

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

Tuesday, 10th September, 2013

Present:- Councillors Marie Longstaff (Chair), Lisa Brett (Vice-Chair), David Martin, Douglas Nicol, Liz Richardson, Les Kew and Will Sandry (In place of Roger Symonds)

Also in attendance: David Trigwell (Divisional Director - Planning and Transport), Adrian Clarke (Transportation Planning Manager), Peter Dawson (Group Manager, Planning Policy & Transport) and Ian Lund (Historic Environment Team Leader)

14 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

15 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Roger Symonds had sent his apologies to the Panel. Councillor Will Sandry was present as a substitute for Councillor Symonds for the duration of the meeting.

17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

18 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was none.

19 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING

The Chair announced that several members of the public wished to make a statement to the Panel and that they would do so directly before their specific item was debated.

20 MINUTES - 16TH JULY 2013

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chair.

21 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

The Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning, Councillor Tim Ball addressed the Panel. He informed them that a planning application was due before the Development Control Committee in October for a 10 pitch Gypsy & Traveller Site on the Lower Bristol Road. He added that the site would be for 5 transit and 5 permanent pitches.

He said that the Inspector relating to the Core Strategy would be holding a hearing on September 17th to discuss the questions he had recently asked of the Council regarding its housing need. He added that he expected a full hearing to take place in either November or December.

Councillor Les Kew asked what criteria he was going to use to gain permission to use the land on the Lower Bristol Road as it is within the Green Belt.

Councillor Tim Ball replied that he would be citing 'exceptional use' as the land is close to an array of local amenities. He added that no other site had come forward as a possibility and that only one objection had been received for the proposal.

Councillor Will Sandry asked what site management arrangements would be put in place as currently there appeared to be more vehicles on site than equated to 10 pitches.

Councillor Tim Ball replied that there were only two true travelling families on the site and that the others present would not be eligible to remain on the site.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport added for clarification that a pitch could contain a number of vehicles / caravans.

Councillor Liz Richardson asked why the number of sites had reduced from 15 to 10.

Councillor Tim Ball replied that a survey of the site had been carried out and to give adequate space for each pitch and room for vehicles to turn it was determined that 10 was a more feasible number. He added that the permanent pitches are larger than the transit ones.

Councillor Douglas Nicol asked if the Council was discriminating against different types of travellers.

Councillor Tim Ball replied that the definitions were defined by law and the Council was working within its agreed allocation policy / criteria. He added that he would send around the criteria to the Panel.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Caroline Roberts addressed the Panel. She informed them that the Dorchester Street TRO had been advertised and that work was expected to start on the project in July 2014.

She said that the bus stops element of the Bath Package was almost complete and that the next phase would involve the provision of shelters.

She announced that a new footway had been provided through Chew Stoke and that the winter maintenance provision was to be increased.

Councillor Liz Richardson thanked her for the work she had done toward the new footway and asked if drain clearance would be carried out in preparation for winter to avoid flooding.

Councillor Caroline Roberts replied that work was on-going to prevent flooding.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked if extra grit bins could be provided to residents within her ward under the proviso that they are the ones responsible to supply the grit.

Councillor Caroline Roberts replied that she felt this should be possible and would discuss the matter further with Councillor Brett after the meeting.

22 BATH TRANSPORT STRATEGY

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport introduced this item to the Panel. He informed them that a master plan is being prepared for co-ordinated growth within the Bath City Riverside Enterprise Area and will be informed partly by the Bath Transport Strategy. He added that key to supporting this growth agenda was the need for a new, clear, innovative transport strategy to ensure that the City can compete in the 21st Century whilst respecting its World Heritage Status.

He said that in order to help develop a new transport strategy for Bath a tender was currently underway. He highlighted some of the areas of work that would be undertaken.

- Assess the cumulative impact of developments with the Enterprise Area on the City's transport network to 2029.
- Identify key priority cycling routes and other aspects that will benefit the cyclist.
- Identify key priorities for those on foot and any constraints for those who with mobility difficulties using the shop mobility services.
- Review the Council's emerging Parking Strategy and confirming whether or not the principles are sound within the context of the existing transport provision in the city and of the growth now promoted by the Core Strategy. In particular advice on the size of any public car parking that might be retained in Avon Street following its redevelopment.
- Review the previous work which assessed the demand for an east of Bath Park & Ride and review the conclusions of that work in the light of the proposed new development sites referred to above and the current commercial bus network. This work should assess what capacity is required for current and future demand including the need for further expansion of existing P&R sites.

