further.
- I am concerned that this proposal will move parking towards me and neighbouring properties restricting visibility when pulling out onto the road. Also if cars park opposite my drive it makes it very difficult to manoeuvre.
- This a 20mph area so cars should be going slow enough to not require the parking restrictions.
- Where are visitors supposed to park?
- The majority of residents on this road use driveways to park their vehicles and bar the odd dog walker parking on the road the only other vehicles that would appear to ever park here are visitors to the residential addresses.
- There is no justification for preventing parking outside of the substation at Vivien Avenue, this small strip of the road is used constantly by families and dog walkers making use of both the Greenway and nature walk.

Local Ward Councillor objection:

- The area in question provides significant parking for both residents and visitors. This includes visitors to Wellow Brook, a council nature facility that actively encourages public use through the provision of seating and picnic areas. The parking available on Vivien Avenue is extensively used, including by residents with mobility issues.

- The proposed restrictions would have a significant detrimental impact on both Vivien Avenue and Clevedon Road by displacing vehicles into less suitable sections that are already congested and oversubscribed for parking. The proposal therefore risks worsening parking pressures for existing residents while reducing accessibility to Wellow Brook.
- In my view, the proposal does not appear to be supported by a sufficiently detailed assessment of local parking patterns and the likely displacement effects. I would therefore ask that the council reconsider these restrictions and undertake a fuller assessment of parking demand, accessibility impacts, and displacement before proceeding.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to assist motorists to negotiate the bend in the road. However, as the local Ward Councillor is not in favour of these proposals, as highlighted above, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and not sealed within this Order.

Plan 12 – High Street, Timsbury

1 Objection / 1 Support / 1 neutral

Main points of objection raised:

- Why are you allowing the sharp bend to be unrestricted when that is where the worst of the parking takes place 24 hours a day. When has it ever been ok to park on a bend?
- The only time the proposed parking restrictions is anyway an issue is when the chip shop is open.
- This will have little effect except take away the only parking the 5 houses.
- All you are doing is penalising residents from parking outside their own house with no option to convert their front garden into driveways.
- Public Transport is almost non-existent and completely unreliable you are creating more problems and solving nothing and yet the council have approved a 2nd and 3rd housing development creating more traffic, more cars and less and less parking.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to replace the existing advisory Keep Clear marking with a formal No Parking At Any Time restriction to prevent obstruction of the highway due to double parking creating a pinch point. As the existing advisory marking is ineffective in this location, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised despite the objection raised above.

Plan 16 – Catherine Way, Batheaston

1 Objection / 1 partial Objection

Main points of objections raised:

- Whilst intent is understood, we question rationale and whether a specialist highways consultant has been instructed to appraise proposals and offer a workable solution. Rather than promote inclusivity, the location of the disabled parking as proposed by the TRO is flawed, particularly when reviewing statutory guidance and best practice for 'ambulant' and 'disabled' users. For example, BS 8300-1, AD Part M and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. In the location proposed by the TRO (at the top of an external stair) the disabled bay fails to satisfy compliant spatial dimensions and offer appropriate access to and from the space. We have witnessed wheelchair users struggle to access the lower rank of houses. It is impossible. Wheelchair users and those that are less ambulant must travel from the disabled parking bay to the nearest ramp which is approximately 70m south in the direction of no.21 Catherine Way. Figure 01 plots distances as proposed by the TRO, measured from the centre of the disabled parking bay at road level to the nearest ramp, and back to centre of bay at a lower footpath level. The distance totals 165m.
- For guidance; best practice suggests the maximum travel distance to a principal entrance is 50m and where possible this should be reduced. It would be more appropriate and inclusive to locate the disabled parking space at the top of an existing ramp. We also understand that existing blue badge holders live opposite the ramps adjacent no.21. In maintaining the current proposal, astride a 1960's external staircase, proposals inadvertently introduce greater risk, severe safety hazards and prevents access for disabled users. See figures 4 and 5. One must step over a kerb before landing on a tread, level positioned slightly below top of kerb, which is very challenging for the purpose group. Rather than alleviate risk; your proposal adds danger through facilitating slips, trips and falls. There is potential to rework a piece of land to the north of the TRO proposal between no.47 and 49 Catherine Way. A fully compliant disabled parking bay measuring 3.6m x 6.0m (incl. 1200mm access zones), with wayfinding, a compliant ramp/gradient and width (e.g. 1:12 max for a 2m length rise), with guarding could be delivered. This approach would inclusively position two disabled spaces with adequate separation between, unlike existing and proposed TRO arrangements that place two disabled parking spaces within close proximity of each other, specific to individual house numbers and at the top of a staircase. See figures 6 and 7.
- In summary we consider the TRO's proposal concerning disabled parking provision non-inclusive to all residents and visitors of Catherine Way. Positioning lacks safety consideration. Rather, it upgrades a constrained advisory disabled parking bay that was created circa 2025 following the request of a former tenant at no.34 Catherine Way. This resident has long departed. As evidenced, its position at the top of an external staircase restricts occupiers and visitors of properties located on the lower rank of houses (east and odd numbers). Consideration must be given to its inclusive relocation to the top of a ramp. Whilst we welcome a disabled parking space along this stretch of Catherine Way, in its current form we are unable to support the TRO's proposal. We seek reconsideration or input from a highways consultant to ensure statutory guidance is met or best practice is delivered. We also seek evidence concerning items 'C' and 'G' that proposals will not result in a loss of parking provision for all Catherine Way residents and further aggravate parking shortages. Parking is a real challenge. Residents are already forced to park on double yellow lines which often results in a PCN.

