

Thank you all for this further opportunity to address you. Today's agenda says that:

"The cabinet are still considering how to meet the need for a P&R to the east"

"How to meet the need...". The element of pre-judgement in this one sentence worried me because it assumes that all debate as to whether there is a need, is now superfluous and all that remains is to decide where to put it. I can see how that has come about; the siting of a park and ride has become so deeply controversial, that the Council has become swept up in this single conversation, and lost sight of the bigger question of whether there is a need for it at all.

So please Councillors, take one enormous step back, and ask yourselves where this all began. Bath has a congestion problem, and a pollution problem, and it wants to grow and be prosperous without adding to these two problems. But Officers have promoted a park and ride to the east for so long now that it's rightness is no longer questioned. The desire to deliver a "thing" – a car park- has clouded judgement as to whether the "thing" is a "solution". It is time for Cabinet to take back control of this issue and to ask probing questions of your officers.

Such as why are we proposing a 4th park & ride:

1. When the existing 3 are, on average, under half full? Why, then do officers persist in calling P & R "popular"?
2. Or when the Hill report tells us it will make negligible difference to congestion on the London Road?
3. Or when Mott McDonald told us as long ago as 2009 that it would cause a air quality in Batheaston to worsen, when this has been steadily increasing here since 2010?
4. Or when, to get the demand figures up you have to invent demand from the RUH, who have their own onsite expansion plans, and have never asked for additional parking, let alone from a site on the wrong side of the City;
5. Or when the impact of school run traffic has never properly been modelled, when this is traffic which can never converted to P & R demand;
6. Or why you are now being invited to trust nebulous, theoretical projections of demand out to 2029, by officers who at the same time have told us in writing that they have no forecasting reports to indicate the demand for a P & R in 3, 5 or 10 years, and that demand will simply
7. " *depend on the general prosperity within the city, as well as the redevelopment of key sites within the Enterprise Area.*"

This "let's just build it and see who comes" approach to P& R, is not a sound basis upon which to authorise a £12million investment. You deserve better from your officers, and I urge you to remind them of this, and demand to see proper, substantiated, evidence of need.

By Annie Kilvington: as presented to Cabinet, 13 July 2016