- Assess the implications and opportunities that may arise from the electrification of GWR mainline.

David Redgewell, South West Transport Network addressed the Panel. He stated clearly his belief that the rural connectivity of public transport must not be cut and called for some areas of the Council to have access to public transport 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

He also called for extra security regarding public transport, especially in the evenings, including CCTV cameras at smaller train stations.

He said that more low floor buses were required across the Council and that also there was not enough bus lane provision.

He asked for the Council to look further into the use of Hybrid / Electric buses and questioned whether the management of the Bath Bus Station could be streamlined.

Henry Brown, Chairman of the Federation of Bath Residents Association addressed the Panel. A copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book.

The Chair asked if the Panel would be able to see the draft detail of the strategy prior to publication and consultation.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that he would welcome that.

Councillor David Martin commented that he felt the brief within the report was not explanatory enough regarding the work the consultants will have to carry out. He also said that it would be difficult to determine transport movements into 2029 and asked how the intermediate steps would be handled.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that the consultants will be asked to take into account our current work and to elaborate on the vision as set out within the Core Strategy when producing the draft strategy. He added that none of the consultants that have been approached have registered a concern over the workload set out.

Councillor Les Kew asked why it had taken 2.5 years of this current Council to only reach this point in the process. He also asked how many consultants were on the shortlist.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that four consultants have been asked to tender for the work, all of whom are familiar to the area.

Councillor Les Kew asked if any details could be announced with regard to the proposed East of Bath Park & Ride.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that no announcement could be made at the current time and that the Cabinet would have to decide upon that matter in due course.

Councillor Liz Richardson asked for pinch points to be identified during the survey and called for parking safety in the City to be examined.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that he would ask the consultants to take those points on board.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Caroline Roberts commented that this should be seen as the beginning of the process which brings together a whole range of elements that have been talked about over a number of years such as the East of Bath Park & Ride and coach parking facilities.

Councillor Will Sandry commented that he believed the consultants should be given more of a scope and that he feared the outcomes would not be innovative enough and constrained by the boundaries of being a World Heritage Site.

Councillor Les Kew commented that he was concerned the public consultation planned for Spring 2014 was near to the end of the life of this current Council.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that this work to some extent is dictated by the future of the Core Strategy. He added that one consultation is planned to encompass the Economic, Placemaking & Transport strategies. He stated that work on these matters will still be required even if the Core Strategy is not approved by the Inspector.

Councillor Anthony Clarke commented that he welcomed the over-arching nature of the strategy and hoped it would receive full political support when it was complete to benefit the City and its residents.

The Chair thanked everyone for contributing to the debate and commented that she looked forward to receiving details of the draft strategy when they become available.

23 PARKING STRATEGY

The Transportation Planning Manager introduced this item to the Panel. He explained that the report was an update of the paper submitted to the Panel in September 2011 and sets out the Council's approach to parking issues in Bath, providing a framework for managing car parking spaces for the period 2013 to 2026. He added that the plan will be developed as part of the Bath Transport Strategy and covers all aspects of car parking including:

- On and off-street parking;
- Park and Ride;
- Future parking demand;
- Residential parking standards and enforcement;
- Management issues.

He spoke of how the aim of the strategy is to help improve the quality of life of the people of Bath by establishing a balance between the social, economic, cultural and environmental needs of the whole community.

He stated that a central objective was to reduce the need for drivers to travel to and from the city centre reflecting concerns about the impact of traffic congestion and carbon emissions on the environment and the historic fabric of the World Heritage city, while providing parking provisions that meet a sustainable demand.

He said that the strategy would complement policies to reduce traffic in the central area of Bath by controlling the availability of parking spaces, both on and off street, and by managing the overall supply to meet priority uses.

The objectives of the policy are to:

- Manage travel demand by introducing restraint-based car parking standards to avoid the over provision of car parking spaces and provide disabled 'blue badge' parking spaces
- Sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of Bath by the introduction of transport policies which support the prosperity of the city and provide a balance of good public transport and short stay parking;
- Effectively manage the total parking supply which include all types of parking and consider short stay priorities, regulation, charges and enforcement.