- I do have a couple of objections and a request for an amended proposal which I hope the committee will take into consideration. Attached are three photographs of the only slip ways on the odd numbers of this lower side of Catherine Way. (and scout hut). All the way to the emergency gate in the cul de sac. Picture 178: is by the slip way by no. 19. There is no pavement on opposite side. Picture 179: is by house 21. The occupant uses a mobility scooter. Is, and does, continue onto the path that leads down muddy lane past the Scout hut to Batheaston Primary School and our new village hall. Which if free in the future to allow people to attend events at the village hall, parents' evenings or even to cast their vote.
- Our village hall only has a few parking spaces. Picture 180: (between houses 49 and 51 with a large green open space) is not as steep green bank with concrete steps. If we have any money could this not be a slip way too. I'm sure we could help fund raise, and our Parish Council request grants from various disability charities to build a gentle slope down and help with our medical services when transporting our poorly residents needing to go to hospital. Most middle houses in Catherine Way terraces are known to be bed blockers (shared stairs and two 90° angles before the front door). This will help ease of access for those disabled or not that sure on their feet, while still feeling part of our great community. I therefore propose that the dedicated disabled bays are put either side of these slopes. (Total two). The single-track road is slightly larger on the curve by the slopes next to numbers 19 and 21. There is no pavement opposite. It has a wider area for the disabled to walk, use a wheelchair or walking frame and not a steep bank of steps with a handrail to navigate around. If we could have the stairs (49-51) turned into a slope in the future that would be three in total. I'm looking at the demographic age range and future needs of this estate. A dedicated bay restricting road width outside number 39 I feel will continue to restrict deliveries and the general flow of the traffic. The bus often has to mount the pavement and drop off the curb which is not helping our road. My second proposal/request is to emphasize very clearly that a dedicated parking bay does not belong to a single person who is driving a disabled person or is disabled themselves. I feel this defeats the whole principal of a blue badge dedicated parking space open to anyone meeting the criteria for a blue badge and this should be strongly enforced. Having two by both current slopes will also help with visiting family members. I say this having witnessed quite frequently during school term time a highly emotive reaction to anyone parking in the current courtesy bay. Even though the no. 8 BANES bus is used to transport the young man to school. I am currently under the care of Somerset, Wiltshire, Avon and Gloucestershire yearly Lung screening program. I have been since 2nd September 2022. First told in January 2023 I was entitled to a Blue Badge which I declined. However, I am realistic that I will need to apply in the future. I'm also aware that a couple of my neighbours have ongoing 'work' related issues, which as we approach our mid 60's will start to rear their ugly head.

Officer Response: The proposed Blue Badge Holder Only parking bay was requested by the local Ward Member on behalf of a local resident. Due to the concerns raised above regarding the suitability of this location, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site at this time and are not sealed within this Order. Further investigation into a suitable alternative location would need to be carried out.

