

COUNCIL MEETING 12th Nov 2015

PUBLIC QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING

Cabinet response to all questions:

A large number of questions have been submitted on the issue of the P&R east of Bath. The majority of these are addressed by the Q&A already available on the website www.bathnes.gov.uk/eastpandr . As many of these questions were submitted only this week, it has not been possible to provide a response to all of the more specific questions and we have therefore asked officers to update the Q&A to address outstanding questions and indicate to all those who have raised questions where a response can be found. We want to ensure that those who have submitted questions receive the fullest possible answers and, whilst we hope this can be completed within 5 working days, we recognise that this might not be possible in all instances given the volume of questions submitted.

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------|
| P 01 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| The proposal states that the Park and Ride East will reduce congestion in Bath. By how much (as a percentage of current traffic volume) and at what locations in the city will congestion be reduced specifically by the construction of a Park and Ride to the east of the city? | | |
| P 02 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| Department for Transport annual figures show an overall decline in traffic volume on the London Road during the period 2000 to 2013 of 31%. In 2009 the Council announced that congestion would get '14% worse than it is now'. In reality, congestion has reduced by 17% between 2009 and 2013. What is the basis (statistical evidence and data) on which the Council believes that building a Park and Ride will reduce congestion? | | |
| P 03 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| By what percentage and at which specific locations air quality will be improved in the City as a direct a consequence of building a Park and Ride to the East of Bath? | | |
| P 04 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| Car traffic is increasingly comprised of hybrid and electric vehicles and this trend is set to continue, exponentially. How has the Council included this in its assessment of future air quality in the City in relation to construction of P&R East? | | |
| P 05 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| By what criteria were the three proposed Park and Ride sites (A,B and F) shortlisted, which other sites were analysed and what were their respective ranked scores? | | |
| P 06 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|
| <p>Site B requires the use of Site F to gain access to the bypass. How much of Site F (as a percentage of the whole and in hectares) will be required for this purpose?</p> | | |
| P 07 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| <p>How can the potential mitigation of the visual impact of a P&R site by planting trees in itself be described as a 'benefit'?</p> | | |
| P 08 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| <p>Park and Ride facilities encourage increased car use, notably attracting people who would ordinarily use Public Transport to drive to a P&R instead. What is the net estimated increase in car miles associated with P&R East and how has this figure been calculated?</p> | | |
| P 09 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| <p>How can planting trees to screen a P&R in a naturally open landscape be considered as visual mitigation?</p> | | |
| P 10 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| <p>The Leader of the Council has stated that there will be a net increase in the provision of parking spaces in the city centre. How does this strategy align with the stated objective of the P&R East to reduce congestion and pollution in the city?</p> | | |
| P 11 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| <p>The existing P&R sites are on average only ever utilised to around 60% of capacity. What strategies are the Council employing to get these properly used?</p> | | |
| P 12 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| <p>There are typically anywhere between 1000 and 2000 unoccupied P&R spaces around Bath, during the day. Why is the Council building another P&R given that the existing ones are woefully under utilised?</p> | | |
| P 13 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| <p>P&R East has been described as part of a 'package of measures' that will reduce traffic congestion in Bath. What percentage does P&R East contribute to this package of measures, what are the other measures and how much do each of these other measures contribute?</p> | | |
| P 14 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| <p>What are the 'special measures' that will be introduced to prevent suppressed traffic demand from consuming any traffic capacity created by P&R East and why can't these measures be introduced immediately to reduce congestion?</p> | | |
| P 15 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------|
| How long will it take a P&R bus to reach the city centre given the single lane exit from the A46 roundabout that the buses will have to use? | | |
| P 16 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| How has the amenity and recreational value of the three proposed sites been accounted for in the Council's short-listing process? | | |
| P 17 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| During the consultation, the Council actively canvassed support via social media from towns and groups of people that would be considered to have a clear interest in building a P&R East. Please explain how this strategy fits within standards for fair consultation. | | |
| P 18 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| What are the success criteria for the P&R East strategy? | | |
| P 19 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| What alternative strategies are the Council exploring to alleviate congestion in the City? Is building additional parking spaces in the city one of these strategies? | | |
| P 20 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| If a Park and Ride site is built on Site A, what will be the principal losses and impact to the community? | | |
| P 21 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| If a Park and Ride site is built on Site B, what will be the principal losses and impact to the community? | | |
| P 22 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| If a Park and Ride site is built on Site F, what will be the principal losses and impact to the community? | | |
| P 23 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| The Council has been described as 'lacking imagination' and being 'stuck in the past' when it comes to transport planning. Please describe the Council's most imaginative and forward thinking solution to solving congestion in the city. | | |
| P 24 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| Sites A and F are frequented by Tawny and Barn Owls that use the existing space for hunting. What impact will a large car park have on this activity? | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|
| P 25 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| The meadow area and specifically sites A, B and F are frequented by bats who use the open, dark spaces for hunting. What impact will a large car park have on this activity? | | |
| P 26 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| How often will Site A be flooded with river water and what liability will the Council carry for damage to cars parked on the site when it floods? | | |
| P 27 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| How much noise (measured in decibels at a range of points in the vicinity of the sites) will be generated by Sites A,F and B when operated as P&Rs? | | |
| P 28 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| P&Rs increase net car mileage. Does the Council disagree with this statement and if so, on the basis of what evidence? | | |
| P 29 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| On what criteria will the necessary capacity of a P&R East be calculated? | | |
| 30 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| Of the average daily 16,300 car trips made on the London Road, what percentage of this traffic is 'through traffic' and what percentage might be anticipated to use the P&R facility? | | |
| P 31 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| Why doesn't traffic currently heading south down the A46 from the M4 use the Lansdown P&R and why will it use a P&R East in the future? | | |
| P 32 | Question from: | Mark Stephens |
| What percentage of P&R East patrons will be OAPs with free bus passes? | | |
| P 33 | Question from: | Steve Horler |
| What percentage of P&R East patrons will be people who formerly used public transport for the whole of their journey? | | |
| P 34 | Question from: | Steve Horler |
| What are the costings for each of the proposed park and ride sites? | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|
| P 35 | Question from: | Steve Horler |
| Ben Howlett's office says that Site B is of 'little environmental interest'. This was printed in the Bath Chronicle 31 st October 2015 What environmental impact assessment has been done to prove this? | | |
| P 36 | Question from: | Steve Horler |
| What impact would the proposed Park and Ride have on the Green Belt? | | |
| P 37 | Question from: | Steve Horler |
| Why did Ben Howlett tweet that site B, otherwise known as New Leaf Farm, is 'best for Bath'? | | |
| P 38 | Question from: | Steve Horler |
| What is the area of each of the 3 park and ride sites? | | |
| P 39 | Question from: | Rory Geldard |
| The Bathampton meadows park and ride proposal is very shorted, and will not ease the congestion on the London Road. Why not save the cost of this experiment and put it towards the A36/A46 link road, which we all know will reduce the London Road traffic. | | |
| P 40 | Question from: | Jan Attah |
| The Council has stated that the proposed park and ride could be hidden by landscaping and tree planting. How can this, together with a large number of parked vehicles, 'preserve the openness of the green belt'? | | |
| P 41 | Question from: | Jan Attah |
| When considering public benefits have you taken into account the detrimental effects of the park on ride on hundreds of businesses and residents in the East of Bath? | | |
| P 42 | Question from: | Jan Attah |
| Have you taken into consideration the detrimental effects of the scheme on tourism in Bath? | | |
| P 43 | Question from: | Jan Attah |
| Have you looked at the number of grade 2 and grade 2* listed buildings in Batheaston, Bathampton and Bathford what will be affected by the schemed? | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| P 44 | Question from: | Susan Murray |
| If this proposal goes ahead are we to expect a raise in Council Tax? | | |
| P 45 | Question from: | Susan Murray |
| Has the Council considered a congestion charge for Bath? | | |
| P 46 | Question from: | Susan Murray |
| Instead of P&R has the council considered investing all the money into a widespread bus service together with congestion charge? | | |
| P 47 | Question from: | Caroline Cooper |
