

City Centre Security project - consultation update

On 19 May 2021 the council published the findings of the independent accessibility study as well as a summary of feedback received during the public consultation that ran early this year.

This was to give people the opportunity to examine the extensive work carried out to address access concerns raised and develop mitigations - all well in advance of the cabinet meeting discussion and final decision.

If people having read the reports wished to add further comments for consideration by the Cabinet they could provide these via an online feedback form. The feedback was invited between 19 May and 1 June 2021 with 64 responses received:

Comments directly related to the consultation reports
The independent study contains a section on disabled access none of this has been taken account of. Those that are not independent to the way they want Bath ie the council have taken no notice of the disabled and the problems their plan for the city has created for them. It is shameful.
The report is unnecessarily long and without any attempt to combine and simplify responses.
This is a complete waste of council taxpayer's money from start to finish. Stop putting up council tax to pay for external consults and consultations that nobody in Bath asked for to fight a terrorist threat that is minimal. We would rather have clean streets, high quality public realm improvements in both the city centre and neighbourhoods, better public transport and a noticeable police presence.
I support the current restriction on traffic in Bath city centre. Whilst this may be inconvenient for a few, the safety of pedestrians and cyclists in the city centre is paramount. Some of the comments relate to potential impact on local businesses by not having through traffic. However, the ability to safely walk or cycle through city, without excess traffic, will encourage people to come and enjoy the city, both locals and visitors. Not only does this help protect against terrorism, but also encourages non-car travel around the city which aligns with net zero, pollution reduction and active travel aims.
This Lib Dem Council is a disgrace. No correct consultations with residents. No proper investigation in to matters. Thousands of taxpayer's money wasted and now paying independent advisors to respond in a manner residents could have done months ago. Utterly disgraceful.

First, the study presents some conflicting complaints that appear to be impossible to address properly:

- Cars can't be banned because wheelchairs aren't a good enough option due to the pavements being too narrow (I agree, it's a problem everywhere in the city - too often the pavements are narrowed to make space for car parking)

- The pavements can't be widened, as we need to have enough space for cars

Have you considered making the pavements and the road level, like Stall Street?

Second, creating "designated cycle and e-scooter" routes in the no motor vehicles area is likely to create conflict - pedestrians will be angry with cyclists riding outside of "their" lanes, while cyclists will be angry with pedestrians walking there. In my experience nobody pays attention to any markings segregating cyclists from pedestrians, unless they are kerb-separated and on different levels. But then we run into the problem with wheelchairs from above. I think it would be a waste of money trying to segregate bicycles/scooters and pedestrians near the shops, as this isn't a transport route and the speeds are already low.

Finally, I do find it insulting that some councillors have only now discovered that there are accessibility issues in Bath.

May I suggest that you focus your attention to the vast number of A-frame barriers, kissing gates, chicanes, bollards with less than 1.5m gap, lack of dropped kerbs, narrow/uneven pavements, and other major problems which have been there for years?

The whole Ring of Steel concept is absolutely ludicrous and un-necessary, coming across as either taking risk aversion to illogical levels, or a sneaky way to pedestrianise, as the cycling lobby wants. The whole plan creates an inefficient Soviet style bureaucracy for residents, removes blue badge parking with no alternatives offered and achieves nothing of note. Whole plan needs scrapping, and if it resurrects, save money and improve quality using local knowledge rather than Consultants writing in a language that only barely resembles English

Any restrictions on blue badge holders entering the security zone should be resisted, and access to residential properties should be allowed at all times of the day and night as well as deliveries to said properties.

The disability report clearly shows that the measures put in are against the equality act. They should be revoked immediately as they are illegal.

I support the proposals. This makes for a safer and more accessible city centre for all. I note the concern for a small number of blue badge holders who currently benefit from free parking very close to where they'd like to shop. I note the council in this document signpost to car parks. Might I suggest that to help encourage blue badge holders to use those car parks that parking is once again, as it was in the past made free to them.

To go back to vehicular access in areas like Westgate Street would be a backwards step for the council. I would also suggest that hand in hand with these proposals more of the highway is offered up for table and chairs for hospitality establishments in the area.