Plan 17 – Dark Lane, Freshford Lane and New Road, Freshford

1 Objection

Main points of objections raised:

- This will have little impact on the increasing traffic congestion and associated road safety issues on New Road between the hours of 0830hrs and 0930hrs and between 1500hrs and 1600hrs on school days.
- The number of vehicles parked in New Road and other roads adjacent to Freshford School has increased substantially over the last five years as the school has had to recruit pupils from a wider and wider geographical area.
- The traffic congestion in New Road, particularly on school day afternoons, has already led to the Council withdrawing the bus which provides 'home-to-school' transport between Freshford and Ralph Allen School from six stopping points in the village forcing students to have to walk to and from the A36 Warminster Road and to cross that very busy trunk road with a forty or sixty mile per hour speed limit once daily.
- The two minibuses which provide 'home-to-school' transport to and from Freshford School are frequently delayed in New Road due to the traffic congestion caused by parked vehicles.
- There are currently two separate 'white line' markings, separated by a 'gap', on the east side of New Road immediately north of the junction with Dark Lane/Freshford Lane/High Street. Parking is 'endemic' on the white lines, leading to congestion and road safety issues caused by the narrowness and curvature of the southern section of New Road; badly parked and over-sized vehicles parked in the 'gap' between the two 'white line' sections also cause similar issues of congestion and road safety concerns.
- I would propose that the Council extends the proposed 'No Parking At Any Time' restrictions for New Road to include both the existing 'white line' sections and the gap between the two sections – this would not cause inconvenience to the residents of Tynning View, who have vehicular access to their property from Dark Lane.
- The Council should additionally paint new 'white lines' across the entrances to both 'Trees' and to 'West House' to enable residents of these properties to have greater success in maintaining vehicular access to and from their properties and to provide 'passing places' on New Road.
- It has been common, during the last academic year, to have vehicles parked continuously on the east side of New Road between the junctions with Church Lane/Crowe Lane/Dark Lane and Dark Lane/Freshford Lane/High Street, thereby making the entire length of New Road a 'single lane road with no passing places'!

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. An extension or additional parking restrictions as requested above are beyond the scope of this particular TRO consultation and would need to be raised with the local Ward Councillors and considered for inclusion in a future Area TRO Review. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised.

Plan 18 – High Street and Priston Lane, Priston

42 Objections / 11 partial Objections / 4 Support in Part / 14 Support

Main points of objections raised:

- More signs detailing 20mph, or speed bumps may be more beneficial.
- A better junction layout would be the best long-term solution for visibility, by pushing the Hill View give way at the end of the Tunley Road further down away from the difficult corner in question.
- I don't believe it to be an accident hotspot.
- Other measures could be taken such as solid lines stopping traffic before pulling out, surrounding hedges cut back in line with actual road and the introduction of a "junction ahead" type sign on watery line so traffic speed is slowed.
- We don't want yellow lines around Priston.
- Parking is at a premium in Priston.
- We have a 20MPH advisory through the village. If all traffic complied with this speed limit, including Cars and Bicycles, I think the streets would be safe.
- Extra reminders of the speed limit as traffic comes into the main part of the high street would be useful.
- Motorists speed through our village, ignoring the speed advisory signs, in a bid to avoid traffic issues elsewhere. At times it is ONLY the parked cars at the side of the road that makes drivers slow down!!
- Placing double yellow lines along the main(ish) road would push the problem out to other areas where there are no pavements, only grass verges, which are torn up and become unsightly, dangerous and unusable particularly in the winter.
- Forcing people to park on the surrounding lanes/roads, like around the corner at Hill view and Priston Lane, would make it practically impossible for the emergency services to get to those residents.
- Procedural Unfairness & Unmanaged Conflict of Interest• The local driver behind this TRO request, the "Priston Parking Survey 2026," was overseen and directed by Priston Parish Council's designated Roads and Highways Representative; who is a local commercial farmer.• Because the councillor's commercial operations stand to directly benefit from cleared village roads and restricted street parking for agricultural transit, allowing them to lead and influence the traffic consultation process introduces apparent bias and predetermination.
- Parked vehicles help slow traffic and protect pedestrians
- The proposal means parking will be displaced to other parts of the village, meaning residents walking further to their cars on a potentially faster road.

- The proposal has the potential to make life more difficult for residents, visitors and carers.
- Any changes to current arrangements should be evidence - based and after proper consultation with residents. If the recent bicycle / van collision in the subject area is relied on, I would point out that this was caused wholly by the excessive speed of the bicycle, who collided with the vehicle coming from Priston High Street and not from Priston Lane.; it had nothing to do with visibility.
- The Parish Council do an excellent job in Priston, but this proposal was formulated with minimal consultation with residents. I suggest that this TRO should be stopped, and a consultation with interested residents take place, to reflect better the local viewpoint.
- A practical alternative to the TRO would be to extend the current 7 metre white line to 10 metres, thereby complying with Highway Code Rule 243. This would have the effect of still retaining 2 parking spaces and preserving the traffic- calming effect at the narrowing point in the road.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Parish Council to improve visibility splays and obstruction around the junction due to parked vehicles. Due to the level of objection from local residents above, and the fact that on-street parking is at a premium and does act as a traffic calming measure to reduce vehicle speeds, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site at this time and further investigations into potential solutions are carried out when resources permit.

