

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

MINUTES OF COMMUNITIES, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL MEETING

Monday, 4th December, 2017

Present:- **Councillors** John Bull, Brian Simmons, Neil Butters, Alan Hale, Richard Samuel, Patrick Anketell-Jones, Ian Gilchrist, Michael Evans and Anthony Clarke (in place of Peter Turner)

45 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

46 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

47 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Peter Turner gave his apologies and was substituted by Councillor Tony Clarke.

48 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

49 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was none.

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

The following people made statements to the Panel:

Robin Kerr – Federation of Bath Residents Associations made a statement regarding the Council's Coach Strategy. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes.*

In response to a question from Councillor Evans, Mr Kerr suggested that Pickfords would be a good place for coaches to drop off or possibly Pulteney Road. He further explained that coaches do not need to drop people off in the city centre and there is an opportunity for a transport revolution in Bath with the new Transport Strategy.

Rachel Demuth – Resident and business owner made a statement regarding Coach Parking Strategy. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes.*

The Divisional Director for Environmental Services, Martin Shields was asked to comment on the Riverside Coach Park. He stated that, while not within in his remit, he could explain that the coach park is part of the regeneration scheme for Bath Quays. He explained that alternatives have been looked at – for example Oddown Park and Ride and arrangements for short stay parking are under review.

Councillor Samuel asked how the coaches affect the business. Rachel Demuth explained that she cannot open the windows in the summer as coach drivers do not turn their engines off due to the air conditioning. She explained that there are queues of coaches, some large coaches which affect pedestrian safety, cause noise, pollution and block disabled access. Councillor Anketell Jones stated that a list of the names of the coach companies would be useful.

Patrick Rotherham – made a statement regarding the Parking Strategy. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes.*

Councillor Samuel asked if Mr Rotherham thought that the one way system in the centre encourages people to drive around in circles. Mr Rotherham agreed and stated that Milsom Street is a classic case where there are 20 parking spaces generating a huge amount of traffic.

Adam Reynolds – made a statement regarding the Parking Strategy. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes.*

Responding to a question from Councillor Bull Mr Reynolds explained that there should be zones across the whole city where people can park for 4 hours or less but if they park for the whole day, they must have a ticket or a permit. He also suggested that residents be issued a reporting App where a traffic warden on an electric bike can respond – cop-operation between the community and the Council.

Councillor Samuel stated that his ward is flooded with cars from the East of the city and asked if his proposal would fix this. Mr Reynolds explained that the whole of a Bath is a park and ride site and he proposes that there is a congestion cost to park in the city and the price of a bus pass should be similar to driving and parking.

Councillor Butters asked if there would be a financial benefit to the Council in his proposal. Mr Reynolds explained that if there is less parking then the Council would get less money but would also be getting less air pollution. The Division Director explained that any money raised through parking would be ring-fenced for transport issues.

Note minute 56 – Panel members agreed a small working group to look at Adam Reynolds proposal on parking policy.

Gillian Risbridger – made a statement regarding the Parking Strategy. *A copy of this statement is attached to these minutes.*

51 MINUTES

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the 18th September 2017 meeting as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the 13th November 2017 meeting as a true record, with the following amendments, and they were duly signed by the Chairman:

- Page 9 Councillor Hardman said that the volunteers would have to run the Youth Service, not that they already do.
- Moorland Road not Moreland Road.

52 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

The Chair explained that Councillor Mark Shelford, Cabinet Member for Transport and Highways was currently ill and introduced Councillor Bob Goodman, Cabinet Member for Development and Neighbourhoods who updated the Panel on the following regarding waste:

- It is the 5th week of the fortnightly waste collections, black bin waste has reduced significantly and the volume of recycling has been tremendous. There has been an increase in green bin waste and food waste recycling. The new arrangements have led to recycling being presented well and cleaner streets. There will be enforcement and further education in the New Year. There has been no increase in fly tipping but this is still being monitored. There have been a few issues with mis-collection but complaints are coming down. A big thanks for all who have worked on this.