| <p>I would like to ask how the decision to build a Park and Ride can be justified at the cost of ruining an area that is valued by so many residents of the surrounding villages as well as being seen from two scheduled monuments of Solsbury Hill and Brown's folly. It is also close to the Bathampton Conservation area and the World Heritage site of Bath.</p> <p>How can this be justified as being for the sake of future generations when it would be depriving these generations of their right to beautiful countryside.</p> | | |
| P 48 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| Why did the B&NES people at the Bathampton consultation inform me that the consultation was the first stage in numerous other consultations, yet couldn't inform me when and where other consultations would occur? | | |
| P 49 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>When I asked the B&NES people at the Bathampton consultation about data to support the assertion that an east of Bath P&R is required, they informed me that there was none. This has continued until recent times when, suddenly, a report has come to light dated November 2014 i.e.: a year ago. Why has B&NES kept this report secret until the last possible minute?</p> <p>i. Section 5.1 of Agenda Item 8 in the Public Reports Pack for Thursday's meeting, states <i>"Two Government funded studies - the Bristol/Bath to South Coast Study (2004) and the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study (2006) - both recommended the continued development of Park & Ride around and to the east of Bath."</i> I contest this statement. I have looked at the former study, I confirm that report recommends expanding the existing P&R provision at Newbridge, Oddown and Lansdown" (Section 7.1 Recommendations). However, in Section 5.19 under the heading of "Park and Ride at Bathampton Meadows" it actually states <i>"...this Park and Ride site can be rejected on grounds of...only marginal incremental benefits for traffic reduction"</i>. B&NES has mis-used and mis-quoted material from the study. Some might question whether this is a deliberate attempt to mis-lead the public and councillors. How has this happened?</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| P 50 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>Why did the B&NES survey on the P&R, assume that everyone would be accepting of the 3 options presented? Why didn't it include an option of "None of the above"?</p> | | |
| P 51 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>Based on #50, how did B&NES deal with my vote, whereby I added a selection box of "None of the above"? The reason I ask is that B&NES has made use of the survey results in Section 6.2 within Agenda Item 8 in the Public Reports Pack where it only provides data for <i>"those that indicated a preference for a Park and Ride facility"</i>. Why doesn't the report mention anything about the number of responses who indicated none of the above?</p> | | |
| P 52 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>Originally, this consultation was to determine which of the 3 sites would be selected. In backing down from the original meeting, I note that the consultation seems now to be nothing about Bathampton Meadows, but more about <i>"whether to proceed with plans for an east of Bath Park & Ride"</i>. Have I understood this correctly?</p> | | |
| P 53 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>Section 5.14 of Agenda Item 8 in the Public Reports Pack recognises what recent studies on P&R conclude, which is that P&R might improve traffic levels for a short time, until <i>"users recognise that there is less congestion on these routes"</i> when traffic levels will increase again. Acknowledging this, why doesn't B&NES make use of the more recent studies that reject P&R as a relevant option to traffic management?</p> | | |
| P 54 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>Section 5.14 of Agenda Item 8 in the Public Reports Pack recognises what recent studies on P&R conclude, which is that P&R might improve traffic levels for a short time, until <i>"users recognise that there is less congestion on these routes"</i> when traffic levels will increase again. B&NES continues <i>"The Council will therefore monitor traffic levels and measures can be introduced to prevent these benefits from being taken up by suppressed demand"</i>. If the Council already knows of such measures, why doesn't it make use of them immediately?</p> | | |
| P 55 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>Has the Council considered alternative measures to spending £10m on a P&R scheme. £10m would last a long time supporting alternative measures. Suggestions I can make include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Making better use of existing P&R schemes through improved signage – especially the Lansdown P&R from the M4 b. Congestion charging at peak times c. Providing benefits to car sharing schemes to improve car usage, thereby decreasing number of cars entering the city d. Subsidising bus fares and increasing bus frequencies making it more economical for people to use public transport both from further afield as well as | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| | | <p>locally instead of driving</p> <p>e. Subsidising train fares and increasing train frequencies making it more economical for people to use public transport both from further afield as well as locally instead of driving</p> <p>f. Do something to drastically reduce the number of cars involved in school runs</p> |
| P 56 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>Why can B&NES reject plans for a farmer to build himself a house on his farm, yet, presumably, enforce a compulsory purchase order on his land and livelihood?</p> | | |
| P 57 | Question from: | Mark Magri-Overend |
| <p>What research has been performed regarding wildlife in the Bathampton Meadows?</p> | | |
| P 58 | Question from: | Andrew Mercer |
| <p>Would you agree that a Park and Ride site at Bathampton does nothing to deal with through traffic. What is being done to deal with through traffic and when are we likely to see positive action to address this?</p> | | |
| P 59 | Question from: | Andrew Mercer |
| <p>Do you agree with the CM2MHIII report released by the council last week when it concludes that taken together, all the measures set out in the Transport Strategy, including a Park and Ride in the East, would still be insufficient to prevent an increase in traffic using the highway network between 3pm and 7pm once the Enterprise Area is developed? That being the case does the council not need to review the Enterprise Area and the transport strategy as a matter of urgency?</p> | | |
| P 60 | Question from: | Christine Boyd |
| <p>Given the difficulty of finding a suitable single site for 1400 cars to the East of the City, has the council considered developing two or more smaller sites, possibly located along existing bus routes so as to reduce the environmental impact of developing on the Green Belt and to ensure existing services remain viable. If not why not?</p> | | |
| P 61 | Question from: | Alison Smith |
| <p>How without doing comprehensive research do you know that there will be sufficient people using the Park and Ride to justify the destruction of green belt land?</p> | | |
| P 62 | Question from: | Alison Smith |
| <p>What evidence do you have that there will be a reduction in traffic on London Road?</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|
| P 63 | Question from: | Alison Smith |
| How can you justify building on land which is part of the setting of the World Heritage Site, borders the Cotswold AONB, is important for agriculture and green belt? | | |
| P 64 | Question from: | Alison Smith |
| How are you intending to landscape the proposed Park and Ride so that it does not negatively impact views from Solsbury Hill, Bath Skyline and Brown's Folly? The view from these elevated sites would not be screened by trees, bunds or any of the other landscaping suggestions you have come up with. | | |
| P 65 | Question from: | Alison Smith |
| Have you undertaken surveys of the wildlife in all of these 3 sites? Do you know if there are any rare or endangered species of animal, bird or plant in this area? | | |
| P 66 | Question from: | Alison Smith |
| What other solutions to the traffic problems have you considered? What about improved public transport or more innovative solutions to the problem? | | |
| P 67 | Question from: | Alison Smith |
| What about the impact on Batheaston High Street of increased traffic avoiding the queues for your really popular Park and Ride? | | |
| P 68 | Question from: | Elizabeth Warren |
| My children's walk to school along a narrow footpath and over a busy road can be a dangerous one, what traffic calming/safety plans will be put in place to slow the obvious increase in cars using the High Street the P & R bring? | | |
| P 69 | Question from: | Elizabeth Warren |
| During the recent work on the railway the traffic outside our house came to a standstill on numerous occasions, I had to direct traffic myself on several occasions with the traffic queuing down Down Lane and backed up onto the A36. How does the council think the High St will cope with increased levels of traffic when much of the street is single carriageway? | | |
| P 70 | Question from: | Elizabeth Warren |
| Greenbelt land should not be built on, what are the special circumstances which mean this beautiful land is being considered and it's Greenbelt status ignored. | | |
| P 71 | Question from: | Elizabeth Warren |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|
| What will be the impact of increased traffic pollution on my children's health? | | |
| Answer from: | | |
| | | |
| P 72 | Question from: | Elizabeth Warren |
| The other Park and Rides in the area are not fully utilised so why is another P & R needed? | | |
| P 73 | Question from: | Elizabeth Warren |
| Exactly who benefits from the building of this P & R? | | |
| P 74 | Question from: | Elizabeth Warren |
| With the obvious increase of building matter on the land where will the water go and what houses will now be at risk of flooding that perhaps were not at risk before? | | |
| P 75 | Question from: | Justine Williams |
| How can a fair consultation take place, or a rational decision be made, in the absence of evidence on traffic flow in the east of Bath, air pollution, other environmental impacts, highways engineering, loss of habitat and loss of amenity to local residents, costs, and economic benefits and dis-benefits? | | |
| P 76 | Question from: | Justine Williams |
| How are Banes councillors able to make a sound decision based on the report prepared by Banes' officers which is unbalanced and biased, and contains no analysis of individual objections to the park & ride? The consultation allowed respondents to explain why they opposed the proposals. The National Trust, the Campaign to Protect Rural England and many others submitted written objections, but these seem to have been ignored. | | |
| P 77 | Question from: | Justine Williams |
| Site A was not supported by the Halcrow report - in fact they said it did not warrant further consideration. Do Banes' Councillors agree that the consultation was misleading in offering Site A as a viable site and that it should not have been included in the consultation? | | |
| P 78 | Question from: | Justine Williams |
| Site B actually requires the significant encroachment onto Site F. Do Banes' Councillors agree that the consultation was misleading in offering Site B or F - the choice is Site B AND F? | | |
| P 79 | Question from: | Justine Williams |