Plan 19 – Kilmersdon Road, Radstock

9 Objections / 2 partial Objections / 4 Support in Part / 1 Support

Main points of objections raised:

- "No Stopping On School Keep Clear Markings" on Kilmersdon Road, are only enforceable Mon-Fri 8.00am - 8.00pm so parking will still happen on evenings and weekends. The SAFEST solution for residents & anyone using Kilmersdon Road would be to implement Double Yellow Lines from No 4 Kilmersdon Road up to & including No's 1 & 3 Kilmersdon Road, on BOTH sides of the carriageway.
- No Parking at Any Time restrictions would enabling traffic to flow freely- Refuse & recycling vehicles not having to block the road when collecting - Street cleaning vehicles able to clean the whole carriageway, leading to drainage improvements - School crossing patrol person can see traffic approaching from Haydon Hill. All of the above will lead to improving Road Safety for Pedestrians, Cyclists & Motorists.
- The introduction of fees & removal of FREE parking in Church Street Car Park in March 2025, has pushed the problem further up Kilmersdon Road. The current hazardous parking situation is exacerbated by motorists NOT adhering to the 20mph Speed Limit.

- The dramatic increase in vehicles parked at the bottom of Kilmersdon Road has presented a constant obstacle when negotiating the climb up Kilmersdon Road/Haydon Hill and even more so when travelling down the road towards Radstock. Many times, I've seen 'near misses' when it comes to potential collisions with parked cars or those trying to pass each other/or avoid t-boning residents trying to emerge from their driveways!
- BANES proposal to install suggested No Stopping Mon-Fri 8am-8pm with relevant white lines/zig zags will not solve the problem out of these hours as motorists can still park at these sites on evenings and weekends - and cars do still definitely use this road on evenings & weekends so the hazard will still persist!
- A safer solution for both pedestrians and vehicles using Kilmersdon Road would be for BANES to install double yellow lines from the house at no. 4 Kilmersdon Road up to and including no's. 1 & 3 Kilmersdon Road on BOTH sides of the carriageway to avoid the existing hazard being transferred to the opposite side of the road.
- It's only a matter of time before a head-on collision happens or a parent/child is knocked down or a resident's car is damaged trying to emerge from their residence onto the carriageway - mostly due to the 'bottleneck' created approaching a school which, by design, should be one of the safer places off the highway!
- Cars frequently speed down the hill and around the corner, and visibility is so poor that you often do not see them until they are right on top of you.
- The safest solution for residents and anyone using Kilmersdon Road would be to implement Double Yellow Lines from No. 4 Kilmersdon Road up to and including Nos. 1 & 3 Kilmersdon Road, on both sides of the carriageway. Implementing this will enforce "No Parking At Any Time" restrictions, enabling traffic to flow freely and improving road safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team and Parish Council to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. This is primarily a TRO admin update to include the existing School Keep Clear markings operating between Mon – Fri, 8am – 8pm on our digital TRO mapping system. An extension of the times of operation of the School Keep Clear markings or additional parking restrictions as requested above is beyond the scope of this particular TRO consultation. It is, therefore, the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised. A proposal to extend the School Keep Clear times of operation to 24/7 and additional No Parking At Any Time markings will be included within the next North East Somerset Area TRO Review for public consultation.

Plan 21 – Faulkland View, Peasedown St John

1 Objection / 1 Support

Main points of objection raised:

- Houses are multiple occupancy with a number of vehicles.
- If this on-street parking is removed, where are we supposed to park?

- Will displace parking to surrounding streets.
- We should be able to park outside our own home.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to prevent obstruction of the highway near to the junction due to parked vehicles. As vehicles should not be parked within 10 metres of a junction, and there is no legal right for residents to park on the highway near to their property, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order despite the objection raised.

