

Zone 15 and 16 Updated TRO's
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Name	Date	Comments (see attached originals for full details)	Opinion		Councils Response
			For	Against	
R S	09/10/14	The principal reason for introducing residents parking is if a problem on a street occurs such that is very difficult or impossible for residents to find a parking space near their home. This could be for example an influx of commuters in the AM taking up all available parking for the working day. The presence of a couple of commuters is usually not a justification if there remains kerb space free for residents and indeed other road users as the roads are public highways.		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.
M L	09/10/14	Please keep GIS up-to-date on the changes when agreed.			Will pass on when available.
D A	10/10/14	In this age, it really is unacceptable for the council to incur the expense of making these documents available personally to callers on demand, when they could simply be published on the website			This complaint has been addressed, and the plans have now been added to the consultation on-line.
J D	13/10/14	As a resident of Frankley Buildings, I support the proposal to include Frankley Buildings within existing Controlled Parking Zone 15. Since the introduction of CPZ15 and Frankley Buildings' exclusion from it, residents of Frankley Buildings, in particular those without off-street parking, have found it increasingly difficult to park on or near Frankley Buildings. As result, parking on Frankley Buildings (which is on a steep hill) has become congested and dangerous. This is of particular concern to us as we have small children.	✓		Confirmation of receipt of this positive response has been sent back to the consultee. However, the levels of public objection have resulted in the proposal being withdrawn and no changes will be implemented in Frankley Buildings.
K D	13/10/14	Since the introduction of CPZ15 and Frankley Buildings' exclusion from it, I have found it increasingly difficult to find parking on our street. Often there is nowhere to park when I get home from work or on Saturdays. Our road is often used as parking for industrial vehicles, vans, campervans and other vehicles by workmen who are working on properties not on our road. This makes a steep narrow road even more difficult to navigate. I have two small children and it is sometimes quite difficult and dangerous to walk with them back home after parking on Tying Lane or Camden Road.	✓		Confirmation of receipt of this positive response has been sent back to the consultee. However, the levels of public objection have resulted in the proposal being withdrawn and no changes will be implemented in Frankley Buildings.

Zone 15 and 16 Updated TRO's
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

P & J R	16/10/14	Resident does not see the point of the scheme, as the road is very rarely full of cars, and most of the houses have off-road parking. Thinks it is just a way of the Council getting more money out of the residents.		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.
R F	24/10/14	<p>The planned changes will have a two-fold effect on us and on our neighbours.</p> <p>The first is that they will greatly increase demand for parking spaces on the stretch of road that leads up Snow Hill from the Kensington Gardens corner, a stretch which has to cater for vehicles not just from Walmsley and Frankley Terraces but from Highbury Terrace as well, which does not have vehicular access.</p> <p>The second is that the affected residents will not be able to use Frankley Buildings as a resource when our own road is fully parked, as it already often is. At present Frankley Buildings almost always has space available (the houses on one side of it have garages of their own).</p>		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.
H W	24/10/14	My greater fear is that the only answer to this is to create residents parking on our section of Snow Hill. As a result of this all the parking above my house will be wiped out, as it cannot be condoned, due to the necessity of parking on the pavement. This would worsen our situation further, although I presume we would, being residents, be allowed to park in the bays at Frankley Buildings		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.
A S	25/10/14	<p>The Variation Order is unfair and will be detrimental to residents in the streets near the proposed CPZ 15 and 16 changes.</p> <p>I suggest you do not grant the Variation Order but look at the area in more detail so that all residents in the above streets and possibly more streets not listed above could enjoy a reasonable level of parking availability. Health and Safety concerning parking issues should be considered especially for the elderly and infirmed residents in the area.</p>		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.