How has £500K been expended so far? Are Banes' Councillors satisfied that this has been well spent? A budget of £4.7m has been budgeted for delivery with £5m identified as "additional costs". Where is the analysis to support these figures? As the funding will come from corporate borrowing, what is the overall cost to Banes' constituents?

P 80 **Question from:** Justine Williams

A "park & sail" is fanciful - yet it is one of Banes' reasons for promoting Site B. Do Banes' Councillors agree that this is purely speculative and should have no place in the consultation?

P 81 **Question from:** Justine Williams

Have all the Councillors viewed the proposed sites from Solsbury Hill, Brown's Folly, The Skyline, Lansdown and visited the Meadows themselves?

P 82 **Question from:** Justine Williams

How can Councillors reconcile their responsibility to Banes and its constituents with the irreversible destruction of this shared landscape, which is what this proposal is asking them to do?

P 83 **Question from:** Maria Naughton

Who/how was the decision taken to narrow down the potential sites to three (I understand that it was not taken at a meeting)?

P 84 **Question from:** Maria Naughton

Who/why was Charmey Down discounted as a potential P & R site?

P 85 **Question from:** Maria Naughton

With regard to the 4,000 (BANES) statistic) of daily return car trips which are allegedly going to be saved with the P & R, please advise what is the current number of car trips going down the London Road.

P 86 **Question from:** Maria Naughton

Why were the reports submitted by National Trust, CPRE, Bath Preservation Trust not published with the consultation results?

P 87 **Question from:** Maria Naughton

Who at BANES signed off the press release detailing the results of the consultation which were so obviously "spun" to give the impression that most Bath City residents want the East of Bath P & R?

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|
| P 88 | Question from: | Eleanor Knechtli |
| <p>What immediate measures will the council be taking to reduce the numbers of HGVs and other through traffic that travel down the A46 and along the London Road each day to get to the A36?</p> | | |
| P 89 | Question from: | Eleanor Knechtli |
| <p>What impact will an East P&R have on the World Heritage status of Bath? There is council documentation available on BANES website that states that building at sites B/F could put this at risk?</p> | | |
| P 90 | Question from: | Eleanor Knechtli |
| <p>Will the council take into account the views of the National Trust, the Bath Preservation Trust and the CPRE (Campain to Protect Rural England)?</p> | | |
| P 91 | Question from: | Eleanor Knechtli |
| <p>What evidence does the council have to back up the claims that the East P&R will be used by 2000 vehicles a day?</p> | | |
| P 92 | Question from: | Eleanor Knechtli |
| <p>If the East P&R is meant to attract commuters coming from the M4 (who travel down the A46) will it reduce the number of vehicles that currently use the Lansdown P&R?</p> | | |
| P 93 | Question from: | Eleanor Knechtli |
| <p>How will commuters coming from the A36 access the East P&R?</p> | | |
| P 94 | Question from: | Eleanor Knechtli |
| <p>If the East P&R is positioned at site B/F, then how will traffic flow along the bypass be managed and maintained? If it requires traffic lights to be put onto the bypass, then how will these lights affect the traffic flow along that particular section of road? What measures will be taken to prevent people from taking alternative routes e.g. Through Batheaston High street, Bailbrook Lane & Solsbury Lane to avoid the lights. Will there be a need for a bypass to bypass the bypass?</p> | | |
| P 95 | Question from: | Philip G Johnston |
| <p>As Council's descriptions of existing park and ride "popularity" and "success" have been proven by statistical analysis as operating at no more than 55% capacity and having no long-term effects upon congestion and pollution except additional, can any member of Cabinet please answer why such misleading descriptions were chosen and why such failure is now defined by them as "essential" and "vital" for mixed commercial/residential developments designed to not be reliant on the use of car transport?</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|
| P 96 | Question from: | Philip G Johnston |
| <p>Can Cllr Warren or any member of Cabinet, provide a complete list of all reasons for rejections of Eastern Park and Ride prior to 2015, then fully explain why it has been chosen to now ignore those democratically arrived at decisions of rejection by redefining them as "discussed and debated for nearly 30 years - it is of course vital that it is delivered..." as if those decisions have not already been made?</p> | | |
| P 97 | Question from: | Philip G Johnston |
| <p>Can Cllr Clarke or any member of Cabinet, answer how the soliciting and encouragement of Conservative Party members' inputs from locations far removed from B&NES Council constituencies is not intentional subversion of democratic public consultation process when, in July 2015, he stated Council's role in that process only as "committed to ensuring that residents in the area are properly consulted"?</p> | | |
| P 98 | Question from: | Hannah Hyam |
| <p>Who was responsible for selecting the three proposed sites out of the eight originally considered by the Halcrow Report?</p> | | |
| P 99 | Question from: | Hannah Hyam |
| <p>How many of the 65 councillors have visited the three proposed sites to assess for themselves their suitability or otherwise for a Park & Ride?</p> | | |
| P 100 | Question from: | Peter Wardle |
| <p>How many different wildlife species live on Bathampton Meadows or are sustained by this sizeable habitat (e.g. feeding, roosting, hunting)? Are any of these species considered to be endangered?</p> | | |
| P 101 | Question from: | Ben Adams |
| <p>Currently there are long queues of cars every day paying 70p each way to cross the toll bridge on Mill Lane, a rat-run connecting outlying areas to the east of Bath while avoiding London Road. How will the Council prevent any cars taken off London Road by a Park and Ride being immediately replaced by drivers who currently use the toll bridge, and other rat-runs?</p> | | |
| P 102 | Question from: | Ben Adams |
| <p>The majority of traffic on London Road appears to be through-traffic - vehicles in transit between the A46 and the A36, vehicles on the school-run and other errands. What hard data can the Council present that shows that a Park and Ride will actually result in a significant reduction in the number of vehicles using London Road?</p> | | |
| P 103 | Question from: | Ben Adams |

The proposed Park and Ride would result in significant environmental degradation for the villages to the east of Bath and accrue no obvious benefit for those communities. How would those communities be compensated for their sacrifice?