Panel members asked the following questions and made the following points:

Councillor Bull stated that the few issues in his ward have been dealt with efficiently by officers.

Councillor Hale stated that this had been a massive undertaking and had been delivered well. He asked if there was still some flexibility over people wanting a bag instead of a wheelie bin. The Division Director for Environmental Services explained that residents should share any concerns via Council Connect as allocations are still being reviewed.

Councillor Evans asked if was true that more affluent areas still have a weekly bin collection. The Cabinet Member explained that there is a small core area in the city where weekly collections continue, this is due to the buildings having no frontage and so that the bags would be hung on railings.

In response to a question from Councillor Gilchrist, The Cabinet Member explained that he is certain that the service is on course for a projected overall saving but cannot confirm at this stage.

The Cabinet Member updated the Panel on the following regarding air quality:

- The situation on London Road must be addressed, there is some funding from the Government to take this study on. A draft report to DEFRA is due in March 2018. DEFRA are keen to see the air quality issue addressed.

Panel members asked the following questions and made the following points:

Councillor Bull asked if there was a chance that the area could become a clean air zone. The Cabinet Member stated that everything had to be on the table.

Responding to Councillor Samuel, The Cabinet Member explained that the Council response to DEFRA was due in March 2018 – this will look at areas to reduce pollution levels. Firstly there will be options and levels of reduction followed by consultation. DEFRA are very keen to see a reduction.

53 SCRUTINY INQUIRY DAY - COMMUNITY SAFETY

Councillor John Bull, Chairman of the Panel introduced the item. He explained that the Panel had looked at a number of aspects of Community Safety at the Scrutiny Inquiry Day (SID). He further explained that the areas looked at had widened. He pointed out the three recommendations in the report.

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

Councillor Butters asked if there was any funding. Samantha Jones, Inclusive Communities Manager, explained that all funding for community safety is from the Police and Crime Commissioners grant, there was no Council budget for community safety. A tremendous amount of work is being done by the authority and the police on a shoe string.

Councillor Hale stated that the work is well appreciated. He noted that there was little reference at the SID to anti-social behaviour whereas public concern on this issue is high. He explained that there was a large attendance at Keynsham Area Forum on the anti-social behaviour item. He further explained that he was concerned that only 8-10 police officers cover the whole of BANES when in response mode and this is less than it has been before. He added that the beat officer for Keynsham and Saltford now covers the whole of the Chew Valley. Another issue of concern is that there are now no officers primarily assigned to burglary. He stated his grave concern and stated that there must to communication to central Government on this issue. Councillor Hale said that he would write to his local MP.

The officer stated that there were 3 speakers at the SID who gave the national, regional and local perspective and all referred to anti-social behaviour as being a precursor to other types of violence and criminality such as cyber-crime, modern slavery and people trafficking. She further explained that the Home Office is consulting on PREVENT.

Councillor Anketell Jones asked about the contacts between the Council and the Muslim Community. The officer explained that there is some good and positive contact and members could help with this.

The Chairman thanked the officers, Donna Vercoe, Samantha Jones and Lores Savine for their work on the Scrutiny Inquiry Day which was interesting, successful and positive.

54 PARKING STRATEGY

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

Panel members noted public statements on this issue (noted under item 6)

Councillor Hale asked what the cost would be to acquire Pickfords as a coach park. The Division Director for Environmental Services, Martin Shields explained that coaches are always encouraged to use the park and rides and if a free ride into the city is offered, the cost would have to be picked up by the Coach companies. He further explained that Pickfords is no longer available as a site.

Councillor Samuel stated that there should be a balance between the impacts of tourism and poor air quality. Regarding the Coach Strategy he commented that there is no word about environmental impacts and that officers and consultants should be asked to take the Strategy back and incorporate the missing elements. He explained that all documents should have environmental impacts. Councillor Goodman, Cabinet Member for Developments and Neighbourhoods explained that the information is being gathered, there is a vehicle recognition system in the city. Councillor Butters suggested that every report should contain a paragraph on 'Air Quality' considerations.

