

Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Statement of Reasons

Bath and North East Somerset Council

(25-052) (CRSTS Various Roads) (City Centre, Bath) (Segregated Cycle Lanes / Parking Restrictions)

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Proposal

Phase 1 of the CRSTS Bath City Centre scheme aims to deliver improved walking and cycling infrastructure in the centre of Bath.

Through the introduction of segregated cycle lanes, revised junction layouts and improved surfaces, new routes for cyclists and pedestrians will be implemented and existing routes rationalised.

This supports Bath's ambition to be the UK's most walkable and accessible city.

The programme serves to complement and enhance the benefits of wider projects, to create a sustainable city centre that is pleasant, safe, secure, well-connected, and has an attractive urban realm that supports the continued development and evolution of the city.

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 segregated cycle lanes and parking restrictions. It has balanced the various considerations and concluded that it is appropriate to promote the segregated cycle lanes and parking restrictions. 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 segregated cycle lanes and parking restrictions are consistent with that duty, having regard to its other policies and objectives.

The Council has considered article 8 within Schedule 1 to the Human Rights Act (Right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence) and Protocol 1 Article 1 (Peaceful enjoyment of possessions). Both of these rights are qualified rights, and the

Council does not consider that the measures proposed under the TRO amount to a deprivation of possessions as the right to access property has not been extinguished. The proposals are considered to have a minimal impact on human rights. However, the Council is entitled to affect these rights where it is in accordance with the law, necessary (such as 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 proposals within this report are considered to be in accordance with the law, necessary, in pursuit of a legitimate aim and proportionate.

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.

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

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 Order specifically for the reason(s) shown and marked 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)	

In making this proposal the Council has discharged its duty under section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

The Council is under a duty pursuant to section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) to exercise its duties under the Act (so far as practicable having regard to the subsection (2) matters), to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

As for the subsection 122(2) matters:

- a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.

Comment: The scheme has no impact on access to premises.

- b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run.

Comment: The scheme has no impact on existing regulations and restrictions.

The scheme has provided a loading bay on Upper Borough Walls to replace the informal loading bay. This new bay has been moved in order to preserve the

passage of pedestrians making the north / south movement across from Union Passage to New Bond Street, which previously would be blocked by vehicles.

- bb) The strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy)
Comment: This scheme supports the reduction of air pollution by encouraging modal switch, increasing safety for pedestrians and cyclists, contributing to a reduction in congestion and associated pollution.
- c) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.
Comment: Extensive review of designs by the highways authority to ensure safety of persons using public service vehicles. Designs have been amended when needed.
- d) Any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.
Comment: N/A

Having balanced the various matters and considerations, the Council has concluded that it is appropriate to progress the proposed Order.

The Council has also discharged its duty under section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. It has concluded that the proposed Order is consistent with that duty, given its other policies and objectives.

Neither section 16 nor section 122 of the 1984 Act precludes the making of the proposed Order.

Date:

24/09/25