Plan 22 – Wellow Lane, Peasedown St John

1 Objection

Main points of objection raised:

- The residents of 118, 116 and 114 don't have car access to the front of their property under this new proposal. The residents of these addresses include an elderly person who needs access to walk to a car parked near the front of her address, and 116 have a young child who needs to be able to get into the car safely without unnecessary need of crossing a road.
- The alleged access blocking is on a very wide dropped kerb where a resident who rents and doesn't drive.
- There has never been a scenario where access to the end of Wellow Lane has been blocked. This proposal would be a total misuse of public funds.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. There is no legal right for residents to park on the highway near to their property, but residents are permitted to load and unload on double yellow lines. It is the recommendation of this report, therefore, that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 24 – Eckweek Lane, Peasedown St John

10 Objections / 1 Partial Objection

Main points of objections raised:

- Limited capacity for informal on-street parking within the surrounding residential area.
- Removing the ability to park along Eckweek Lane is likely to displace existing parking demand onto neighbouring streets, where parking capacity is already constrained.
- The proposed restriction on Eckweek Lane needs to be considered in the context of the wider local parking situation, rather than in isolation.

- My neighbours on Ashgrove include people who are elderly, have very young children - losing access to nearby parking options will severely impact their quality of life.
- Existing white lines already protect access to a narrower driveway, and the two houses directly opposite have wide, large driveways with plenty of space to manoeuvre and good sightlines.
- We cannot see what benefit these proposed restrictions would offer beyond a purely aesthetic one, while they would have a serious and potentially harmful impact on a considerable number of people in the neighbourhood.
- We would also add that Ashgrove is a bus route, with double yellow lines already in place along many sections — including outside and opposite our house. Removing the possibility of stopping and loading on Eckweek Lane could put us at risk of serious harm from passing traffic.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. Although there is no legal right for residents to park on the highway near to their property, this section of Eckweek Lane is not near to a junction, and the narrowest section is already covered by a white Keep Clear marking. On street parking is also at a premium along Eckweek Lane, as highlighted within the 10 objections above. It is, therefore, the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and are not sealed within this Order.

Plan 30 – Third Avenue, Westfield, Radstock

1 Partial Objection

Main points of objection raised:

- Whilst these measures may be warranted or justified, they will only be effective if enforced adequately.
- Will displace vehicles elsewhere in the vicinity.
- The issue with this particular location is that many businesses here have insufficient parking space of their own to accommodate the number of staff commuting by motor vehicle.
- The long-term effects of this TRO, if implemented, are more likely than not to be negative for local employment.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to prevent obstruction of the entrances of the adjacent commercial properties, as requested by a local business to allow day-to-day operations to run unobstructed. It is, therefore, the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed as advertised despite the partial objection above.

Plan 31 – Plumptre Road / Rudgeway Road, Paulton

1 Objection

Main points of objection raised:

- The 5 houses and 3 bungalows on the footpath at the top of Plumptre Road have no allocated parking.
- The implementation of no waiting at any time zones to this part of the street will significantly decrease available parking to residents.
- I have two small children, and it is already a struggle to carry my shopping and this would make it significantly worse.
- I get home from work later than all my neighbours 4 days a week so I would frequently be unable to get a parking space near my own house.
- If this were to be implemented, it would only be reasonable to do so if allocated parking spaces were created for residents at the top of Plumptre Road. For example, the raised area opposite the garages could be flattened and turned into allocated parking spots.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to prevent obstruction of the highway near to the junction of Plumptre Road and Rudgeway Road due to parked vehicles. Additional restrictions opposite the junction and extending northwards down Plumptre Road were also requested. As there is alternative parking provision in the area, including off-street parking for some residents, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 32 – Church Lane, Monkton Combe

2 Objections / 3 partial Objections / 5 Support in Part / 2 Support

Main points of objections raised:

- Concern that the current proposal doesn't place the parking bays at the widest points and therefore will limit access for emergency vehicles and refuse collection.
- Concern that the proposed location of the virtual footpath will encourage traffic to drive faster and reduce safety outside homes and the nearby school.
- Concern that by formalising no parking on the south side of the lane, it will create a presumption that the north side of the lane is an acceptable place to park. Cars parked on the north side will create significant pinch points and reduced visibility given the bends in the road. It would be best to make the north side of the lane a no parking area too.
- The no parking extends just around the corner into the top of Mill Lane. At this point the road appears wide enough to park on, but previous experience has been that emergency vehicles struggle to get down the lane when cars are parked here.
- Concern that ending the no parking a short distance down Mill Lane provides an invitation to park just where the yellow lines finish. The no parking should be extended down Mill Lane (on both sides) as far as the telephone box. This will have

the additional benefit of maintaining good visibility for traffic entering/exiting the existing school car park. Below the telephone box, the lane becomes so narrow that it's less likely that people will assume they can park.