Sally Rothwell, Circus Area Residents' Association and Vineyards Residents' Association addressed the Panel. A copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked if it would be possible to link the North Central Zone with areas 7 & 16.

Sally Rothwell replied that she felt residents were prepared to be flexible on this matter.

The Chair asked if that proposal could be taken on board.

The Transportation Planning Manager replied that he would consult with the Cabinet Member for Transport on that matter through the review process.

The Chair asked if the consultants will be asked to review residents parking.

The Transportation Planning Manager replied that they would and added that the results of that would not necessarily have to wait for the draft strategy work to be completed. He said he would again consult the Cabinet Member for Transport for her view.

Henry Brown, Chairman of the Federation of Bath Residents Association addressed the Panel. A copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book.

Councillor Les Kew commented that he felt the report was disappointing and showed no vision.

Councillor Will Sandry commented that he felt there was a risk to services and a loss of revenue if car parks situated in the centre of Bath closed before further Park & Ride provision was put in place.

Councillor Liz Richardson commented that the use of the Park & Ride needs to become a more attractive offer to the public and suggested charging per vehicle as opposed to per person and introducing an off-peak charge.

The Transportation Planning Manager replied that current Park & Ride services were working well and that usage of the service was increasing. He added that the service was under the control of First so it would be them that set the charging levels.

He said that the Residents Parking Guidance documents had been devised by the Head of Parking Services and should be shared with the Panel.

The Chair summed up the debate and stated that collectively the Panel felt frustrated that it had taken so long to reach this position. She added that the Panel would like to see work progressing on the issue of residents parking outside the collective work of the strategy.

24 ENERGY EFFICIENCY & RENEWABLE ENERGY GUIDANCE FOR LISTED BUILDINGS AND UNDESIGNATED HISTORIC BUILDINGS

The Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning, Councillor Tim Ball introduced the item to the Panel. He explained that he was seeking their advice on the matter prior to the Cabinet making a decision on 11th September. He also placed before them two additional recommendations;

- (i) To test the balance between sustainability and the conservation agenda by looking at pilot projects especially in the Council's property portfolio and in association with Curo and other partnerships to prove the capacity of Bath and North East Somerset to demonstrate exemplar projects in a World Heritage Site.
- (ii) A further report to come to the Cabinet and this Panel in one years' time to report on progress.

The Historic Environment Team Leader added that conservation lies at the heart of sustainability and that he felt that the additional recommendations were very positive. He also said that significant discussions had been held in the past with Curo and that he would be happy to work with them on future projects.

Councillor Will Sandry commented that he did not think it was too far-fetched to suggest that Listed Buildings should be allowed to have double glazing.

Councillor David Martin, the Member Champion for Climate Change asked the Cabinet to look carefully at the measures that can be implemented and called for them to be as wide reaching as possible. He added that he would like to seek a

change in national guidance through work with the National Trust and English Heritage. He stated that he welcomed both of the additional recommendations.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked if anybody could confirm if York had given permission for its Listed Buildings with timber framed windows to be replaced with double glazing.

The Historic Environment Team Leader replied that he would find it difficult to believe that they would have made a block decision on such a matter. He added that historic buildings needed to breathe. He also reminded the Panel of the work carried out at St. John's Hospital which involved the replacing of around 147 windows following incorrect mouldings and proportions from work carried out in the 1980s.

Councillor Douglas Nicol commented that he had met with Curo recently and was confident that they would like to be involved in this work area.

Councillor Liz Richardson suggested that if the guidance was to be modified in the future then conservation areas should become included.

Peter Andrews, Transition Bath addressed the Panel. He said that he had been asked to be part of a similar project several years ago and had thought that an SPD had been agreed but when the documentation was finally produced it had been heavily edited. He stated that felt around 400 – 500 jobs could be created through retro-fitting.

He said that he applauded the existence of the current document as the buildings concerned should be considered as places to live and work, not museums.

He agreed strongly with the part of the Cabinet recommendation that states to 'Progress the work through the Sustainability Team and engagement with the key Stakeholders and other Authorities'.

The Chair summed up the debate and stated clearly that the Panel supports the report that is going to Cabinet including the two additional recommendations.

25 PANEL WORKPLAN

The Chair introduced this item to the Panel.