P 104 Question from: Ben Adams

If an east of Bath Park and Ride were to be built but does not turn out to reduce congestion in Bath, what will happen?

P 105 Question from: Ben Adams

If an east of Bath Park and Ride were to be built but does not turn out to be well used, will the site be returned to its current state?

P 106 Question from: Ben Adams

There is significant opposition to a Park and Ride scheme on Bathampton meadows locally, and nationally from organisations such as the National Trust. Is it appropriate, or wise, to proceed with a scheme in the face of such widespread and vehement opposition?

P 107 Question from: Ruth Wardle

How can it be justified to export parking and congestion from one part of B&NES to another, and to seek to misrepresent the debate over the Park and Ride as a conflict between the residents of Bathavon North and residents of the City and the rest of the unitary authority, when the beauty of the Avon Valley belongs to all of us?

P 108 Question from: David Faulkner

Have the potential flood risks in Bathampton Meadows have been fully and rigorously examined?

The initial Council Connect magazine comments on the recent survey work were that there was "**low risk of flooding**" in the area to the east of Mill Lane – this had mysteriously changed to "**no risk**" in the public consultation meetings.

P 109 Question from: David Faulkner

Were the surveyors aware that there was significant flooding for over two months in Batheaston in 2013 and also, to a lesser extent, in 2012? A huge tarmacked area of car park will significantly increase this risk – not just to local residents but also to the use of the car park at a time (pre-Christmas) when the car park use will be at its height. The water from the proposed ponds will still have to go somewhere when full.

P 110 Question from: Glen and Lesley BATTEN

Our question concerns the proposal for an East of Bath Park & Ride facility. Given the likely cost of the proposed scheme, both financially and in terms of lost open space amenity, we would like to be reassured that a wide range of possible alternatives has been considered, including a full analysis of the expected benefits and impact of each, and that the terms of

reference and results of that analysis will be made available for public scrutiny. These alternatives should include options such as alternative sites for a bus park and ride (including, but not limited to, Charmy Down), improvements to existing bus services to minimise the need for car use, and expansion of parking facilities at Chippenham, Bradford-on-Avon and Trowbridge railway stations. Can we please have the Council's assurance that any decisions taken on this matter will be rational and will take full and explicit account of such analysis?

P 111 Question from: Peter and Andy Lloyd Williams

In view of the overwhelming objections to the proposed Park & Ride on Bathampton Meadows, and the wide range of people, would it not be wise to re-examine the proposal in far more detail before agreeing to causing irreparable damage to the ancient meadows east of Bath. Are there really no better alternatives, for example, the link road A36-A46, or Park & Ride on Charmy Down?

P 112 Question from: Peter and Andy Lloyd Williams

The traffic currently using the A36 being diverted to proposed Park and Ride would inevitably use Down Lane and Bathampton High Street to reach the Park and Ride. They are NOT going to go over Cleveland Bridge and along the A4 London Road to reach the P & R. Bathampton High Street is already dangerously busy, particularly at peak times, with traffic driving well above 20 mph.

P 113 Question from: Jan Attah

Your nitrogen dioxide monitoring data for Batheaston for 2014 shows that it is as high as 38 in places (Government's Objective 40). Have you done any analysis of how much this is likely to be increased by the proposed park and ride?

P 114 Question from: Judy Bailey

Are BANES council prepared to risk Bath's UNESCO World Heritage Site status by building a park and ride on the green belt approaches/ landscape setting of the city?

P 115 Question from: Judy Bailey

Why is the beautiful area of Bathampton Meadows under threat from a giant car park in the green belt, when planning permission for a 2 bedroom house was denied on the same land as it was deemed to be inappropriate development in the green belt?

P 116 Question from: Judy Bailey

People in the villages to the east of Bath have always considered ourselves as Bath residents. Now we find out we are 'Bath Avon North'... why don't our opinions and interests matter as much as people in Bath?

P 117 Question from: Judy Bailey

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Has BANES done a study on the effects of any tarmacking on such a vast site next to the River Avon flood plain? | | |
| P 118 | Question from: | Judy Bailey |
| Will the businesses which are already badly affected by flood damage on a regular basis be compensated when the damage is even worse, after the tarmacking? I mean Bathampton Mill, The Old Mill Hotel. | | |
| P 119 | Question from: | Judy Bailey |
| What is the council's response to the National Trust, the Council for the Protection of Rural England, UNESCO's comments? | | |
| P 120 | Question from: | Judy Bailey |
| How is a business park, attracting 9000 workers (plus all the customers, lorries etc.) going to affect traffic in Bath in the future? | | |
| P 121 | Question from: | Judy Bailey |
| What studies have been done about the school run traffic in Bath? | | |
| P 122 | Question from: | Judy Bailey |
| Would the council be prepared to provide free transport to all schools, state and private, in Bath, in order to get the school run traffic off the road? | | |
| P 123 | Question from: | Caroline Cooper |
| Why does Ben Howlett claim that he is behind this scheme as it is for future generations when the scheme is actually depriving future generations of their right to beautiful countryside? | | |
| P 124 | Question from: | Nick Cooper |
| Why is the council intent on choosing the most visibly offensive site possible for the Park and Ride where the residents of the East of Bath are concerned? | | |
| P 125 | Question from: | Nick Cooper |
| As a lifelong Conservative supporter but fervent opponent of the proposed desecration of the Bathampton Meadows, have the Tory members considered the future electoral impact of a vote in favour of this scheme and the probable return to the Liberal Democrats political control. | | |
| P 126 | Question from: | Caroline Cooper |
| Why is the council telling the public that the reason for the Park and Ride is to reduce | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|
| <p>congestion and air pollution when it is in fact so they can build Enterprise IT business where the car parks now exist? Can the council please be honest about the true reasons behind the Park and Ride?</p> | | |
| P 127 | Question from: | Caroline Cooper |
| <p>How can the council be seriously considering the destruction of the Meadows when it is not supported by the National Trust, Bath Preservation Trust, the campaign for the Preservation of Rural England or the threat of losing the status of World Heritage site?</p> | | |
| P 128 | Question from: | Valerie Major |
| <p>May I suggest we, as residents in the very near locality, are informed of the pollution levels BEFORE you invite thousands of cars to drive and park here in the sacred green belt of Bathavon .</p> | | |
| P 129 | Question from: | Deb Turner |
| <p>Certain elected officials have suggested that a 'Vocal minority' are opposed to the Meadows scheme, but how many people have actually voted in favour of the scheme? Is it more than 6000 who make up the so called 'vocal minority'?"?</p> | | |
| P 130 | Question from: | Deb Turner |
| <p>What sane individual favours the destruction of a treasured green belt site over the use of an extensive brown field site not two miles away at the Charmy Down runways which is not overlooked or would cause such devastation?</p> | | |
| P 131 | Question from: | Jeff Owen |
| <p>The BANES website provides a number of documents to inform the community on the park and ride consultation with details on the various sites. With regards to Site F, the detail provided is absent assuming the reader has knowledge of a previous planning application and the site is not assessed to the level of detail as that outlined for the other sites. See page 26 Halcrow May 2103 report. This inconsistency in the information must render this consultation invalid as the viewer of such documents cannot make a balanced and informed judgement of the facts. Can the council confirm this lack of information renders this consultation void until such time as a balanced presentation of detail is provided/</p> | | |
| P 132 | Question from: | Jeff Owen |
| <p>The site proposed will have an enormous negative visual impact. Please advise when a winter visual impact study will be undertaken as the sites are highly visible in winter . Please confirm the consultation will be placed on hold pending this winter visual impact study?</p> | | |
| P 133 | Question from: | Jeff Owen |
| <p>Please confirm the pollution impact of each site offered for consultation. Please confirm if pollution levels will rise in the area for the park and ride sites? Please confirm the factual data</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| referenced? | | |
| P 134 | Question from: | Jeff Owen |
| Given the significant lighting required for safe parking what is the impact of the park and ride on the Browns Folly bat protection site? | | |
| P 135 | Question from: | Jeff Owen |
| Can you confirm that the impact of the park and ride sites being proposed have been fully assessed in accordance with BANES World Heritage Site supplementary planning document? Will the findings be presented for new consultation? | | |
| P 136 | Question from: | Jeff Owen |
| Can you confirm that the visual impact of the sites being offered has been assessed and how this compares with the other 11 sites? It's hard to believe these sites could pass such a test, given the detrimental visual and environmental impact. | | |
| P 137 | Question from: | Mrs Cheryl Nield De Crespo |
| Ben Howlett said face to face to Cheryl Nield de Crespo at his Manvers St Drop- In on 30 th October 2015 [witnessed by two other people]: “ <i>The consultation is weak in many areas. You can quote me on that.</i> ” Can the council explain how they can trust any of the findings of the consultation when even Bath's MP has no faith in the process? | | |
| P 138 | Question from: | Mrs Cheryl Nield De Crespo |
| Given the supposed importance of the P and R to BANES' economic development, could the council explain what economic cost/ benefit analysis has been done on the impact of the proposed East of Bath P and R on businesses to the east of Bath,[ranging from farms to pubs, hotels, architects, design consultancies etc...] | | |
| P 139 | Question from: | Mrs Cheryl Nield De Crespo |
| Could the council explain why the public were presented with a consultation which focussed completely on reducing congestion and pollution levels, whereas all along the real purpose of the P and R has been to facilitate increasing numbers of vehicles coming to the city[i.e. economic development strategy]? | | |
| P 140 | Question from: | Mrs Cheryl Nield De Crespo |
| Could the council explain why more innovative twenty-first century alternative solutions to | | |