- The side that this is proposed also reduces the opportunity for residents electric charging which is clearly contrary to BANES current objective to increase electric vehicle usage.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor and Parish Council to support a virtual footpath through the village to create a safer route for pedestrians. The purpose of the parking bays on the northern side of Church Lane was to advise drivers where it is safe and practical to park. No on-street parking provision is proposed to be removed outside the properties on the northern side of Church Lane. The proposal is to move the existing No parking At Any Time restrictions westwards closer to the junction with the footpath to improve visibility splays for pedestrians. A parking bay marking is proposed to be introduced where the No Parking At Any Time restrictions were previously located to retain the existing amount of on-street parking provision for local residents. The on-street parking in front of Jullian Cottages on the southern side of Church Lane is proposed to be removed as this is a narrower section of the highway and where on-street parking is not considered to be appropriate. As these proposals were requested by the local Ward Councillor and Parish Council who represent the village, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order. Additional restriction requests are beyond the scope of this particular TRO consultation and would need considered for inclusion within a future Area TRO Review.

Plan 34 – Firgrove Lane & Hillside View, Peasedown St John

2 partial Objections / 1 Support

Main points of objections raised:

- My household has no off-street parking, and we rely entirely on being able to park on Hillside View. My work requires me to leave home extremely early in the morning and return late in the evening, often in darkness, particularly during the winter months. If this restriction is introduced, residents like myself will have no realistic parking option nearby and will be forced to park a considerable distance from home. Walking that distance alone, at unsociable the dark, raises genuine personal safety concerns.
- I would ask the Council to reconsider this proposal, or at minimum to explore alternatives that would preserve some residential parking provision on Hillside View, for example, permit-based or time-limited restrictions rather than a full-time ban, so that residents without off-street parking are not left without any viable option.
- Confused as to why I won't be allowed to park outside my house.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles around the junctions. There is no legal right for residents to park on the highway near to their property, and these proposed restrictions would only remove a small number of on-street parking spaces in locations where it is considered inappropriate to park. It is, therefore, the recommendation of this

report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 35 – Main Street Farrington Gurney

1 Partial Support

Main points of comments raised:

- Whilst I recognise and potentially support why this is felt necessary, I don't think full consideration has been given to the consequences of double yellow lines at this point.
- Currently residents living on the 'no through road' section of Main Street have little or no off-road parking resulting in them parking where they can find any space. This is exacerbated by non-residents using the area as a park and ride whilst using the bus stop. The no parking restriction should improve safety at this point but will, in my opinion, make a bad situation worse by moving the problem to the other side of the junction of Farrington Way and Main Street. This part of the road has more traffic (it not having no through access), two additional junctions Meadow Close and School Lane within a few metres and the pedestrian route to the local primary school. Unfortunately, accidents at the junction with School Lane have already occurred due to vehicle parking issues and the fact that School Lane has poor visibility when exiting onto Main Street.
- Of additional note there are several properties at this location who currently need to be extra vigilant when exiting their properties as approaching traffic is often partially unsighted due to parked vehicles. It also makes navigating this stretch difficult for larger vehicles such as lorries and delivery vans. Therefore, the risk of accident due to poor visibility would be significantly increased under the current proposal unless the double yellow lines, no parking at any time restrictions are increased to include all junctions along Main Street. Consideration should then be given to residents only parking along the 'no through road' area of Main Street.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to improve visibility splays when exiting private entrances onto the A362. Additional parking restrictions as suggested above are beyond the scope of this particular TRO consultation and would need to be raised with the local Ward Councillors and considered for inclusion in a future Area TRO Review. It is, therefore, the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 36 – Main Street & Farrington Way, Farrington Gurney

5 partial Objections / 2 Support in Part

Main points of objections raised:

- The physical layout of Main Street at this location is wide enough to allow vehicles to pass safely when cars are parked legally.