Councillor Lisa Brett suggested that the Panel at some stage looked at the outcomes of the upcoming Alcohol Harm Scrutiny Inquiry Day.

The Chair reminded the Panel of their wish to see the draft detail of the Transport Strategy and suggested that was placed on the workplan for November.

Councillor Liz Richardson asked if the Flood & Drainage Management item scheduled for November could contain details of the current flood reports.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to agree with all of the above proposals.

The meeting ended at 12.05 pm

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
Bristol City Council Cabinet on 5 September and full Council on 10
September, Sustainable Transport Commission on 19 September,
West of England Partnership Scrutiny Commission on 6 September,
Transport Board and Transport Executive on 11 September
South Gloucestershire Planning, Transport and Environment
Committee on 3 September
BANES full Council on 12 September
Sedgemoor District Council Bus Scrutiny Panel on 3 September*

Bus Service Alterations and Progress on MetroWest

We are concerned that the bus service alterations from a number of operators on 29 July and 1 September, particularly those affecting Bridgwater, Weston-super-Mare and North Somerset, have caused real passenger concern. The loss of almost all evening services in the Taunton Wellington, Bridgwater, Burnham and Weston-super-Mare corridor and the Taunton-Minehead corridor is especially damaging to the quality of life, rural economy and access to Healthcare in the major centres. This is despite the fact that there are “Quality Partnerships” between operators and the local authorities — i.e. Somerset County Council in this instance — on these routes.

On 1 September the situation has been exacerbated by the closure of all bus operations from Baker Dolphin (Weston to the Hospital, Weston to Worle on W5 and W14, the 121 to Banwell, Winscombe and Wrington via the town centre, although for the time being daytime services are being maintained on route 121, 66 (Congresbury to Portishead) and the 668/669 Lower Langford, to Cheddar, Street and Shepton Mallett.

Following the cutbacks on the Bridgwater town services, some of which are now being restored by Webberbus and First (rerouting the 1 and the 14),

Statement from South West Transport Network for Bristol City Council Cabinet on 5 September and full Council on 10 September, Sustainable Transport Commission on 19 September, West of England Partnership Scrutiny Commission on 6 September, Transport Board and Transport Executive on 11 September South Gloucestershire Planning, Transport and Environment Committee on 3 September BANES full Council on 12 September Sedgemoor District Council Bus Scrutiny Panel on 3 September

the deepest concern here is the issue of continuity of public subsidy. Unless this can be addressed with central government and resources put into protecting the rural bus network (with rural proofing), the operators will never be able to make these services commercially viable. Whilst we hope that some of these services will be restored in November, this will not take place without an injection of public finance.

It is very important that the West of England Partnership, Wiltshire, Somerset and Gloucestershire County Councils work together to protect the bus network across their boundaries and this issue of rural proofing is raised with the Secretary of State, the buses Minister Norman Baker and the Department for Transport. A similar situation arises with bus services between South Gloucestershire and Gloucester where the Bristol—Dursley—Gloucester corridor only has funding for a single year.

It is also very important the Bus Priority measures between Bristol and Thornbury go ahead along the showcase route, and the issue of Highworth Road in Patchway is addressed within this corridor.

Night-time Bus Services

We are pleased with the success of the extension of Greater Bristol daytime services to create the innovative night bus service. We would however urge the Mayor of Bristol, BANES Council, South Gloucestershire and North

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
Bristol City Council Cabinet on 5 September and full Council on 10
September, Sustainable Transport Commission on 19 September,
West of England Partnership Scrutiny Commission on 6 September,
Transport Board and Transport Executive on 11 September
South Gloucestershire Planning, Transport and Environment
Committee on 3 September
BANES full Council on 12 September
Sedgemoor District Council Bus Scrutiny Panel on 3 September*

Somerset Councils to retain and improve on the current network. Routes 1, 2, 40A, 43, 44, 48, 49, 70, 73, 75, 76, 90, 339 and N50 all need to be retained with affordable fares and the following routes should be considered for addition to the night network:

- 6 and 7 between Bristol and Kingswood via Staple Hill
- 376 Bristol to Whitchurch, Wells, Glastonbury and Street
- Bristol to Weston-super-Mare
- Bristol to Portishead (with possible extension to Clevedon)
- Bristol to Thornbury
- Bristol to Yate and Chipping Sodbury (replacing the N50 with the 342 running six nights per week).