congestion problems were not included as options in the public consultation?

P 141 Question from: Mrs Cheryl Nield De Crespo

Could the council please explain what technical economic cost/ benefit analysis has been done, [including full social costs and benefits] of the proposed East of Bath P and R?

P 142 Question from: Bob Gore

Consultation Process

Given in the 2013 Halcrow report made recommendations not to consider site A further -what was the purpose of including site A , when it had already deemed inappropriate by experts?

P 143 Question from: Bob Gore

Consultation Process

Are the council treating this "consultation " as a first past the post vote ? If not what weight are the council placing on past general consultations and the previous objections to the Bathampton meadows site.

P 144 Question from: Bob Gore

Other Stakeholders Opinions

A number of well respected bodies e.g. National Trust and The Bath Presevation trust have expressed opinions regarding the consultation. It wasn't clear in the councils update on the consultation responses how they are considering stakeholders other than Bath residents and what weight they are giving to these opinions. Can the council please make this clear how they are dealing with these responses.?

P 145 Question from: Bob Gore

Development of park and ride in a greenbelt area

Given the council refused planning Application No: 12/05631/FUL (Erection of a permanent agricultural workers dwelling for New Leaf Farm Mill Lane Bathampton Bath as it "**would have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt**", what objective "special reasons" are there now for allowing 1400 car parking spaces , associated tunnel and exit roads from the A4 on the nearby site ?

P 146 Question from: Bob Gore

Impact of commuters on the proposed P&R site

What proportion of commuters are expected to use the proposed P&R site ? Has an investigation i.e. market research been conducted into this to validate the modelling ?

What is the impact on the proposal if the commuters do not use this park and ride as expected?

What mitigants are there against this outcome?

P 147 Question from: Bob Gore

Objective information on the case for the Park and Ride.

What actual factual information e.g. concrete research on tourist/ commuters behaviour or traffic modelling information exists to inform and make a case for the proposed East of Bath park and ride? If it exists why was it not made available at the time of consultation and put in the public domain? If doesn't exist why is this proposal being discussed without it as it would seem to be fairly essential?

P 148 Question from: Bob Gore

The Loss of Parking Capacity in Bath and linkage to east of Bath P&R

The status of parking when I was writing this in my lunch time on Monday 9th November was :

| Name | Occupancy | Capacity | % occupied |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Odd Down P+R | 739 | 1252 | 59% |
| Newbridge P+R | 491 | 698 | 70% |
| SouthGate Rail CP | 125 | 140 | 89% |
| SouthGateGeneralCP | 528 | 720 | 73% |
| Charlotte Street CP | 469 | 1056 | 44% |
| Avon Street CP | 393 | 630 | 62% |
| Lansdown P+R | 506 | 827 | 61% |
| Podium CP | 343 | 521 | 66% |
| Total | 3594 | 5844 | 61% |

source : data.bathhacked.org

This is just one day and seems to say there are over 2000 parking spaces available round Bath, but I realise parking capacity is changing..

What parking capacity is due to be lost from the centre of Bath in the next few years? What proportion of the proposed East of Bath park and ride is expected to meet this lost capacity? What justification is there for this proportion being met?

P 149 Question from: Bob Gore

Environmental aspects

Beyond Planning and Land Constraints, Agriculture & Land Use and Biodiversity considerations , what wider environmental assessment of proposed sites has been carried out

P 150 Question from: Annie Dodd

Consultation

Are the council aware that the raw data from the consultation has not been released to the public upon request? Keeping this information does not allow for objective analysis by any other

party and there has been no analysis of the comments made in the 'open comments' box.

P 151 Question from: Annie Dodd

Park and Rides

Why would the council support another park and ride, bearing in mind the huge number of empty spaces daily in the existing three park and rides around Bath?

Bearing in mind the current safeguards for our green spaces, can the council really justify desecrating culturally and environmental land for car provision?

Does the council accept the limitations of park and rides as a solution to Bath's traffic issues and recognise that other more modern and innovative solutions have not been explored sufficiently.

P 152 Question from: Annie Dodd

Green Belt

Is the council aware that Green Belt development for a Park and Ride is only permitted by the National Planning Policy Framework after three specific criteria have been satisfied, namely

1. the P&R sites need to be in a Green Belt location, AND
2. it would preserve the openness of the Green Belt, AND
3. it would not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

And clearly these criteria are not satisfied by this proposal?

P 153 Question from: Annie Dodd

Common Sense

In spite of all the comments for and against, surely plain common sense would tell any interested party that sacrificing our beautiful natural environment for car parking is simply wrong?

P 154 Question from: Claire Warnes

What is the specific economic case for a park & ride on any of the 3 sites proposed, giving evidence of anticipated usage particular to these sites, cost and the financial impact on the local economies?

P 155 Question from: Claire Warnes

Why is there no specific evidence available of the very special circumstances that are required to develop on the Green belt. Why have non-green belt alternatives been given no serious consideration?

P 156 Question from: Alexis Pavlou

I would like to speak about the damaging environmental policies of increasing the supply of parking spaces in the Bath City Centre and the proposed park and ride scheme and what local government plans to do about the ensuing increase in traffic in the City Centre and outside.