I feel it is important to see the wider threat from terror and the different ways this has been brought to our streets, in Nice with a truck in London with knives and in Manchester with a bomb. We need to consider layers of protection to us all. The Terrorist does not abide by time of day or location but wants to create as much disruption as possible so restrictions such as these are important to reduce the threat and anyone who does not see that cannot see the wider picture we would not want Bath to be part of so by creating such obstructions will help to reduce that threat to all. I fully support the report as a result.

I have read the reports and the independent assessment and I feel the police have used a threat of terror to exclude those who are infirm, disabled or find moving around difficult. The independent report refers to blue badge holders but many people not holding a blue badge find the only way they can get access into the city is by car being it friends or their own. They may well not be eligible for any help but nevertheless are trying to be independent. if the city is insistent to put these arrangements in place the city needs a "spine tram" (it can be an electric bus or similar) which goes from the top of Milson Street to the Bus Station (return) and operates at least every 10 minutes. If infirm people are doing their best to get to the city (from whichever part of the compass) they need some low access help to move them around the central core. You can't just impose limited access without providing some sort of other way of people accessing all parts of the city without having to walk long distances. The proposal seems to solve low level risk identified by police without providing any mitigation for those who have difficulty walking even part of the length of the town!

You should make sure that you realize everything that has been done is in breach of the equalities act section 20 and article 4, 9 and 19 (and I'm sure there are others) of the UN Human rights- committee on the rights of persons with disabilities, at the moment they are fully in breach of both of these with many of the changes that have been made, whose calling them out on this?

As is clearly stated in Steve Maslin's Atkins report, they have not evaluated the Council's PSED (Public Sector Equality Duty) in respect to the EQ (Equality Act) (2010) as this is for the Council's own E&D (Equality & Diversity) Dept & Legal team to do. The PC's include others beside DD (Disability Discrimination).

There is absolutely NO WAY the Council can meet their PSED with ANY barriers left in place.

The wording of the question about "hostile vehicles" is an amazing piece of manipulation. Of course no one wants "hostile vehicles" anywhere so the question is designed to elicit only one answer. That alone raises doubts about the entire "consultation" exercise and appears to suggest that "hostile vehicles" are the only MO a potential terrorist group or individual might consider. So the entire "ring of steel" is predicated on a false assumption which suggests that it is not about protection of the public but rather a way to justify the banning of all vehicles from the city centre.

Comments by TARA:

It seems to us that Atkins have done a reasonable job with the limited brief they were given and while we might quibble with the details and limitations of their recommendations the council has provide an inadequate forum for doing this.

We would however, like to highlight two observations they report:

1. "It seems like this is just tinkering with traffic management without any overall plans for the City Centre - What is the vision for what kind of City Centre we want?"

This for us seems to be a key observation and should form a starting point for a new consultation.

2. The state of the pavements and the muddle of street furniture are a constraint on any access and mobile plans for the city centre.

We note that there are large sums of proposed expenditure for "active" travel schemes most of which is planned to be spent of specialist cycling infra-structure. We would contend that much of this expenditure would be better directed at improving the ability of pedestrians and disabled people to move around the city.

Finally, reading officers analysis of the consultations responses make it clear that there is a bias in designing consultations to making them easy for officers to analyse at the expense of offering residents the widest range of options for participation. This is a bias which, in our view, should be corrected.

The plans are unlawful. The Council is in breach of its Public Sector Equality Duty in making these plans without due consideration for the elderly and disabled, who need access by vehicle to visit city centre facilities. The Accessibility Report findings confirms this. The original Equality Impact Statement is below the standard of due diligence required by law. Mitigation of Equality impact post implementation is insufficient: Equality requirements should have been integral to the plan design. The plan to close roads is a grossly disproportionate response to the security threat. Central Westminster, a much higher profile target, is open to traffic, pedestrians protected by pavement bollards. No road closure was required in the joint Council - Police security plan published in 2018, since then the threat level has been reduced. My FOI requests for the results of the public consultation, and advice of the police on security were denied without lawful justification. The Council sought to evade its democratic responsibilities in this affair, and must revisit Cabinet governance to avoid such debacles in the future.