We are pleased to see that Police and Crime Commissioner, Avon and Somerset, BTP, the Bristol Port Police and the Universities have worked so well together in creating an environment where access to the night-time economy in Bristol, Bath with its links to the Airport is available to so many people.

The recent route changes on Services 40, 40A and 41 in Bristol have left both night-time users and day-time users with an impaired level of service. Whilst we understand that these changes are primarily pragmatic rather than ideological on the part of First Group (reflecting traffic management problems in Sneyd Park and Broadmead/Old Market crew changes). In view of the strong local opposition to these changes in the Sneyd Park/Stoke Bishop area and the effect the cutback of the route from Old

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
Bristol City Council Cabinet on 5 September and full Council on 10
September, Sustainable Transport Commission on 19 September,
West of England Partnership Scrutiny Commission on 6 September,
Transport Board and Transport Executive on 11 September
South Gloucestershire Planning, Transport and Environment
Committee on 3 September
BANES full Council on 12 September
Sedgemoor District Council Bus Scrutiny Panel on 3 September*

Market to Union Street is having on the night-time economy in Old Market, we would urge the Mayor and South Gloucestershire Council to use the opportunity of the forthcoming review to consider ways of restoring these services and deal with the traffic management issues in more appropriate ways. It is regrettable that there are no statutory quality partnerships on the routes signed with First or Wessex to deal with the issues of frequency, routing, vehicle quality and ticketing.

This group of routes has seen no investment in vehicles and consequently little growth in its market appeal over recent years. Whilst we welcome the planned investment in vehicles for routes 6, 7, 24 and 25, we do believe that the 40 group needs to be included in the next round of improvements.

MetroWest bus and train services

We would like to see details of progress on the Portishead line reopening (including the station sites at Portishead and Ashton Gate), the Interchange at Temple Meads with MetroWest Buses and works to finish the embarrassingly protracted Interchange at Bath Spa (including the disabled toilets and signage). We also think it is vital that studies between the West of England Partnership and BANES include the reopening of Bathampton, Corsham and Salford stations as well as the provision of disabled facilities and access at existing stations (Oldfield Park and Keynsham in particular).

Statement from South West Transport Network for Bristol City Council Cabinet on 5 September and full Council on 10 September, Sustainable Transport Commission on 19 September, West of England Partnership Scrutiny Commission on 6 September, Transport Board and Transport Executive on 11 September South Gloucestershire Planning, Transport and Environment Committee on 3 September BANES full Council on 12 September Sedgemoor District Council Bus Scrutiny Panel on 3 September

We welcome the appointment of an officer from Centro to South Gloucestershire Council to coordinate the reopening of the Henbury Loop and integration of bus and rail services with the re-opened line including disabled facilities (for which specific funding is available). We are looking forward to seeing a proper delivery plan for MetroWest and in particular the Henbury line.

From a passenger perspective the widespread closure of public toilets at Bus Terminals (including disabled facilities) is very much regretted (The prime examples are Bath, Weston-super-Mare and Clevedon but the same proposals are now on the table for Portishead, Twerton, Larkhall, Midsomer Norton, Peasedown St John, Combe Down and Keynsham).

In Conclusion

It is good to see the working relationship which is developing between the Mayor of Bristol, the West of England Partnership and the bus and rail operators. Encouraging events have been the special train on the Henbury loop, the electric buses and the high-quality commuter coach on display at the Make Sunday Special event, and the new buses in Bath and South Gloucestershire. We welcome the setting up of a Public Transport Forum for the Greater Bristol area by the West of England Partnership, along the lines of the successful forum partnership in South Gloucestershire and the sadly cash-strapped Somerset County Council Transport Forum.

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
Bristol City Council Cabinet on 5 September and full Council on 10
September, Sustainable Transport Commission on 19 September,
West of England Partnership Scrutiny Commission on 6 September,
Transport Board and Transport Executive on 11 September
South Gloucestershire Planning, Transport and Environment
Committee on 3 September
BANES full Council on 12 September
Sedgemoor District Council Bus Scrutiny Panel on 3 September*

David Redgewell

South West Transport Network – Tel 07814 794953

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL, 10 SEPTEMBER 2013

Bath Transport Strategy

Henry Brown, Chairman of FoBRA. We represent 27 separate residents' associations in central and outer areas of Bath.