Councillor Butters asked what remit the staff in Terrace Walk have to police the coaches there. The Divisional Director explained that there were security officers there to support the Christmas Market and there is a warden who patrols Terrace Walk which is funded by 'Safe and Sound'. He stated that he would report concerns back to the relevant officers.

Councillor Clarke stated that the authority do not have the tools yet regarding air quality and WECA may put forward measures to help such as bypasses.

Councillor Simmons stated that on average tourists spend £30 a day in Bath, if coaches are stopped then shoppers will go to Cheltenham.

The Panel noted the recommendation made at the informal meeting:

- The Panel recommends that the Cabinet should reconsider the move to promote short stay parking and instead aim to remove short stay curb spaces to improve air quality and prioritise the use of these areas to residents, service vehicles or pedestrianisation.

The Panel made further recommendations:

- The panel considers that all transport related policies and strategies should contain air quality impact assessments in their proposals. The parking and coach parking strategies presented to the panel do not meet this standard and therefore require further work before being taken forward.
- Officers be asked to look at the practicality of coach drops offs outside the city centre and this should include a review of locations at Terrace Walk.

55 DOMESTIC ABUSE STRATEGY

Samantha Jones, Inclusive Communities Manager and Lores Savine, Community Safety Officer introduced the item and gave a presentation to the Panel on the following:

- Domestic Abuse – definition
- Guiding principles
- National Statistics
- Locally
- Objectives
- Examples of progress (multi agency working/Disclosure and Early Help)
- Improving support
- Next steps

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

In response to a question from Councillor Bull, the Community Safety Officer explained that housing benefit changes will affect provision. Councillor Samuel stated that MP's should be lobbied about these changes. Councillor Bull stated that the Panel will write to the MP.

Councillor Anketell Jones asked what the provision was for men and boys. The officer explained that male victims would also benefit from the VAWG (Violence Against Women and Girls). She also agreed that figures on prosecutions should be added in to the data.

Councillor Samuel asked how access to temporary housing was working. The officer explained that it generally works well but sometimes there is a logjam. Also people can move out of the area into neighbouring authorities. She explained that she did not have the data today but could get it. Some people are put into emergency accommodation.

The Chairman stated that the Panel support the strategy and will take up this issue of funding refuge provision (write to MPs).

56 PANEL WORKPLAN

The Panel noted the workplan and the following updates:

- John Bull to investigate 20mph zones information
- Parking Policy working group – Brian Simmons, John Bull and Michael Evans (Ian Gilchrist if needed) to discuss proposal from Adam Reynolds.

The meeting ended at 6.00 pm

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Council Coach Strategy (Consultation dated 18th Sept 17) – Speaking Note

I want to speak to you about the Council's proposed Coach Strategy. It is totally flawed. It fails to recognise the severe adverse impact of coach traffic on the city, or analyse the contribution that coaches make to the economy. The approach seems to have been to ask what the coach operators, drivers and passengers want, and accommodate them without regard to the impact on the city or its residents.

2. In the view of many residents (and some businesses), coaches are a plague. They park illegally. They leave their engines running. They are visually intrusive and generate high levels of congestion and air pollution. Yet they are currently permitted to come into the very heart of the city and drop off just metres from some of the Key Elements of the World Heritage Site. Some just drive twice round The Circus before departing for Stonehenge. Coach demand is forecast to increase 24% by 2026.

3. One of the places worst affected is Terrace Walk, where at least 50 coaches arrive each day, creating enormous congestion there and on the approach roads. Air pollution at the nearest measuring point, is significantly over the legal limit, and analysis shows that 80% is due to buses & coaches. Yet the strategy proposes to increase coach parking in Terrace Walk, and to formalise coach parking at Royal Avenue.