Things are bad enough now under the present restrictions and if as planned these hours are extended to 24/7 then living will become so badly affected for Blue Badge holders. We are already banned for the city centre shops, banks and restaurants and if the hours are extended, also from theatres and evening dining. I would suggest that my human rights as a disabled person are compromised against an able person.

One suggestion will be to keep the park and ride service running to 23.00 hours but of course this will lead to extra cost and my disability will not be worth it for the Council to consider!

I have never known a Council be so dedicated to destroying this city so completely regarding visitors and shoppers.

As for terrorism, will you stop an innocent holidaymaker carrying a backpack?

Finally who decided to put replies on Excel??

From the results of the public consultation, it is obvious that there is no overwhelming support for this scheme. This despite question 1 clearly using bias in an attempt to get consultees to agree to the need to "protect people from hostile vehicles". This is clearly a leading question and arguably invalidates the whole survey. An unbiased question would have asked something such as "In your opinion is there a need to protect people in these city centre streets from vehicle based terror attacks?" Had an unbiased question been used it is likely less respondents would have answered agree or strongly agree.

For all the other questions roughly 40% are in favour and 60% against, confirming the lack of support for the scheme in its current form. As stated in 4.2 the respondents were self-selecting, not chosen at random, but as per Cabinet Office guidance issued in 2016 the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory required proposals.

More concerning is the Accessibility Study which clearly identifies the negative impact this proposal will have on those with mobility difficulties, who are blind or partially sighted and those with dementia, as well as the impact on those that live within the scheme area. This should have been undertaken before the proposals were put out to public consultation and should have informed the design. At a time when the Council should be implementing measure to increase the number of people living within the city centre, creating an environment where deliveries are nigh on impossible will achieve the opposite.

This leaves the question of how the Council responds to the advice provided by the CTSA's. I tried to obtain a copy of the advice using an FoI request but it was rejected on security grounds, and therefore I can only speculate on the content. Were the CTSA's themselves responding to a leading question from the Council such as "would restricting vehicular access on these streets reduce the chance of a terrorist attack using a vehicle" to which the CTSA's would have to answer yes, or an open question such as "what actions should the Council take to reduce the threat to the public from a terrorist attack in the city centre?". Ultimately the Council must consider whether spending £2.3 million on this scheme is really justified, particularly

in light of the severe financial consequences of Covid-19, or whether that money could be better spent on other priorities.

I believe these plans are in direct breach of the Public Sector Equality Duty and the Equality Act. These plans without any consideration for the elderly and disabled, who need access by vehicle to visit city centre facilities with the Accessibility Report findings confirming this. In times of greater terrorist threat these measures were not deemed necessary so should not be deemed necessary now.

Having read all the documents, I see that a majority are against the proposals. But I ask again that the car owning City Centre residents with C zone permits, are given consideration with regard to parking. Now that tourists have returned to Bath, many parking spaces are being filled with permit holding hotel and B&B guests. On the odd occasion I use my little car for a journey out of Bath, I have the worry of finding a space on my return.

It is very clear from the accessibility study that the consultants failed to address the fundamental issues that not only are a problem for the city centre but also for the city and North East Somerset as a whole. The public realm is extremely hostile to wheelchair/mobility scooter users and the Visually Impaired and the study gives up and recommends that the car is a way to overcome those failings. If councillors are going to use cars as shopmobility then they have failed to understand and fix the underlying issues or even understood that disabled households have less access to cars than the average household.

What the council should be doing is using the £20m Levelling Up Fund granted to the Bath constituency to fix Bath's public realm, particularly high streets, and make these spaces fully accessible with shop mobility services attached to existing car parks. Not give up and have cars used as shop mobility devices on busy high streets that only a privileged few have access to.

The consultants acknowledged the hostile nature of the public realm in the executive summary but gave up defaulting to "the car" as the answer to overcoming poor public realm. They should have done significantly more work on identifying how to fix the public realm, not just in the city centre, but across the whole of Bath.