Regularly ask our member associations what they think FoBRA should do, and transport, pollution & congestion always come out top.

Welcome the work that the Council is doing on a transport strategy, indeed we claim credit for persuading them to do this.

However, we do have some reservations about the work described in the paper:

- It is asking consultants to gather information towards drafting a strategy. It isn't clear who is to draft the strategy itself. The consultants need to be clear whether this is their job, or whether a separate stage is to follow.
- We don't see how a strategy can be drafted unless there is an underlying vision for the actions to deliver. This isn't something for outsiders to recommend. The Council should have talked to stakeholders in Bath, and drawn up an agreed vision on something like the following lines:
 - *An economically vibrant city with sustainable development as set out in the Core Strategy.*
 - *A city centre (this could be the BID area) free of all but essential traffic.*
 - *Public Realm and Movement Strategy delivered.*
 - *Key Elements of the World Heritage Site protected from traffic and pollution.*
 - *Enhanced quality of life and wellbeing for those who live in, work in and visit Bath.*
 - *Air quality better than statutory pollution limits*
 - *Reduced congestion and free movement on the designated through route (London Road - Bathwick Street – Pulteney Road – Lower Bristol Road).*

[Type text]

➤ *Public transport attractive enough to get people out of their cars.*

- Looking at the work commissioned, the most important paragraphs i and ii request an assessment of future developments. This isn't enough. Existing congestion and pollution need to be assessed and tackled as well.
- Paragraph viii talks about reviewing previous work on an Eastern Park & Ride. We don't need is more time-wasting reviews on this. Instead the Council should give a clear commitment to get on and build it without further delay.

Draft Bath Car Parking Strategy

Welcome the Council's work on this. As paper makes clear parking is an essential element of transport policy. Every parking space encourages vehicle movements to and from it. So if we are serious about reducing congestion and pollution in Bath, parking in the city centre must be progressively restricted, and every sustainable alternative to the private car, particularly Park & Ride, must be encouraged.

I have some detailed comments:

- Appendix 1. The graph on bus journeys shows little or no growth, even against a modest target of 1.5%. Bus services need to be made attractive enough to get people out of their cars.
- Parking controls, last bullet point. The Council needs to recognise that 10,000 people live in Abbey & Kingsmead wards in the centre of Bath. This is not a small handful. Many of us do without a private car – I use the car club myself. But those who do need a car are very badly served by residents' parking – only one permit per household, as against two elsewhere, and often real difficulty in finding a space. We welcome Action A2, to review provision, and demand that residents should be given priority over visitors.
- Principle P1. The principle of squeezing out central parking in favour of Park & Ride must not be allowed to be watered down.
- Action A5. Fully support development of eastern Park & Ride. Should be implemented without more delay.
- Action A6. Given the desire for later opening of Park & Ride, why is this not being implemented now? It would need to be accompanied by physical security measures, as customers may not feel comfortable about leaving their vehicles in the later evening.

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel
10 September 2013
Item 10 - Draft Bath car parking strategy

Note by Circus Area Residents' Association and Vineyards Residents' Association

1. Our two residents' associations cover much of the northern part of the Bath Central Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The difficulty of on-street parking for residents is one of our members' main concerns.
2. The northern part of the Central Zone (the area north of Queen Square, George Street and Paragon) is predominantly residential in character. For historical reasons this area is in the Central CPZ, as it was originally created in the 1970s. But as the attached map clearly demonstrates, the north Central Zone (coloured orange) is no closer to the commercial and civic city centre than most of the other Controlled Zones (the so-called 'Outer Zones').
3. Residents in this area are unfairly treated compared with residents in the Outer Zones. Although it is the most densely residential area in the city, there is almost no 'permit-holder only' parking. There are no resident visitor permits. In the Outer Zones there is a minimum of 50% permit-holder only places and residents can buy day permits for their visitors. Similar arrangements should apply in the residential north Central Zone.
4. The Central CPZ is now completely surrounded by the Outer Zones, where parking for non-residents is strictly limited. Visitors therefore head into the centre and drive around looking for a space, adding to the congestion and pollution in the heart of the city. The result is close to 100% occupancy of parking bays in this area, while in the Outer Zones there are empty bays, with occupancy in some Zones as low as 8%. This places enormous pressure on residents of our area when they are trying to find a place to park in the area in which they live. (Many residents here, like most people, need to use a car more or less regularly).
5. The current arrangements have developed without any overall strategy. When the Central CPZ was originally created in the 1970s the aim was to discourage parking in the centre. Parking was available on streets around the edge of the CPZ. This has now been completely reversed, so that the centre is almost the only place where visitors can park. Even here, on-street visitor parking is limited because 75% of the spaces are always occupied by residents.
6. Visitors should be encouraged to use firstly the park-and-ride, and then off-street parking. If some on-street visitor parking is needed, the burden ought to be shared with the other residential areas surrounding the centre.
7. There has been no action on this since the Panel received a paper almost a year ago. That paper included the results of a survey which underlined residents' dissatisfaction with the parking arrangements in the Central Zone. Action A2 of this paper calls for a review of parking provision in the Central Zone. We think that the Council should, as a matter of policy, give priority to residents. We hope the Panel will agree that this should be addressed in the near future.