4. All B&NES's higher level plans call for reduction of traffic in Bath: the Core Strategy, the Placemaking Plan, the Public Realm and Movement Strategy, and the Bath Transport Strategy, with the overall vision of reducing the intrusion of traffic especially in the historic core. In addition, B&NES has an obligation to bring air pollution in the city within legal limits in the shortest possible time. The proposals in this Coach strategy are quite incompatible with these policies, and a wasted opportunity to improve our city.

5. There is little analysis of the actual contribution to the economy made by various types of coach visitors. Most visitors make a very limited contribution to the economy, with 50% spending less than £30. Arguably short-stay, low-spending visitors contribute less to the city than the harm they cause.

6. A coach park at Odd Down is good, but the drop-offs should be provided at less congested locations outside the city centre and away from the iconic places that form the essence of the Bath experience, but within a reasonable walking distance of the attractions. Special arrangements could be made for disabled passengers. York provides an example: there coaches are not allowed into the historic city centre. That might affect the operators' schedules, and some customers might dislike the idea of walking a little distance, but this is normal in other historic locations.

7. The Council should reject this document and direct that a revised strategy for coach parking and coach movement is prepared which is consistent with the traffic reduction aims of its various adopted policies, and the requirement to bring air pollution within the legal limit. The revised strategy should include a full analysis of the economic benefits of the various types of coach visits. Coaches must be managed, not simply accommodated.

Robin Kerr, draft 1, 27th Nov 17

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath and North East Somerset

Meeting of Scrutiny Panel for Communities, Environment, Transport

Monday 4th December 2017

Statement by Rachel Demuth

Re: Bath Coach Parking and Pick-up and Drop-off Strategyⁱ (BCPS 2017)

I will address only three important points about the unacceptable Air Quality levels in Bath and the Coach Parking proposals in the BCPS 2017) the strategy, and will be referring specifically to the report which was commissioned by B&NES. The three points are:

1. The worldwide and UK medical authorities declared urgency on the strong causal relationship between air quality and both morbidity and mortality.
2. The July 2016 DEFRA legally binding Direction on Bath specifically to improve the Air Quality and Pollution levels in Bath.
3. The proposals in the Bath Coach Parking report (BCPS 2017).

1. Current unacceptable Air Quality (read: Air Pollution) and the high morbidity and mortality globally, in the UK, and specifically in Bath.

In the 2016, the WHO published a report on the global crisis of air pollution and health:

“To date, air pollution – both ambient (outdoor) and household (indoor) – is the biggest environmental risk to health, carrying responsibility for about one in every nine deaths annually.

Ambient (outdoor) air pollution alone kills around 3 million people each year, mainly from noncommunicable diseases. Only one person in ten lives in a city that complies with the WHO Air quality guidelines. Air pollution continues to rise at an alarming rate, and affects economies and people’s quality of life; it is a public health emergency.ⁱⁱ

The Lancet Countdown on world Health and Climate Change in 2015ⁱⁱⁱ reported that 71.2% of nearly 3000 cities in the WHO database (including London) are still above WHO recommendations of 10µg.m³. Road transport was still the major source of NO₂ and particulate matter.^{iv}

The Royal College of Physicians (RCP) is one of the senior medical profession organizations in the UK. They have a history of engaging in public health politics in the UK. In 1962 they published a report on Smoking and Health that

established the evidence that cigarette smoking was the main cause of lung cancer. They also actively campaigned for change in the acceptance of smoking. They joined with the Lancet in Oct 2017 to produce a briefing for UK policy makers on the Lancet Countdown report. The RCP recommended for the UK local and national governments that:

The RCP recognises that while smoking kills 80,000 people a year in the UK, smoking is voluntary. Air pollution kills nearly half as many a year as cigarettes at 40,000, but breathing toxic, polluted air is involuntary. All of us have no choice but breathing in toxic air. The RCP teamed up with the Royal College of Pediatrics and Child Health (RCPCH) to produce in 2016 a hard report on *Every Breath we Take; the lifelong impact of air pollution*.^{vi} The campaigning mood of these leading doctors is signalled by their stating in this report that, “*When our patients are exposed to such a clear and avoidable cause of death, illness and disability, it is our duty as doctors to speak out*”

They have recommended immediate action, by all policy makers, with the objective to reduce both the existing levels of air pollution in the UK and peoples exposure to toxic pollution when they breathe. They want to target the vulnerable (pregnant women, children, the elderly and the already ill with bronchitis, signs of heart disease etc. They recommend Clean Air Zones, better management of transport (emission control and traffic movements), monitoring of pollution in cities, etc.

NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) is a respected voice in health policy and practice in the UK. NICE has also released strong guidance^{vii} on similar local government planning measures as the RCP.

2 The DEFRA legally binding Direction to reduce levels of pollution in the shortest time possible.

This action is in part responding to the significant reports from the WHO, and the UK's RCP and NICE reports that were published in 2016 and early 2017. It clearly requires that early action and progress in reducing the levels of pollution, especially NO_x in selected UK cities, including Bath, be taken and be evidenced.

The immediate implication of this is that improved air quality and reducing pollution levels should be identified among lead objectives of B&NES planning at all relevant levels. Already, in 2017 the Bath Air Quality Action Plan Consultation Draft (final) appeared in August 2017. The paper begins with Fig 1 on page ii, showing that 12 sites that were monitored in 2016 produced annual readings for NO₂ that were all exceeding the acceptable level of 40 µg/m³. The RCP stated in their report that they would like to see acceptable levels as low as 10 µg/m³ since it is not possible to show evidence of a level of NO_x pollution that is harmless.

The DEFRA requirements set the minimum standards to assess the Bath Coach Parking Strategy.

3. The Bath Coach parking and pick-up/Drop-off Strategy.

To begin, some pertinent observations on the BuroHappold report.

I found it extraordinary that they didn't consider air quality impact of coach traffic anywhere in their report. They didn't mention their brief, so I don't know whether it was intended or whether it was purposively omitted, or just not considered relevant. But failure to consider the air quality impact of not only additional coaches being directed right into the heart of the city of Bath twice, to drop off and again to collect passengers, but also on the baseline level of pollution from traffic in the centre of Bath. Without any consideration of the impact of their allocation of coach traffic movements and drop-off locations around the inner and central Bath, their recommendations must be set-aside as incomplete and inadequate.

The coach traffic was surveyed only on two days in 2016, Thursday the 25th August and Saturday the 27th August. Both were in school holidays and the Saturday was in the Bank Holiday weekend. Both would have been unusual traffic days, possibly with less local traffic in town

The study didn't speak to or survey the views of residents or workers in the centre of Bath or on any of the access roads or suggested parking locations. There was no mention of any questionnaire survey or results of the same. There was mention of resident participation in a stakeholder meeting on Thurs 10th October 2016. 21 people attended, only one was not a B&NES or BuroHappold employee, a coach company owner, member of the Chamber of Commerce etc. Patrick Rotheram was representing the Federation of Bath Resident's Associations.

But coach passengers were represented with a dedicated survey of their own. Given that the majority were foreign, mainly Chinese with Mandarin as their first language, just what did they make of the terms in their questionnaire ; 'site characteristics', 'Environment', 'Visitor experience getting to and from site'? The coach staff were given bulk questionnaires to distribute on the return journey. Passengers were meant to fill in the forms and return with a stamped envelope ...Was the survey piloted? How many were given out and how many were returned are two pertinent questions.

Coach drivers and the owners of coach companies were also questioned .

A weighting system was applied to the questionnaire scores. The multiplier weightings were devised by "a consensus of the B&NES Council working group on the coach study". No mention of the criteria used was given. But the highest weighting was for the 'Visitor experience getting to and from Site.' Fancy that.

The highest scoring drop-off sites happened to be the closest to the Roman Baths.. Fewer than 5% of the passengers were dissatisfied with those drop-off

locations. In fact, the ranking of the drop-off sites reflected what was already happening as coaches moved from Riverside, which B&NES was beginning to wind down.