Also, I would like to ask of the evidence as to whom will benefit (and how these are costed) and who will lose from the proposed Park and Ride and if the Councillors believe a windfall gain and loss should be compensated or should residents just rely on luck?

Finally, I'd like to know whether councillors believe that environmental damage will have a positive effect on Bath Rugby Club's proposed expansion. And also if the council members believe it is its responsibility to benefit a private, professional club based on public land at the expense of the environment and non central residents and how would it plan to recoup these windfall benefits?

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| P 157 | Question from: | Dr Sharon Collins |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|

Where is the evidence on who would use a P&R East? Where do they come from? How do they currently travel to Bath?

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| P 158 | Question from: | Dr Sharon Collins |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|

Where is the evidence that traffic would be reduced on London Road following the construction of a P&R East?

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| P 159 | Question from: | Dr Sharon Collins |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|

Where is the evidence that emissions would be reduced on London Road following the construction of a P&R East?

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| P 160 | Question from: | Dr Sharon Collins |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|

How many car journeys could be saved by investment in bus services, cycling and walking; modes that are also promoted by the transport strategy?

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| P 161 | Question from: | Dr Sharon Collins |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|

Sites F and B were rejected by previous administrations on environmental grounds. Why do you now think that they are suitable sites for a Park and Ride?

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| P 162 | Question from: | Dr Sharon Collins |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|

Do you think it's 'fair and reasonable' to conduct a consultation into the P&R East then urge people to vote 'yes' to avoid a "political disaster"?

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| P 163 | Question from: | Mark Millar |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|

If the Full Council Meeting determines that an Eastern Park and Ride is necessary, will a proper, transparent and fair assessment of appropriate sites then be undertaken, including all relevant information such as direction of travel statistics, and then a proper consultation process? Or will it be used to justify one of the three sites selected in the recent "consultation"?

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| P 164 | Question from: | Mark Millar |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|

Please explain to the meeting what the process was to select the three sites involved in the consultation from the Consultant's report. Who approved that decision?

P 165 Question from: Mark Millar

How much money (on both consultants and internal staff) has been spent on the East of Bath park and ride since May 2015?

P 166 Question from: Mark Millar

Given that the Council officers, who have expertise in transport, put forward no credible evidence demonstrating that a park and ride to the East of Bath is necessary in the consultation, how can elected councillors make a decision that one is necessary?

P 167 Question from: Mark Millar

Given that 46% of the traffic on the London Road (confirmed by Peter Dawson) comes from the north - A46/A420 junction, was creating better links from that junction to the Lansdown Park and Ride (which regularly has capacity and could be extended further) considered? What would be the cost of such a step?

P 168 Question from: Mark Millar

How much would adding a rail link to Site B cost? At the consultation Nick Richardson from Mott MacDonald said the cost was an additional £6m and would require a loop. Where would such loop go?

P 169 Question from: Sian James

In the final Q&A you say that the expected budget is £6m - £10m excluding land costs. In the agenda paper it states in 3.2 that £4.7m plus £5m for additional costs re land acquisition etc. What is the latest estimate of costs? Do these costs include all likely costs regarding CPO and legal challenges to the planning process?

P 170 Question from: Sian James

It is stated in section 4.1 of the agenda paper that the 'consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage'. The Bath MP Ben Howlett has stated that "almost no chance the plan will be shelved" (Twitter 27/09/15) – so it appears that a decision has already been made and this is just a tick box exercise. Why does the MP think that proposal is so certain if it is still at a formative stage?

P 171 Question from: Sian James

Also in 4.1 it states 'proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit of intelligent consideration and response'. Why did the consultation not include any data around why a Park & Ride was necessary? Why did the CH2M Hill paper only appear in the Agenda paper – why was it not published, or even referred to, during the consultation process? It's titled as dated November 2014, but when was the final version signed off?

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| P 172 | Question from: | Sian James |
| <p>5.1 of the agenda report states that 2 studies recommended the continued development of Park & Ride around & to the east of Bath.</p> <p>a) In fact the Bristol/Bath to South Coast Study specifically states: in section 5.19: “the results for the traffic reductions indicate that this P&R site (at Bathampton Meadows) can be rejected on grounds of impact on the local environment and only marginal incremental benefits for traffic reduction”. And under 5.20 it states “Fundamental to an integrated transportation strategy for Bath is to increase the availability, quality and accessibility of public transport services – essential if demand management measures are to progress.”</p> <p>b) The Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study is appraising the overall Bath Package of which a small part was the Lambridge P&R which was already in the planning process. But P&R is not mentioned at all in its Executive Summary recommendations.</p> <p>How have these 2 reports been reported as supporting this proposal – when they do not actually do that?</p> | | |
| P 173 | Question from: | Sian James |
| <p>In the 51 pages of the UK Overview document of the ‘Draft plans to improve air quality in the UK’ P&R is mentioned TWICE with no detail behind it. The emphasis is on encouraging cleaner vehicles and a move to cycling, walking and public transport AWAY from private vehicles. Why have you suggested that it has emphasised P&R when it has not? What are the Bath plans for FirstBus to move to green vehicles, and for a Low (or Ultra Low) Emissions Zone? Those would make significantly more difference than a P&R to emissions – especially in the wider area including Bathavon.</p> | | |
| P 174 | Question from: | Sian James |
| <p>In 5.3 it states that the ‘Getting Around Bath’ Transport Strategy supports a new Park & Ride east of the city. In fact the Transport Study consultation was for a Park & Ride/Rail east of the city. Of the 160 respondents to the consultation that said yes to a P&R/Rail to the East, 32 said that they would use it. Of these 32 possible users – 14 were local to the site (ie Bathampton, Batheaston, Bathford & Northend), 10 were in the target area east of Bath (Colerne, Corsham, Biddestone, Melksham and surrounding roads) but the other 8 were from locations such as Bear Flat, Weston, Newbridge, Keynsham which suggests that the interpretation was for a new RAIL site and not a P&R into the centre of Bath. Do you agree with my conclusion?</p> | | |
| P 175 | Question from: | Sian James |
| <p>5.3 also states that the Strategy demonstrates how a combination of better rail and bus services are essential – what is B&NES doing to improve rail and bus services with FGW and FirstBus?</p> | | |
| P 176 | Question from: | Sian James |
| <p>5.4 states that 2812 more housing units are forecast to be built in Bath in the next 5 years. Where are these locations in Bath? How many are in the city centre and how many are out of the city centre?</p> | | |
| P 177 | Question from: | Sian James |

5.4 states that the 'Core Strategy' states that a P&R is required to 'reduce commuter traffic'. How much of the commuter car traffic goes into the city centre and how much is outside of the city centre?

P 178 **Question from:** Sian James

Have B&NES worked with key employers in the area (eg Future, Wessex Water, Rotork, University of Bath, RUH etc) to understand the hours that they work, the transport methods that they use and the directions of travel? What are the plans in place to encourage employers to encourage staff to move to public transport and car sharing?

P 179 **Question from:** Sian James

There appears to be a significant difference in morning rush hour traffic on the London Road during school holidays – therefore it is assumed that school run traffic is significant. Are B&NES working with schools to reduce this? Which schools are they working with regarding London Road traffic – and what are the plans?

P 180 **Question from:** Sian James

5.5 states that the Economic Strategy is to create a net increase of 7700 jobs in Bath, mainly in the Western Riverside area? What percentage of these jobs are assumed to be filled by residents – and how many from outside Bath? What type of jobs are these assumed to be? What type of hours are these jobs assumed to work?

P 181 **Question from:** Sian James

For the new employment facilities in the WR Enterprise area – what parking provision is planned? How many car parking spaces are planned – and who for? (i.e. for residents of the new flats, or employees, or general public?). Are there plans to put restrictions in place on the use of these parking spaces – eg electric vehicles and car sharing use only? What specific restrictions are you planning to put in place?