Sally Rothwell, Circus Area Residents' Association
Patrick Rotheram, Vineyards Residents' Association

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL, 10 SEPTEMBER 2013

Bath Transport Strategy

Henry Brown, Chairman of FoBRA. We represent 27 separate residents' associations in central and outer areas of Bath.

Regularly ask our member associations what they think FoBRA should do, and transport, pollution & congestion always come out top.

Welcome the work that the Council is doing on a transport strategy, indeed we claim credit for persuading them to do this.

However, we do have some reservations about the work described in the paper:

- It is asking consultants to gather information towards drafting a strategy. It isn't clear who is to draft the strategy itself. The consultants need to be clear whether this is their job, or whether a separate stage is to follow.
- We don't see how a strategy can be drafted unless there is an underlying vision for the actions to deliver. This isn't something for outsiders to recommend. The Council should have talked to stakeholders in Bath, and drawn up an agreed vision on something like the following lines:
 - *An economically vibrant city with sustainable development as set out in the Core Strategy.*
 - *A city centre (this could be the BID area) free of all but essential traffic.*
 - *Public Realm and Movement Strategy delivered.*
 - *Key Elements of the World Heritage Site protected from traffic and pollution.*
 - *Enhanced quality of life and wellbeing for those who live in, work in and visit Bath.*
 - *Air quality better than statutory pollution limits*
 - *Reduced congestion and free movement on the designated through route (London Road - Bathwick Street – Pulteney Road – Lower Bristol Road).*

[Type text]

➤ *Public transport attractive enough to get people out of their cars.*

- Looking at the work commissioned, the most important paragraphs i and ii request an assessment of future developments. This isn't enough. Existing congestion and pollution need to be assessed and tackled as well.
- Paragraph viii talks about reviewing previous work on an Eastern Park & Ride. We don't need is more time-wasting reviews on this. Instead the Council should give a clear commitment to get on and build it without further delay.

Draft Bath Car Parking Strategy

Welcome the Council's work on this. As paper makes clear parking is an essential element of transport policy. Every parking space encourages vehicle movements to and from it. So if we are serious about reducing congestion and pollution in Bath, parking in the city centre must be progressively restricted, and every sustainable alternative to the private car, particularly Park & Ride, must be encouraged.

I have some detailed comments:

- Appendix 1. The graph on bus journeys shows little or no growth, even against a modest target of 1.5%. Bus services need to be made attractive enough to get people out of their cars.
- Parking controls, last bullet point. The Council needs to recognise that 10,000 people live in Abbey & Kingsmead wards in the centre of Bath. This is not a small handful. Many of us do without a private car – I use the car club myself. But those who do need a car are very badly served by residents' parking – only one permit per household, as against two elsewhere, and often real difficulty in finding a space. We welcome Action A2, to review provision, and demand that residents should be given priority over visitors.
- Principle P1. The principle of squeezing out central parking in favour of Park & Ride must not be allowed to be watered down.
- Action A5. Fully support development of eastern Park & Ride. Should be implemented without more delay.
- Action A6. Given the desire for later opening of Park & Ride, why is this not being implemented now? It would need to be accompanied by physical security measures, as customers may not feel comfortable about leaving their vehicles in the later evening.

This page is intentionally left blank