Coach drivers and owners seem to have preferred the Riverside Coach Park as it was much easier to access and has facilities (toilets and café for the drivers). Several (5 out of 7) are also quoted in the report as saying they would prefer the Poultney Road parking to the centre (Terrace Walk, Orange Grove, Grand Pde, and North Pde). Again I presume that drivers don't like driving into and out of the congested inner-city traffic and would prefer to drop-off on the main route into Bath they were using.

The report says that B&NES had two objectives in mind when launching the Coach study. First was to find an alternative for the Riverside site that they had other plans for. Second, to be consistent with the Getting around Bath Transport Strategy (2014). The report says that B&NES saw coaches having an important economic contribution to the city and sought to increase the role of coaches in dropping off spending visitors in the city centre while simultaneously reducing other visitor car parking in the city centre. However the GABTS 2014 has one of its Policies, GABP4, state " Vehicle movement should be better managed to reduce traffic impact and emissions, particularly in the city centre where there is less space available." And GABA12: "Develop programmes to remove traffic from the central areas of the city and reduce its impact on other areas....". Seems B&NES has many directly conflicting plans for traffic and parking in the centre of Bath.

It seems the new initiatives to reduce traffic and improve air quality in the city centre 'urgently' or 'as soon as possible' are conflicting objectives with the BuroHappold Drop-off recommendations. They also conflict with B&NES other objective of reducing the impact of all vehicles in the historic city centre. It seems that such considerations plus the impact of more coaches in the city centre on air quality and pollution (which will grow as coach numbers grow and the medical and public concern with the health effects of vehicle pollution grows) support locating most of the coach drop-off and pick-up points out of the city centre. Cities like York ban coaches from within the City walls, and Liverpool also keeps coach drop-off locations away from the centre. It is normal or common in other historic cities in Europe. Is there any reason to believe that coach visitors to Bath would fall away if they had to walk 300-500 meters from a drop-off point? Having fewer coaches and less polluted air in the historic centre might even be an added attraction for tourists.

Let's look at the reports recommendations for Coach Drop-off locations. The Table 1 below shows in column 1 (Spaces available) based on their appraisal of the sites. The Score shows the weighted scores in the report. When the report came to *recommending* locations, they dropped both Orange Grove and Grand Parade for sensible reasons (increased traffic congestion and both have already other uses (for taxis and local bus stops and traffic respectively). The added pollution around the Guildhall is contradicted. I have also dropped the existing

spaces in Terrace Walk for the same reasons. The proposals for 5/6 spaces in Terrace Walk can be seen from the report's three drawings of their proposed configurations would mean a highly congested Terrace walk with added traffic congestion in the road leading to and around the Guildhall and also the junction to North Pde and to Manvers St. As one service provider commented in the report, the site doesn't allow for the increasingly large new coaches that are on the London-Bath runs now. In addition, the location is already a nightmare for passengers trying to get from the island to and back from the safety of the pavement on the west side of Terrace walk, and also for the pedestrians walking from Orange Grove along the East side of the island and down Manvers St towards the station. This is a busy pedestrian way that is already made difficult with the presence of coaches and other traffic turning both ends of Terrace Walk. Signage is not the problem: it is the nature and size of the heavy traffic making difficult turnings into and out of the Terrace Walk.

But a major consideration was also the need to remove additional coaches and associated loss of air quality from the inner-city core, especially around popular pedestrian routes accessing the heritage of the area. I recommend the site serve the other local minibuses, client access to the Abbey Hotel, and important delivery access destinations for the businesses in the narrow streets neighbouring the Terrace Walk. The location could become an important drop-off and pick-up for frail or disabled people delivered there in minibuses, even from the main coach drop-off locations.

