

Sian James statement to B&NES Council 14Sept 2016.

I am here tonight because I remain concerned that you do not have a clear set of objectives before you as you come near to a decision about an East P&R. Please listen with an open mind to what I have to say:

You have stated, in your own papers produced for the Planning Inspector, that the original justification for the P&R had 6 objectives, so I have reviewed your papers against your objectives.

First objective - Congestion – your own papers state that morning rush hour on the London Road will not improve – at best it will stand still. Your SRN paper says that by **2029** the P&R **might** take **around 100 cars** off the London Rd. 1.6 cars per minute – that doesn't sound much.

For the P&R to help the rush hour – the target users have to be commuters – however **most** currently park elsewhere for free so are unlikely to use P&R.

And you **still** don't have any **data** about what drives the congestion, who is going where, or whether people would actually use an East of Bath P&R.

To reduce congestion around car parks – you need to reduce the number of spaces offered. Please tell us the latest? Are they reducing or increasing? Each week we hear something different! What is the truth?

And of course the P&R will only impact 50% of the congestion anyway!

By developing in Bath you are planning for congestion to get WORSE, P&R will hardly make a dent in it – your own experts tell you this, but that is not what you are admitting to your electorate/residents.

Second objective- Environment – Remember Bens Corridor of Death? if congestion doesn't significantly improve – pollution won't either. Pollution isn't mentioned in the Inspectors report.

Third - Reduce car use into the city – this will only reduce IF you remove car parking spaces.

Fourth & Fifth: To reduce carbon emissions & To improve connectivity – aren't these both reliant on **significant** reduction in congestion.

So - According to YOUR papers **5 of the 6** objectives for P&R will not be met. But of course the 6th one will – supporting economic development. BUT – if congestion is worse than now – even a P&R for shoppers won't be attractive if the buses are just stuck in traffic on the London Road!

According to the Chronicle you now only HOPE that an East P&R will alleviate future congestion. That's not very convincing.

So - What is your objective for P&R now? Is it still reducing congestion and pollution, which is what us, the residents, want. It doesn't appear to be.

Your original consultation clearly misled people into thinking that an East P&R will solve all the problems of congestion and pollution on the London Road. It won't.

You have stated that you have 6 objectives for an East P&R – you should be presenting metrics as to how your proposals meet these objectives – this is sorely lacking.

Sorry – but this is £12million plus of tax payers money – our money – and we want a **real significant difference in congestion and pollution** – not just a tiny insignificant difference, perhaps, in 2029. Bath deserves better, our Green Belt deserves better.

Note:

Objectives of P&R (from BNES/PMP/002/20 Q3. Is Provision of an East of Bath Park & Ride justified?)

1. To reduce congestion within the city & around car parks
2. To improve the environment
3. To reduce car use & improve % of public transport journeys
4. To reduce carbon emissions from transport
5. To improve connectivity to support regions growth
6. To support city's economic development