

Bath & North East Somerset Council			
DECISION MAKER:	Cllr Roger Symonds, Cabinet Member for Transport		
DECISION DATE:	On or after 9 <sup>th</sup> March 2013	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:	
		E	2507
TITLE:	(Various Roads Bath)(Prohibition of Parking)(Designated Parking Places) Order 201- – consideration of responses to public consultation		
WARD:	Kingsmead, Lansdown, Walcot, Westmoreland		
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM			
List of attachments to this report:			
Appendix 1 – Plans of proposals			
Appendix 2 –Comments received in response to public consultation			
Appendix 3 – Proposed relocation of disabled bays in Victoria Park			

## **1 THE ISSUE**

- 1.1 This report considers comments received in response to public advertisement of the (Various Roads Bath)(Prohibition of Parking)(Designated Parking Places) Order 201-

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

The Cabinet Member is asked to agree that:

- 2.1 The proposals are implemented as publicly advertised
- 2.2 The existing disabled parking bays in Victoria Park are relocated to a flatter site further east (Appendix 3 refers) and are replaced by 2 hour pay & display parking bays.

### **3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 Funding exists for Pay & Display Replacement within the 2012/13 capital programme for implementing the works and has been approved in the 2013/14 capital programme.
- 3.2 Ongoing maintenance costs have been factored into the proposal and will be funded from existing revenue budgets and additional income generated from the parking charge proposals.
- 3.3 The parking charge proposals for Victoria Park are likely to raise £60,000 income per annum. Year one costs are £64,000 including purchase and installation of ticket machines. However, it is anticipated that we reuse machines from other locations which would reduce the costs to approximately £20,000, yielding a net income of approximately £40,000 in the first year.
- 3.4 The income generated will contribute to the 2013/14 additional income targets in Parking Services approved by Council in the budget report.

### **4 CORPORATE OBJECTIVES**

4.1 The following corporate objectives apply:

- Creating neighbourhoods where people are proud to live
- Building a stronger economy

### **5 THE REPORT**

- 5.1 The proposals were publicly advertised from 15<sup>th</sup> November to 6<sup>th</sup> December 2012. The proposals are shown in plan form in Appendix 1. The rationale for the proposals varies from site to site, and is indicated in more detail in the paragraphs below. A total of 108 responses were received. As the scheme covers a wide area, responses generally relate to specific issues, and can be grouped into 6 specific area proposals. The responses are summarised in Appendix 2, and the issues relating to the specific areas are considered below, with recommendations on a way forward.

#### **Royal Victoria Park**

- 5.2 The rationale for implementing short term Pay & Display for people visiting Royal Victoria Park is that the changes will eliminate all day, long-stay parking. Currently people wishing to use the park often cannot park because the roads are clogged with vehicles, many of which are commuters who use it as a long-stay car park. By introducing Pay & Display restrictions more short-term parking will be available for people wanting to access the park. Charges are set to encourage higher visitor numbers with tariffs lower than other parts of the city centre. The proposals would also allow the allocation of areas designed to meet the needs of visitors to particular attractions within the park, like the Botanic Gardens, and improve safety because fewer cars are anticipated to be parked in the vicinity. Additionally, the proposals will reduce the numbers of long stay vehicles within the boundaries of the

park in line with the requirements of the Heritage Lottery Funding Grant received in 2000 which required a reduction in the overall number of vehicles parking within the park. .

- 5.3 24 responses received; 2 for; 4 partly for; 17 against, and one with further suggestions. Details are outlined in Appendix 2
- 5.4 The proposal removes commuter parking and therefore provides more parking for bona fide visitors to the park. The time limit also allows a turnover of vehicles allowing more people to visit the park. Some respondents were concerned that displaced parking would create the need for expansion of the current residents parking zones. One respondent requested that the existing disabled bays are moved to a more level site to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act. This would also free up more space for general parking.
- 5.5 Recommend that the proposals be implemented as advertised, and that the current disabled parking bays are moved to a flatter site to the east of their current location (Appendix 3 refers). Surrounding areas will be monitored to establish whether expansion of the residents parking zone needs to be considered.