Both the Royal Ave and Poultney Rd are already used by greater numbers of coaches. The Royal Ave is useful space out of the busier traffic routes. The location of only 5/6 drop-off locations that were managed and 'official. Could provide a more orderly drop-off that also is close to both the Royal Cres, No 1 Royal Cres, the Assembly Rooms, and the Fashion Museum. Poultney Rd is already used by variable and larger numbers of coaches on rugby days. Providing a regular location for managed coach drop-offs would be continuing a usual practice and also provides a location near both the Holbourne Museum and the historic Great Poultney St as a walk into the centre of Bath.

The table includes the Riverside location. That Terrace Walk is the most used drop-off location appears to have arisen only after B&NES announces that Riverside may not be available in the future. But the reports records views of some drivers stating a preference for the Riverside. It is easy coach access and has the facilities all drivers (and passengers) need at the end of journeys. It is also close to the city centre and it works. It is being used now for coach drop-offs during the extremely busy Christmas Market, so B&NES must consider it a safe and acceptable location.

The report also says that B&NES would like to find an alternative site in the inner city. The BuroHappold report couldn't locate an equivalent one and there are many sound and important arguments that there should no longer be additional coach traffic routed into the centre of Bath. Also the Riverside needs to be maintained and used as a location for Drop-offs and collection into the mid-and

long term. It provides a valuable and versatile contingency coach space. The police horses and their transport are using the Riverside location to service the crowd at the Christmas market this year. There was also a recorded statement in the report that, if needs be, the Riverside site could be retained. I recommend that. In Table 1, I have allocated only 5/6 drop-offs be allocated to that site, which may be to the relief of most drivers and passengers. (it is the only site in Table 1 with both a toilet and café).

<u>Location</u>	<u>Spaces Available</u>	<u>On/off street</u>	<u>Total Score</u>	<u>Report choice Spaces</u>	<u>My recommendation</u>
<u>Terrace Wlk</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>On</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>5/6</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>North Pde</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>On</u>	<u>66.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Royal Ave</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>On</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5/6</u>
<u>Grand Pde</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>On</u>	<u>58.7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Orange Grove</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>On</u>	<u>58.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Poultney Rd</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>On</u>	<u>57.6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Green Pk Rd</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>On</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Rossiter Rd</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>On</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Riverside</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>off</u>			<u>5/6</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>					<u>20</u>

Table 1 (Based on report Table 7.9) The spaces available as Coach drop-off locations in the report with my recommendations for allocating spaces in the short term and possibly into the med- or long term.

From Table 1, without the inner city locations, 20 walkable city locations for drop-offs can be provided without additional coaches being directed into the inner city. Walking would be more pleasant with fewer inner city coaches. The encouragement of more walking within Bath was a healthy and enjoyable

recommendation of several UK reports quoted here that recommend urgent action to improve the air quality in UK cities.

If B&NES decide to support their own recommendation to reduce both traffic and air pollution in the city of Bath, a related and additive benefit could be to regulate the times that delivery vehicles can enter the main shopping area of the inner city to those outside 0800-1630 hrs or such suitable timing.

I have not addressed the longer-term parking of coaches discussed in the report. My concern today is with the important protection of the inner-city air quality. That objective draws attention to and provides a logic for addressing traffic management, parking, inequality, vulnerability and the general health and well being of all the people in BATH. We all need to breathe, let's work to ensure that we can breathe air that helps us lead desirable working and leisure activities and not that makes us ill and kills us without our choosing..

Rachel Demuth © 2017
30 Belgrave Cres
BA1 5JU

ⁱ BuroHappold (2017) Bath Coach Parking Pick-up and Drop-off Strategy. Final Report

ⁱⁱ WHO (2016) Ambient air pollution: a global assessment of exposure and burden of disease.

ⁱⁱⁱ Published Online October 30, 2017 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)32464-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32464-9) (Accessed 26 Nov,2017)

^v Lancet/RCP (2017) Lancet 2017 Countdown report : briefing for UK policymakers.

^{vi} RCP/RCPC (2016) *Every breath we take; the lifelong impact of air pollution.*

^{vii} NICE (2017) Air pollution: outdoor air quality and health. NG70. June 2017.

