

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: Keynsham and Saltford Area TRO Review

PROPOSAL: Parking Restrictions

SCHEME REF No: 26-051

REPORT AUTHOR: Traffic Management Team KG

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 Keynsham and Saltford 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 26-051.

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:

- Durley Lane, Culvers Road, Culvers Close, Vandyck Avenue, Ludlow Close, Chewton Close, Chandag Road, Cranmore Avenue, Caernarvon Road, Keynsham.

Additional No Parking / No Loading At Any Time restrictions on:

- Manor Road, Saltford and Temple Street, Keynsham.

Additional 30-minute Limited Waiting parking bay on:

- Temple Street, Keynsham.

Removal of Bus Stop Clearway marking on:

- Temple Street, Keynsham.

Additional 4 Hour Limited Waiting parking bay operating 8am – 6pm on:

- Durley Lane, Keynsham.

Removal of existing No Parking At Any Time restrictions on:

- Park Road and Kenilworth Close, Keynsham.

Conversion of existing Loading Bay to a Goods Vehicles Only Loading Bay on:

- Temple Street, Keynsham.

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

This proposal is being funded by the capital Area Parking Review budget, project code TCJ0009S.

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. 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 7 – Ludlow Close, Keynsham

5 Objections / 1 Neutral

Main points of objections raised:

- This proposal will have a detrimental impact on all the residents of numbers 9 to 18 as these houses do not have road access to their properties and rely entirely on the limited number of spaces at the top of the close.
- Every house has at least one car, some two.
- High demand for the current on-street parking as we have a problem with parents parking in our close at drop off and collection times for St Keyna Primary School and residents who live in Monmouth Road, Arundel, Barnards and Raglan Walks.
- Residents in numbers 1 to 8 Ludlow Close already have drop down kerbs and when they have guests or workmen they park across their own driveways, by putting yellow lines in front of these houses, they will come up to our area.
- If these lines are implemented, you must put up some signs to say 'Ludlow Close Residents Only' at the beginning and the top of the Close. Also, a letter to St. Keyna Primary School asking them to inform parents not to park in Ludlow Close.
- What would help with the parking problems in our vicinity would be if you were to convert the green areas in both Arundel and Raglan Walks into more parking specifically for those residents.
- I object to the proposals as it will make the parking in the "hammerhead" area far worse and more dangerous. Access to properties and emergency vehicles is a currently compromised. The "hammerhead" is currently unadopted and should be adopted and double yellow lines implemented here at the same time as the proposals currently being consulted.
- I object to implementing yellow lines on Ludlow Close because it will restrict parking for residents, causing a lack of parking and congestion.

- Parents at the school will simply ignore the restriction however it will make life very difficult for residents, when it is already difficult to find parking.
- Putting DYL outside the homes of the residents is an expensive waste of money and a pointless exercise.
- BANES does not enforce the existing DYL in Ludlow Close.
- BANES in their infinite wisdom decided to arbitrarily add a large chunk more traffic onto this close by expanding the school, to yet more pupils. The Close is inundated with vehicles during school drop off and collection. The turning area between the garages is filled with as many vehicles as the parents think they can squeeze into it. The grass is apparently a parking space, using my drop kerb to access it.
- You have spent a lot of money for aesthetic road decoration which achieves ZERO, since no one enforces, no warning notices are handed out. WORSE still, in the summer the engines are running, pumping fumes into my home, so the aircon can be used to keep the earlier arrivals cool, some arriving up to 45 minutes earlier than the true drop off time to park on the unenforced DYL to be sure of a spot, their poor taste in music often blaring out. In the winter; starter for 10 what happens - oh yes - the engines are running because it's cold, fumes once again an issue for my asthma, nothing done about it.
- None of the residents park regularly in the locations marked for DYL, it's only people dropping kids off at St Kenya school - they already park on the existing DYL, on the corners, and blocking dropped kerbs without penalty, so it seems a waste of our Council Tax to add more lines to be ignored.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. Due to the objections raised above, however, regarding these proposed restrictions, and the lack of available on-street parking provision, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented and are not sealed within this Order.

Plan 8 – Chewton Close, Keynsham

1 Objection

Main points of objection raised:

- This is now the third time double yellow lines have been added to our road while more houses have been built, and parking has become increasingly limited. You cannot keep removing parking without considering the impact on the residents who actually live here.

- In this case it appears a parking space is being removed because one neighbour claims they cannot get out of their space. Yet they themselves regularly park in a way that makes it difficult for their own neighbour to get out.
- How is it fair to remove a parking space used by everyone to accommodate one household?
- You have already added double yellows elsewhere so this will simply push vehicles further up the road onto a narrower bend. This risks creating more obstruction and making access harder for emergency vehicles and bin lorries and further obstructs other neighbours from being able to get out of their fixed car ports that was from the first development of houses.
- This proposal does not appear to solve the parking problem; it simply moves it and penalises everyone else.

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the Traffic Management Team to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. The proposed restrictions will remove only 4.5 metres of on-street parking where it is considered inappropriate to park. It is therefore the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed within this Order as advertised.

Plan 10 – Cranmore Avenue, Keynsham

2 Partial Objections / 3 Partial Supports

Main points of objections raised:

- Given that the affected properties in Cranmore Avenue are separated from the highway by the green which I understood to be owned by Curo, has the Council consulted Curo about the proposal and investigated whether alternative residents' parking could be provided on the green?
- I object to the proposed additional parking restrictions on Cranmore Avenue unless suitable alternative provision is made for affected residents. Several houses on Cranmore Avenue face onto a green and are set back from the public highway. These properties have no direct vehicular access and no practicable opportunity to provide off-street parking. Their residents are therefore necessarily dependent upon the limited on-street parking available nearby. What assessment has the Council made of the number of residents' vehicles likely to be displaced by these restrictions, where those vehicles are expected to park instead, and the resulting effect on neighbouring streets? What suitable alternative parking provision or other mitigation will be provided for existing residents who have no access to off-street parking?

Officer Response: The proposed restrictions were requested by the local Ward Councillor to prevent obstruction of the highway due to parked vehicles. Vehicles

already park on the northern side of the road, so the proposed restrictions on the south side would only deter parking which could lead to a possible obstruction. It is, therefore, the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are implemented on-site and sealed within this Order as advertised.

No Objections received to:

Plan 1 – Temple Street, Keynsham
Plan 2 – Durley Lane, Keynsham
Plan 3 – Culvers Road / Culvers Close, Keynsham
Plan 4 – Manor Road, Saltford
Plan 5 – Vandyck Avenue, Keynsham
Plan 6 – Park Road, Keynsham
Plan 9 – Chandag Road, Keynsham
Plan 11 – Temple Street, Keynsham
Plan 12 – Caernarvon Road, Keynsham
Plan 13 – Kenilworth Close, Keynsham

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:

No comment.

Town Council:

No comment.

Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport Delivery:

Councillor Lucy Hodge - I have reviewed the Officer comments in response to objections and am supportive of the proposed restrictions proceeding as set out within the report.

11. RECOMMENDATION

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



Paul Garrod
Head of Highways Delivery

Date: 14/09/2026

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 7 – Ludlow Close, Keynsham**

Due to the objections raised above, however, regarding these proposed restrictions, and the lack of available on-street parking provision, it is the recommendation of this report that the proposed restrictions are not implemented 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: 14/09/2026