Zone 15 and 16 Updated TRO's
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S C	25/10/14	<p>The plan to make residents parking in Frankley Buildings has a huge knock on effect to the lower streets and will be detrimental to residents parking situation.</p> <p>The original CPZ 15 and 16 did not include Arundel Road, Frankley Buildings and Margaret's Hill, Bath as I am led to believe the residents of these roads wished to be excluded. Time has passed and the same residents now wish to be included in CPZ 15 and 16 as they have suffered the negative effects of commuter parking.</p>		✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.</p>
J H	26/10/14	<p>I live on the periphery of the proposed extended area, and will feel the knock on effects of this scheme as visitors look for alternative parking as the residents only zone grows larger. I fundamentally object to Residents parking. It is merely a cash cow for the Council and the inconvenience of having to arrange visitor permits for friends, tradesmen, etc is ridiculous. It basically means we, the council tax paying residents, have to pay fees for permits to park where we already park for nothing. Ridiculous. Beyond this the Council's new guidelines for the introduction of residents parking schemes have given more influence to Councillors and "Committee/Cabinet Members" in the "voting" process than to the public. This is extremely undemocratic. I would be really interested in understanding the rationale for this, and look forward to hearing from you.</p>		✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money. The proposals for consideration were drafted based on requests from residents and agreed with Ward Members. The formal consultation is part of a consultation process with residents.</p>
J L	26/10/14	<p>I strongly object to the imposition of any parking zone in this area. Residents Parking Zones do not add any spaces, quite the contrary, and they simply add expense for residents, while pushing any perceived parking problem onto neighbouring streets. This is simply a tax on residents, and I do not want this to go ahead. It would add beauracracy and hassle for visitors and tradesmen.</p>		✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.</p>
R S	26/10/14	<p>This feels very much like the "salami slice" tactic of introducing such schemes bit by bit, and since we live only a few streets away from the proposed area we cannot see the benefit to our overall area of schemes such as these. Our area is far enough out of town that very few people are parking to walk in to town - what increased parking pressure there is mainly comes from locals forced East by your other controlled parking schemes...</p>		✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.</p>

Zone 15 and 16 Updated TRO's
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

H W	27/10/14	<p>Unlike the commuters from out of town, who arrive between 8 and 9am and leave their cars outside our houses until they return to drive away between 5 and 6pm, my daily life involves multiple trips backwards and forwards during that 10 hour period. Many of my trips involve caring for my 96 year old mother who wants to spend time with me in my home. When I collect her and bring her home she is either subjected to climbing or descending the considerable distance of hills and narrow pavements that surround our house, because it is impossible to park in the same street that we live in, or she simply cannot come to visit.</p>		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.
J N	27/10/14	<p>The Variation Order is unfair and will be detrimental to residents in the streets near the proposed CPZ 15 and 16 changes.</p> <p>Suggest you do not grant the Variation Order but look at the area in more detail so that all residents in the above streets and possibly more streets not listed above could enjoy a reasonable level of parking availability. Health and Safety concerning parking issues should be considered especially for the elderly and infirmed residents in the area.</p>		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.
A H	27/10/14	<p>The original CPZ 15 and 16 did not include Arundel Road, Frankley Buildings and Margaret's Hill, Bath as I am led to believe the residents of these roads wished to be excluded. Time has passed and the same residents now wish to be included in CPZ 15 and 16 as they have suffered the negative effects of commuter parking.</p> <p>I suggest you do not grant the Variation Order but look at the area in more detail so that all residents in the above streets and possibly more streets not listed above could enjoy a reasonable level of parking availability. Health and Safety concerning parking issues should be considered especially for the elderly and infirm residents in the area.</p> <p>This is especially so in Snow Hill where disputes happen because of intense commuter parking.</p>		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.
L H	27/10/14	<p>I am writing to you to express my concern regarding the residents parking proposed for this area. I see no reason why we need it and would like to put forward my objection to the proposed plans. Please let me know if there is an online form available for me to place my objection or if this email is enough?</p>		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.

Zone 15 and 16 Updated TRO's
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R T	27/10/14	<p>I'm writing to register my strong objection to the variation order "PEV10403/AC". The grounds on which I'm making this objection are that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expanded scheme does not solve the problem of parking supply at the eastern end of the city. It simply displaces the problem. A better solution would be to provide an eastern Park and Ride scheme. • Parking is a cash cow for the Council. According to RAC figures, in 2012/13 BANES were 11th in a league table of the top 30 councils (outside London) making the most money from parking income. 		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.
Various	27/10/14	Included a petition that has been signed by the majority of the Frankley Buildings residents' against the proposals.		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. Petition includes a number of households from both sides of Frankley buildings.
J S	29/10/14	<p>Imposition of resident-only parking scheme during the day for these areas will have a direct negative effect on neighbouring streets in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-residents looking for a parking space will have further reductions to where they can go in this neighbourhood. This will increase the number of vehicles moving through and exploring neighbouring streets looking for possible parking. All streets in this area are narrow and often steep and this increased 'exploration traffic' adds to congestion and frustration. 2. Outsiders who are frustrated by the lack of available parking and who do not understand the need to park so as not to obstruct the flow of traffic, may park in dangerous spots. 3. Those streets which do not have and do not want resident-only parking schemes will become severely congested and residents may not be able to park outside their own homes. 4. Visitors to residents will not be able to park easily. Visitors may have disabilities or children, making parking at a great distance very difficult. 		✓	The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.