This page is intentionally left blank

Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel

4 December 2017 – Parking

Notes by Patrick Rotheram, Federation of Bath Residents' Associations

Let me start with a few general points on parking.

Parking creates traffic. This isn't rocket science. Cars are not beamed down to parking spaces, they are driven there. That is traffic. The more parking in the city, the more traffic, and the more pollution. Short-term parking generates even more. So reducing parking is a direct way of reducing pollution. The parking strategy recognises the need to use parking control to reduce traffic, and we applaud that.

However, the strategy paper speaks of reducing the *growth* of traffic in Bath and ensuring *no increase* in air pollution. Of course, Bath is already very congested. Air pollution is already well over the legal limit across the city and must be reduced. Traffic volumes must be reduced to achieve this.

Some argue that reducing parking will affect business. But reducing traffic and pollution will add to the vitality and viability of Bath, not detract from it. These objectives are not in conflict, as the many historic cities in Europe that have removed traffic from their centres have shown.

We warmly welcome the Hierarchy of Kerb Space, which places resident parking above short-stay and long-stay parking. This should be applied in the central zone, where residents have almost no priority despite this being the most densely residential part of the city. Reducing on-street visitor parking would dramatically reduce the traffic caused by people driving round and round looking for a space. Instead they would go straight to an off-street car park, or better still, use the park-and-ride.

Let me now turn to the specific issue of parking in Lower Lansdown, which is the area in the Central CPZ immediately north of the city centre as it is defined in the parking strategy (and the Core Strategy). The city centre is marked in red on the map in your pack. Lower Lansdown is hatched in yellow.

Lower Lansdown is almost entirely residential, but unlike all the other residential parking zones, there is very little resident-only parking and residents don't have access to resident visitor tickets. We have been trying to get this injustice rectified for more than 10 years. The local residents' associations have brought the case to this Panel (or its predecessor) several times, and you gave us your support. However, our concerns have yet to be properly addressed by the Council. This makes us wonder how local democracy is meant to work for residents.

Residents' parking problems were aggravated in 2011 when Parking Services began issuing visitor permits to hotels, guest houses, and B&Bs in the Central CPZ, without any public consultation or even getting the approval of the Cabinet member for transport. By definition, these permits are used for long-stay parking and so belong at the bottom of the Hierarchy of Kerb Space. They should be discontinued and hotel etc visitors directed to off-street parking or P&R.

The introduction of this parking strategy offers the ideal opportunity to rectify the long-standing discrimination against Lower Lansdown residents, while contributing to reducing traffic congestion and pollution in the city. We hope you will support that.

Parking Review Statement to Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel December 2017

I would like to comment on 2 areas: Draft Coach Strategy and Council Travel to Work Plans

1) The recent draft coach strategy is flawed as increasing the number of drop-off spaces within the centre of Bath is incompatible with the council's stated policies to cut air pollution and reduce traffic. Coach drop-offs should be provided at locations outside the city centre and areas of high pollution. This is already practised in many larger UK and European cities. Those with mobility issues could be dropped off closer in existing car parks.

The Scrutiny Panel should reject the current Coach Strategy plans and direct that a revised strategy is produced which removes coach traffic from the city centre, to assist with reducing air pollution below the legal limit.

2) The Council has a Business Engagement Account Manager dedicated to working with employers to encourage their staff to use active and sustainable travel to get to work. Perhaps in the light of the comments made in the CTE informal session, about council employees taking up most of the long term parking in Keynsham, which is probably duplicated in Bath, the council should first put their own house in order and concentrate on reducing their own employees use of cars to get to work. Setting an example to other businesses would not only ease congestion and pollution within both city centres, but also serve as a model which could be developed and replicated by other organisations.

I would hope that members of the Scrutiny Panel already 'practice what they preach' and do not drive polluting vehicles to council meetings. I would also like the Panel to request the Business Engagement Account Manager targets and reviews the council's own Travel to Work plans, with the aim of significantly reducing the impact of council employees journeys.

This page is intentionally left blank