P 182 **Question from:** Sian James

5.5 states that there is a need to address coach parking provision – is this envisaged to be in the East of Bath Park & Ride facility?

P 183 **Question from:** Sian James

5.5 states the need to address a36 as well as a4 routes. How is the a36 going to be impacted by this P&R? How will any a36 traffic that wishes to use the P&R (eg from Limpley Stoke) access the site?

P 184 **Question from:** Sian James

5.8 states that the existing 3 P&R's has enabled those without ready access to public transport to travel in and out of the city quickly. How many of the existing P&R users have been abstracted from public transport? What was the impact on local buses when the P&R's were

first opened? I personally know people that previously got a bus from Combe Down that moved to driving to the P&R at Odd Down – so its definitely not true that all cars are a reduction – many are an increase. Has a survey ever been done on Odd Down usage? Or on local patronage via VNR?

P 185 Question from: Sian James

5.9 states that the existing P&R have enabled the council to introduce RPZ and cycle lanes. How have the P&R actually enabled this? How have they enabled the potential Low Emission Zones?

P 186 Question from: Sian James

Regarding a bus lane a P&R on the east of bath – there is an existing bus lane going in, but not one coming out. How are the buses coming out of the city going to get priority over cars queuing on the London Road?

P 187 Question from: Sian James

5.10 refers to an estimate of 4000 people who commute into Bath by car from the East every day. Where is this data from Mott MacDonald? Why has this not been shared as part of the consultation? Where are these 4000 people going? How many are working in the centre of Bath in 9-5 jobs? How many work outside of city centre? How many work in jobs that would require transport outside of the P&R core hours? How many could get the existing bus service if it was cheaper, more reliable, quicker? How many already car share? How many could car share if there was sufficient incentive to do so? What is the basis of this data?

P 188 Question from: Sian James

5.11 refers to a recent modelling exercise by CH2M Hill – why was this not referred to during the consultation? The CH2MHill paper states that it is based on the previous work by Mott MacDonald (also not released to the consultation) but states that the Mott MacDonald work “did not explicitly assess the operational impact of the expected additional EA traffic on the highway network” and “Critically, the work previously undertaken made no quantitative estimate as to the amount of existing vehicle traffic which might be removed by Strategy measure to encourage the use of Park and ride and rail, walking and cycling”. Hence the modelling that has been done by CH2M Hill has made high level assumptions on not only P&R expansion as well as P&R East, growth in rail use, Metro West and increases in walking and cycling – all of which do not appear to be substantiated by data – but by modelling assumptions. Why is this so?

P 189 Question from: Sian James

CH2M Hill paper states “the Transport Strategy will need to be successful in achieving a level of reduction which largely balances out the increased traffic effects of the EA”. How has this been translated to there will be a significant reduction in congestion on the London Road?

P 190 Question from: Sian James

The CH2M Hill paper states in 3.2.2 that the traffic distribution was agreed “following dialogue between Mott MacDonald and B&NES officers” which suggests that it was not based on data.

The “agreed” number of 23% was used for A4 East/A46. What was the difference in data for this approach direction between B&NES and Mott MacDonald? What is the % split between A4 and A46?

P 191 **Question from:** Sian James

Table 3.1 Enterprise Area in CH2M Hill paper – what is the total area split between Restaurants/cafes, Offices/Innov, Hotels, Residential, Shops? What is the employment split assumption between these different categories?

P 192 **Question from:** Sian James

Under table 3.4 in the CH2M Hill report it states ‘An overall car driver mode share of only circa 20% for all trips made to/from the EA developments is possibly optimistic, even allowing for the ‘bus’ component using P&R trips which are arguably trips made as a car driver at origin’. What does this mean in laymans terms?

P 193 **Question from:** Sian James

The CH2M Hill report assumes a East P&R of 1600 spaces – but the max in the consultation is 1400. It also assumes further expansion in Odd Down (300) and Lansdown (300) over and above the recent expansions. Is this correct – or have these expansions already been completed? What is the impact on the CH2M Hill analysis if 1400 spaces are used rather than 1600?

P 194 **Question from:** Sian James

CH2M Hill report in 4.1.2 states that Odd Down site is used as a proxy for the hourly flows for East of Bath. Please explain how the P&R catchment area of Odd Down is similar to East of Bath?

P 195 **Question from:** Sian James

What is the assumption within the CH2M Hill report for abstraction from the local bus services for East of Bath P&R?

P 196 **Question from:** Sian James

in 4.1.4 if the CH2MHill report it states that “the increase in walking/cycling seen in the last 10 years...were not associated with a drop in car driver use of anywhere near the same magnitude. The figures show instead that local bus usage for internal trips has showed a decline (-24.4%) and trip making as a car passenger also reduced (-26.5%)” What is thought to have driven these changes in behaviours?

P 197 **Question from:** Sian James

In summary in 4.2 of the CH2M Hill paper it states “The estimated ‘net’ traffic increases predicted..... suggests that this ‘balance’ is achievable in weekday 0700-1000, but that the expected traffic increase in the 3.00 to 7.00 pm period is likely to outweigh the mode shift

reduction in existing car use possible”. This suggests whereas the congestion on the morning rush hour may stay flat – that there is an increase (over current position) in the afternoon/evening – is this the correct interpretation of this?

P 198 **Question from:** Sian James

Under 6.3.1 CH2M Hill states “ In the 0800-099 period the westbound congestion on the A4 London Road is reduced..... in contrast the westbound congestion here worsens in the weekday 5.00 – 6.00pm period. As such the journey time is noticeably higher than the existing, with the plots showing congestion leading to mean speeds of <15mph extending back to A46 interchange.” So based on the CH2M Hill modelling assumptions - the morning rush hour will be better but the evening incoming (ie Bath residents that work outside Bath) will be much worse? Is my conclusion correct?

P 199 **Question from:** Sian James

Based on the evening incoming traffic being significantly worse – what is the conclusion on the A46/A4 roundabout if you have a very busy London Road – and you also have all the P&R exit traffic?

P 200 **Question from:** Sian James

In the conclusions of the CH2M Hill paper 7.2 it states ”the level of existing car trips reduction achieved by the Bath Transport Strategy will need to balance or cancel out any expected ‘net’ increase in traffic generated”. It talks about increased rail and P&R – but there is NO mention of increasing bus (non P&R) or car sharing travel. With all the new development in Bath it would be relatively easy to push any new jobs to sustainable non-car travel – why is this not being considered?

P 201 **Question from:** Sian James

The CH2M Hill 7.2 conclusions state “the operation of the highway network is likely to be severely compromised if the development of the EA proceeds apace, but the implementation of a new P&R on the east is unavoidably delayed....”. Given that this P&R proposal is based on Green Belt land, will require a CPO for Site B, with a large number of planning hurdles to get through – and likely to face challenge at every stage – what is the Plan B? What is in the risk register for this project?

P 202 **Question from:** Sian James

Agenda paper 5.13 states that each parking space is currently used 1.4 vehicles each day. Where does this data come from? In the B&NES Q&A it states 1.5 cars per space. Which is it? Looking at the Bath Hacked data site it appears that the average utilisation is approx. 50%. What proportion of the P&R East is assumed to be commuters and what proportion shoppers/tourists for less than half a day?

P 203 **Question from:** Sian James

In the Bristol/Bath to South Coast study it states in 5.4 that “76% of their capacity which is near to practical capacity”. What is the current practical capacity assumptions for P&R East?