Zone 15 and 16 Updated TRO's
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S D	29/10/14	<p>There is inadequate parking locally, what there is has been taken up by the overspill from the already implemented zones. There will be no parking for the local amenities, of which the doctors surgery in Tynning Lane requires a considerable amount of on street parking. It will also disallow service engineers parking and deliveries, such as groceries, will be considerably hindered and even have to block roads in order to deliver as the current available parking, in the surrounding streets of Frankley Buildings, will be taken up with the only available free parking. The area is already congested with the overspill to the extent of illegal and irresponsible parking, controlling another street here will increase these dangers.</p>	✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.</p>
M M	30/10/14	<p>I object to this proposed variation as it appears arbitrary, ill considered and unwanted by the local residents.</p> <p>It appears to be action prompted by resident need but no residents seem to have been consulted and it appears to lack any consideration for the knock on effect that will happen to the surrounding streets.</p> <p>It needs to be shelved and a broader plan needs to be considered, one that is more equitable to all the surrounding residents.</p>	✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The proposals for consideration were drafted based on requests from residents and agreed with Ward Members. The formal consultation is part of a consultation process with residents.</p>
J B	30/10/14	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This will affect the already dire parking and traffic problems on the Snow Hill at Walmsley Terrace and Frankley Terrace. 2. This will continue to exasperate the problem by shifting the demand for car parking from one street to another when already the area is overparked by commuters working in the city centre. In my street we are already suffering from the zoning of Camden road, Thomas Street, Seymour rd etc. 3. A parking zone will in effect reduce the parking capacity in the street as can be seen on the Camden Road and other streets. 4. It is an unfair scheme primarily aimed to raise revenue for the local council and will lead to further stress and frustration of citizens. 5. There is no guarantee a parking permit secures a parking place outside a resident's home or even in the zone. 6. Double yellow lines will likely follow 7. There is an inconsistent public transport service. Buses serving Camden Road (Fairfield Park) are far less regular than those observed to travel along Baytree Road for instance - every ten minutes a largely empty bus travels along Baytree Road, demonstrating there is no correlation to actual demand. 	✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.</p>

Zone 15 and 16 Updated TRO's
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Various	30/10/14	<p>I have attached a signed petition form all the house holders I have so far been able to visit with reference the consolation into Zone 15.</p> <p>The feeling is that we formally wish to be include in the consultation to be included in the zone as families are finding it unacceptable that we are being excluded. This petition is from more than 50% of the households and represents 100% of the residents i was able to visit as many were on holiday or empty at the time of visiting.</p>		✓	<p>This petition was for inclusion of Arundel Road in Zone 15. As this is not a formal proposal it cannot be considered through this process. Ward Members and Group Manager for Parking have met with lead petitioner and explained processes for consideration of this proposal in future.</p>
P N	30/10/14	<p>I wish to object to the proposed variation as it is unwanted by the local residents and will only make the current situation worse.</p> <p>The scheme would result in fewer on-street parking spaces.</p> <p>The whole residents' parking scheme exists in order to exploit motorists. In particular, resident motorists.</p>		✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.</p>
CG	30/10/14	<p>We wish to object to the above plan to extend controlled parking zones to Frankley Buildings in the strongest possible terms. We live on Walmesley Terrace on Snow Hill and, as CPZ has crept closer and closer to us, parking problems have become exacerbated on our street. To bring it as close as Frankley Buildings can only make the situation worse.</p>		✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur.</p>
M K-R	30/10/14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expanded scheme does not solve the problem of parking supply at the eastern end of the city. It simply displaces the problem. A better solution would be to provide an eastern Park and Ride scheme. • Parking is a cash cow for the Council. According to RAC figures, in 2012/13 BANES were 11th in a league table of the 30 councils (outside London) with the highest parking income. 		✓	<p>The proposal for Frankley Buildings has been withdrawn due to the level of public objection and therefore no detriment will occur. The overall Residents Parking account runs at a deficit and the Council does not implement Residents Parking to make money.</p>