#### **Sion Hill, Summerhill Road**

- 5.6 No Parking At Any Time proposed for safety/improved visibility reasons at 2 junctions. These proposals replace existing advisory 'Keep Clear' markings.
- 5.7 12 responses received; 4 for; 2 partly for; 6 against. Details are outlined in Appendix 2
- 5.8 All the objectors to this proposal objected on the grounds that parking stock would be lost, however as the proposed restrictions are to replace Keep Clear markings, these areas are currently not available for parking, hence there is no net loss. Therefore recommend that the proposals be implemented as advertised.

#### **Richmond Road**

- 5.9 No Parking At Any Time proposed to remove double parking and allow freer traffic flow.
- 5.10 4 responses received; 4 for; 0 against. Details are outlined in Appendix 2. Recommend that the proposals be implemented as advertised.

#### **Sion Road, Lansdown Road, Northfields**

- 5.11 These proposals are based on consultation with local residents. No Parking At Any Time is proposed on Sion Road to allow a freer flow of traffic. The restrictions alternate between different sides of the road to create a 'chicane' effect to keep vehicle speeds low. Limited Waiting is proposed in Northfields to prevent long-term parking and allow visitor parking for residents.
- 5.12 17 responses received; 10 for; 1 partly for; 6 against. Details are outlined in Appendix 2.

5.13 Some of the objectors believed removal of parking on Sion Road would increase traffic speeds, however the alternate parking bays should act as a chicane to keep vehicle speeds down. Other objectors believed displaced parking would create parking pressures elsewhere and the consequent need for expansion of the current residents parking zone.

5.14 Recommend that the proposals be implemented as advertised. Surrounding areas will be monitored to establish whether expansion of the residents parking zone needs to be considered.

### **Claremont Road**

5.15 The proposals are in association with a development proposal in Southborne gardens. The proposal was initially refused and went to appeal twice. In both cases the Inspector ruled in favour of the developer, on the basis that the access to Southborne gardens was made safe by implementation of No Parking At Any Time as per the current proposal. As part of the appeal process, the Inspector considered many objections regarding the loss of on-street parking and the effect of displaced parking. Based on surveys undertaken by the appellant, the Inspector concluded that there is on-street capacity in the locality, and that any displaced parking could be accommodated. Officers agree with this conclusion.

5.16 31 responses received; 1 for; 30 against. Details are outlined in Appendix 2

5.17 The objectors object on the grounds of loss of parking and effects of displaced parking. Surveys have shown that there is sufficient on-street parking capacity at this location, and displaced parking can be accommodated. Accordingly, it is recommended that the proposals be implemented as advertised.

### **West Avenue, South Avenue, Triangle North**

5.18 No Parking At Any Time proposed at junctions and on a bend to allow for better visibility and safe passage of vehicles, especially buses which find it difficult to negotiate tight turns through parked vehicles.

5.19 17 responses received; 11 for; 2 partly for; 3 against, and one with further suggestions. Details are outlined in Appendix 2

5.20 The objectors suggest removal of parking will increase vehicle speeds and increase pressure on local parking stock. Supporters consider the proposals necessary to reduce risks of collision, and 'stand-offs' due to lack of opportunity for vehicles to pass. One respondent suggested the need for a residents parking scheme.

5.21 The proposals will increase the pressure on parking stock slightly, however there is good support for this proposal which is deemed necessary on grounds of safety and traffic flow. Recommended that the proposals be implemented as advertised.

## **6 RISK MANAGEMENT**

6.1 The report author and Cabinet member have fully reviewed the risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

## **7 EQUALITIES**

7.1 An EqIA has been completed. No adverse or other significant issues were found.

## **8 RATIONALE**

8.1 The proposals are designed to address operational traffic issues.

## **9 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

9.1 None considered.

## **10 CONSULTATION**

10.1 Ward Councillor; Cabinet members; Staff; Other B&NES Services; Local Residents; Other Public Sector Bodies; Section 151 Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer

10.2 Ward Councillors, Emergency Services and local residents have been consulted via public advertisement. Internal staff have been consulted via circulation of this report.

## **11 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION**

11.1 Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Health & Safety; Other Legal Considerations

## **12 ADVICE SOUGHT**

The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

<b>Contact person</b>	Nick Jeanes, Traffic & Safety Team Leader 01225 394256
<b>Background papers</b>	
<b>Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format</b>	