- Lack of Alternative Parking for Historical Housing: Many of the traditional cottages along this stretch of Main Street are multi-generational households. These historic properties were built without driveways or dedicated off-street parking spaces. Removing on-street parking will leave residents with nowhere to park their vehicles near their homes.
- Forcing vehicles off this corner will not reduce car ownership; it will simply displace the problem. Vehicles will be pushed onto Farrington Way and further up Main Street. Crucially, this will worsen the existing heavy congestion near the post box, where cars already park on both sides of the road, creating a genuine highway bottleneck.
- It appears this sweeping restriction may be a reaction to isolated incidents of inconsiderate or illegal parking by specific individuals. Introducing a permanent, blanket ban punishes the entire community for the actions of a few.
- I think the corner of Main Street and Farrington Way has extended too far along Main Street beyond the legal minimum. I also think it should be considered where the displaced cars will now park. Most of the surrounding area is even less suitable, for example the opposite corner of Farrington way and Main Street. Or the opposite side of Main Street.
- Whilst I accept that where a vehicle is parked on the corner of this junction it would create visibility issues for another vehicle turning from that junction, to place restrictions up to the boundary of Chestnut Cottage will be counterproductive and is just going to move the problem to the area on the corner of Meadow Close as there will be nowhere else for cars to park.
- Not all residents on this part of Main Street, have access to a driveway so we are solely reliant on on-street parking and should the restrictions in their current form be put into place, this will result in three less on-street parking spaces in an area where parking is already in high demand.
- This will have an impact on visitors who struggle to find parking.
- Another alternative is to introduce residents' parking for those properties that don't have a driveway i.e. Chestnut Cottage and Jessamine Cottage who will be most affected by this proposal.
- I acknowledge that, at times, vehicles do park over the corner, and this does create a hazard. However, having reviewed the diagram, I note that the yellow lines are proposed to extend up to Chestnut Cottage. My preference is that the restriction extends only up to the cul de sac sign post before Chestnut Cottage. This adjustment would allow the few houses in this section to retain essential parking as we do not have access to any off-road parking.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to improve visibility splays around the junction. Requests for additional restrictions, such as permit parking, is beyond the scope of this particular TRO consultation. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 40 – Catherine Way, Batheaston

1 partial Objection

Main points of objection raised:

- As a disabled driver I would object to losing disabled parking and other parking spaces.
- As I understand, it is all about keeping the steps outside No 73 Catherine Way clear. There seems to be quite a lot of misunderstanding regarding this section of Catherine Way. First off, all the steps down from Catherine Way had Single No waiting white lines painted across them. When the road was re-surfaced all those white lines were replaced, all except outside No 73 where yellow lines were placed across the steps and continued towards the bus stop removing two car parking spaces as well. The mistake was rectified by the lines being blacked out to allow parking once again leaving the yellow lines across the steps. After a while the black wore off and to correct that this time the lines were burnt off including across the steps. So, somebody assuming the yellow across the steps pre-existed which was an error when all that was there was a white no waiting line. It seems to me that somebody is asking for an unnecessary change without the full facts.
- Surely extending the parking outside number 64 Cathrine Way towards the junction would impede the rotation of the Bus going around that corner.

Officer Response: The removal of some of the existing No Parking At Any Time restrictions were requested by Batheaston Parish Council to provide more on-street parking provision for local residents. The proposed extension of the existing restrictions is intended to retain access to the steps and maintain visibility. No existing Advisory Disabled Parking bays are proposed to be removed as part of this Order. As the Parish Council represent local residents and only one partial objection was raised, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restriction changes are implemented on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Plan 42 – Wellow Lane, Peasedown St John

17 Objections / 17 partial Objections / 2 Support in Part / 6 Support

Main points of objections raised:

- I have enclosed a petition to protest against parking opposite the entrance of Home Farm Close by the residents. We feel that it would restrict our exiting, and entering into our cul-de-sac, and it would become a safety hazard for us. Recycling lorries who reverse into the cul-de-sac for collection would not have the room to position their lorry to swing in, if there are cars parked opposite.
- It does not cause any harm parking along the side of the road near the Home Farm Close cul de sac.
- Many households have multiple vehicles that need to be accommodated on street.
- Where do visitors park?