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| P 204 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 5.14 states that “over time traffic levels might increase as users recognise that there is less congestion on these routes”. How long do you think it will take a satnav such as TomTom to reroute someone? | | |
| P 205 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 5.14 also states that “measures can be introduced to prevent these benefits from being taken up by suppressed demand”. What exactly are these measures that can be introduced? Why cant they be introduced now? | | |
| P 206 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 5.15 states that the modal shift is from car to P&R. What is the assumption on modal shift from local bus, walking, cycling, car share passenger, taxi to the P&R? | | |
| P 207 | Question from: | Sian James |
| Has any survey (with VNR?) been done to establish ‘local’ users of the existing P&R’s? | | |
| P 208 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 5.15 states that a shuttle service to the RUH is a potential option – but this was not suggested in the consultation. Why not? Is this an additional shuttle to the 4 buses proposed? | | |
| P 209 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 5.15 states that the P&R will address air quality – by what percentage will the emissions be reduced? What will the air quality impact be in the Bathavon valley? | | |
| P 210 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 5.15 states that York and Oxford are expanding their P&R provisions. What is their business case for expansion and how much are they expecting congestion to be improved by P&R? Both York and Oxford have existing ring roads – doesn’t this make the proposition very different? | | |
| P 211 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 6.1 states that the overall consultation count was 49% for and 51% against. What were the numbers when split between paper and online returns? What were the numbers prior to the final week of the consultation ie up to Friday 9 th October? | | |
| P 212 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 6.3 states that the shortlist of 3 sites were selected in effect for reasons of purely operational | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| cost effectiveness – not feasibility or damage to the local area, or overall cost/benefit. Who decided on this short list of 3? | | |
| P 213 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 6.5 Why are the issues raised by the consultation feedback of need; benefit; impact and potential alternatives not discussed in more detail in this paper? As 51% of the respondents did not agree with the proposal – should they not be discussed in more length in this paper to the council? | | |
| P 214 | Question from: | Sian James |
| 8.1 should cover other options considered. What are the other options that the council has considered? What is the Plan B if this proposal is not approved? | | |
| P 215 | Question from: | Sian James |
| Planning and Green Belt – New Leaf Farm has previously had planning applications refused to build a small farm workers cottage on the farm as it is on Green Belt. How can it be OK that a giant car park is OK but a small farm workers cottage is not? | | |
| P 216 | Question from: | Sian James |
| Planning and flood plain. Avon Rugby Club is regularly flooded each year and were not allowed to put in drainage as it is an active flood plain – so how can it be approved for a giant car park? | | |
| P 217 | Question from: | Sian James |
| Council employees. I understand that B&NES either have car parking permits or Rail passes – but not bus passes. Why is that? | | |
| P 218 | Question from: | Sian James |
| Are there any plans to create HOV (High Occupancy Vehicle) lanes in Bath? If so – when? If not, why not? | | |
| P 219 | Question from: | Sian James |
| Are there any plans to create HOV parking in Bath? If so, when? If not, why not? | | |
| P 220 | Question from: | Sian James |
| What are the plans to expand parking provision at Chippenham, Bradford on Avon and Trowbridge railway stations – and also to increase peak hour services from these stations? | | |
| P 221 | Question from: | Sian James |

How is B&NES working with First Bus on the subject of pricing? On many occasions car parking is the cheapest option, followed by park and ride. A local bus option is normally far more than driving – even with the cost of petrol taken into account. To encourage people onto public transport and out of cars the cost differential has to be there. What is B&NES doing to make sure that the car is not the cheapest option?

P 222 Question from: Sian James

Has an underground P&R been considered?

P 223 Question from: Sian James

If the aim of the P&R is to attract commuters rather than shoppers, can the P&R cope with the numbers at rush hour?

P 224 Question from: Sian James

In the final Q&A published you state that the benefits to congestion, air quality are 'significant'. Please quantify this in percentage terms?

P 225 Question from: Sian James

In the Q&A "Some people think that a new P&R will increase traffic through the villages" the response is "there is no evidence....." is that because there has been no traffic study yet? So therefore there is no evidence to suggest that it won't increase?

P 226 Question from: Sian James

In the Q&A under bus service impacts it is suggested that "Local residents can also benefit as they will be able to use the P&R". Are you suggesting that Bathampton residents will be able to access the P&R on foot via Mill Lane?

P 227 Question from: Sian James

What is the impact on the new cycle way from Bathampton to Batheaston across the meadows?

P 228 Question from: Chris Hunger

Does the fact that there is already ample and largely unused free parking in Batheaston with a frequent bus service into the city which together offer already a park and ride facility, not provide hard evidence that a park and ride is surplus to requirements?

P 229 Question from: Andrew Lea

How do the council members feel that such an important decision with regards to the Park and Ride in Bathampton is being influenced by a piece of research that was undertaken in a biased and unprofessional way?

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|
| P 230 | Question from: | Andrew Lea |
| <p>Why has the raw data set (excluding the respondents comments) for the consultation with regards to the Park and Ride in Bathampton not been released for analysis even though it has been available to the transport department for nearly two weeks?</p> | | |
| P 231 | Question from: | Andrew Lea |
| <p>Could I ask who in the council chamber has visited the actual proposed Park and Ride Bathampton sites?If not, why not?</p> | | |
| P 232 | Question from: | Andrew Lea |
| <p>Councillor Warren speaks of how successful Park and Ride schemes are around Bath. How is he measuring this success? What does success look like? How has this success been quantified?</p> | | |
| P 233 | Question from: | Andrew Lea |
| <p>Given that current Park and Rides over the last year have very rarely achieved over 50% capacity (<i>Data sourced from Bath Parking usage data provided by Bath Hack a joint council and community initiative with a primary mission to bring bright people and quality data together</i>) does the council in these austere days feel it more prudent to maximise the usage of the existing locations by better signage and incentives than indebting the people of Bath with another.</p> | | |
| P 234 | Question from: | Andrew Lea |
| <p>Do members of the council believe that the consultation process for Bathampton meadows is 100% credible? If you have any slight doubts then can we assume that you will be voting against the motion? If you are not voting against the motion but have doubts in the consultation then why are you doing this?</p> | | |
| P 235 | Question from: | Tony Ambrose |
| <p>What evidence can the council provide to show that the proposed park and ride and tarmacking of land on or near a flood plain will not worsen the risk of flooding?</p> | | |
| P 236 | Question from: | Tony Ambrose |
| <p>What evidence can the council provide to demonstrate that traffic flows into Bath will demonstrably and permanently decrease as a result of sacrificing this green field site to a park and ride?</p> | | |
| P 237 | Question from: | Graham Feasey |
| <p>The council wants to bring 9000 new jobs to the city and to allow more housing development and student accommodation. It also knows that a Park and Ride at Bathampton will not prevent</p> | | |

traffic grinding to a halt. So what happens next? Should we expect to see plans to take up even more of our Green Belt for parking?

P 238 **Question from:** Graham Feasey

What thought has been given to light pollution? How many lights will there be, what type of lighting will be used and what will be the hours of operation?

P 239 **Question from:** Jennie Franks

Why is the disused airfield site at Charmy Down no longer under consideration?

P 240 **Question from:** Jennie Franks

Why is the council not pursuing the simple option of imposing a weight limit on Cleveland Bridge to deter damaging HGVs from passing through?

P 241 **Question from:** Jennie Franks

Has the council considered the impact on traffic in Bath of reopening the railway station at Corsham?

P 242 **Question from:** Jennie Franks

Has the council attempted to have any local roads, particularly Cleveland Bridge and the London Road, classed as 'roads to avoid' with Ordnance Survey in order to discourage through traffic?