- Given the limited parking throughout Peasedown St John, particularly on Ashgrove, if you removed further available parking spots those of us with accessibility needs would have unnecessarily increased difficulties finding parking that was acceptably close to homes.
- The road is a 20mph, very wide residential road and parked cars are not a problem. They help with slowing the cars that do use the road.
- This has all come from a select few that have been moaning prior to the houses being built, who did not get their way to prevent the houses being built.
- There is talk that it is hard to pull out of their driveways, the road is wide enough and does not cause a problem.
- All this will cause is more parking issues with the roads that are connected to Wellow Lane due to displaced vehicles.
- What a waste of our money to keep a handful of moaners happy. All it will do is bring more problems than solutions.
- I bought this house due to the on-road parking and now there won't be enough parking for residents and visitors.
- Buses and emergency vehicles have enough space to get past when vehicles are parked.
- It is stated the new development has adequate off-street parking. 1 space is not adequate parking when the garages are not wide enough for a standard car. As for the older properties on the street. They are able to park on the council owned grass verges (if it isn't council owned verges then why are banes cutting the area) so does that mean others will be able to park there without their vehicles being damaged by residents that think they own a whole street?
- Household dependants are living at home more nowadays as it is near impossible to get their own properties which means more drivers.
- Take a good look around the area and realise that other places have more problems.
- All it is going to do is annoy residents who need to park and as the restrictions are nearly all on the same side of the road for most of Wellow Mead will mean a nice clear run for speeding vehicles, especially motor bikes.
- Our semi-rural area and poor public transport do not support the needs for most who work anywhere other than bath.
- The issue of speeding needs to be simply addressed with speed bumps, an example of which can be proven to work not far from us in Camerton on Camerton Hill, the resulting speed bumps were simple, effective and I'm sure the residents would agree, reduced speed.

Officer Response: The No Parking At Any Time restrictions and advisory parking bays were requested by the local Ward Councillor to provide dedicated locations to park and prevent obstruction to property access. Due to the large number of objections raised from local residents regarding the limited on-street parking provision along Wellow Lane and Wellow Mead, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and are not sealed within this Order.

No Objections received to:

Plan 1 – Huish Close, Radstock
Plan 3 – High Street, High Littleton
Plan 6 – Purnell Way, Paulton
Plan 13 – Wells Road / Wesley Ave, Westfield
Plan 14 – Fosseway Gardens, Westfield
Plan 15 – Glebelands, Westfield
Plan 20 – Church Street, Radstock
Plan 23 – Keats Road & Longfellow Road, Westfield, Radstock
Plan 25 – Grove Wood Road, Radstock
Plan 26 – Tynning Road, Bathampton
Plan 27 – Elm Road / Winterfield Park, Paulton
Plan 28 – Bailbrook Lane, Lower Swainswick
Plan 33 – Shaft Road, Monkton Combe
Plan 37 – Bathampton Lane, Bathampton
Plan 38 – Northend, Batheaston
Plan 39 – Catherine Way, Batheaston
Plan 41 – Catherine Way, Batheaston

Response: As no objections were received to these proposals it is the recommendation of this report that they are sealed as advertised.

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

Ward Councillors:

Councillor Sarah Warren - I would like to respond please to the proposed Report 4 decision in relation to plan 16 (Catherine Way).

It is important to recognise that not all disabilities that confer eligibility for a blue badge are visible or involve a wheelchair. This proposal merely seeks to take an existing advisory disabled space and makes it mandatory. As ward councillor, it is my understanding that there is a need for a mandatory disabled space at this location. I would therefore encourage officers (who clearly considered this a suitable location for a disabled space at the time it was originally created) to progress with this TRO as planned.

Response: In light of Councillor Warren's comments above it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed Blue Badge Holder Only Disabled Parking Bay be introduced on-site as advertised and sealed within this Order.

Parish / Town Councils:

No comments.

Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery:

Councillor Lucy Hodge - Having considered the Officer's response to public feedback, and the consequent review of the some of the schemes, I support the proposals recommended to progress in this report.

11. RECOMMENDATION

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



Paul Garrod
Head of Highways Delivery

Date: 17/09/2026

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.

specify minor amendment to Order here:

Plan 10 – Berkeley Avenue, Midsomer Norton

However, as the local Ward Member is not in favour of these proposals, as highlighted above, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and not sealed within this Order.

Plan 11 – Vivien Avenue, MSN

However, as the local Ward Councillor is not in favour of these proposals, as highlighted above, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and not sealed within this Order.

Plan 18 – High Street and Priston Lane, Priston

Due to the level of objection from local residents above, and the fact that on-street parking is at a premium and does act as a traffic calming measure to reduce vehicle speeds, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site at this time and further investigations into potential solutions are carried out when resources permit.

Plan 24 – Eckweek Lane, Peasedown St John

Although there is no legal right for residents to park on the highway near to their property, this section of Eckweek Lane is not near to a junction, and the narrowest section is already covered by a white Keep Clear marking. On street parking is also at a premium along Eckweek Lane, as highlighted within the 10 objections above. It is, therefore, the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site

and are not sealed within this Order.

Plan 42 – Wellow Lane, Peasedown St John

Due to the large number of objections raised from local residents regarding the limited on-street parking provision along Wellow Lane and Wellow Mead, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented on-site and are not sealed within this Order.

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: 17/09/2026