Cars are a vital form of transport for many disabled people, but as shop mobility, they are simply a very poor sticking plaster and one that is unfortunately only available to more well off. Fix Bath don't hide behind cars.

I wish to support in broad terms the approach that B&NES Council is taking. The issues of accessibility for people with disabilities of any kind are of course important. However specific questions of access from point to point need to be balanced against the generally improved experience arising from traffic-free roads. This will considerably advantage people with many kinds of disability, as well as being a welcome improvement for pedestrians in general.

Some access comments relate to the terrain in Bath, and we can't change that. Many more relate to specific issues about dropped kerbs, improved surfaces etc which can be changed (although not the cobbles which add to the historic and visual interest in several areas). My personal view is that there is little wrong with the general thrust of these proposals, and broadly I support them, but that considerable attention needs to be paid to minor improvements that help with the experience of those with disabilities.

I remain seriously concerned that should this proposal be accepted, I and others like me, would be considerably disadvantaged as a consequence. I applied for and was issued with a blue badge because of mobility issues and my need to be able to park near where I need to be. Constant pain, slow walking and a long recovery period makes the option of parking in a car park unfeasible for me. Also the idea of drop off zones would not work for me as I am the driver. According to the Disability Act the proposed plan would unfairly deny me from facilities like my banks, the post office, library etc. in comparison to able bodied people. I've lived in Bath all my life and am saddened to feel I will not be able to visit, despite living what was for me a 15 minute walk from the centre. I also feel that more effort should have been made to find out views on this matter. Surely there is a register of blue badge holders, most of whom could have been contacted by email or letter? An additional thought is regarding the reliability of a terrorist motorist attacking between 10.00 and 18.00 hours & not during large events like The Christmas Market. Common sense says that this does not preclude rush hours or indeed evening hospitality trading.

I have to return to the Chief Constables words of PROPORTIONATE/HIGH FOOTFALL/PEAKTIMES

The city centre proposals as drafted exceed those parameters and must be seen as fulfilling an agenda of ridding the city centre of cars and vehicles.

We must not lose sight of the removal of on street parking bays, Disabled parking bays and yellow line parking which has taken place over preceding years. The Atkins report is unequivocal that this shortage MUST be reinstated and NOT shifted into carparks because they lie outside the distance a BB Holder can walk if they qualify for a BB.

Independence and dignity MUST be maintained.

I support the proposal that BBH be permitted to enter the restricted zone and this should be maintained throughout the 24 hour period. I can see that the adviser has tried to accommodate some measure of restriction by suggesting permits but I believe this will be likely to prove costly. The other problem when talking of NEED to access the city centre is who defines that need? Similar problems exists on the issue of a geographical area or hinterland..who sits one side of a boundary or the other side? Banes already hold personal details of all its blue badge holders so there should be no issue with allowing automatic access 24 hours per day for these people via ANPR cameras. The RUH operates the system of vehicle registration for BBH and TFL allows holders of BB to register 2 vehicles to be exempt from the congestion charge. A computer system could be developed for Banes residents and a similar registration for regular visitors to Bath, those who work in the city but who do not have Banes issued BB. Tourists could apply for temp permits.

Any suggestion for time limited (duration) access must take account of the need to park in the area for cinema visits and theatre performances which may be longer than 3 hours.

Taxis, again licensed vehicles, should be allowed 24 hour access to be of service to elderly people and vulnerable such as women at night and those suffering temporary mobility impairment, those with sight loss etc.

Banes must look at plans for essential services eg banks and building societies to move into the pedestrianized area. Post Office should not have been allowed to relocate to WHSmith. Kingsmead Sq and Milsom St should be looked at within the total of the plans for the city centre.

Please take on board comments from stakeholders as these are heartfelt comments from real people who are anxious as to their future in Bath.

General or additional comments

It's worth pointing out that as a pedestrian on the pavement I am about 5 times more likely to be killed by a vehicle than a terrorist incident.

I suggest that there may well be a case for protecting pedestrians at points where there is a danger of vehicles mounting the kerb and of course pavement parking.

More to the point however given that we recognise that vehicles can be used as weapons, why not direct police resources to those who play the fool with vehicles and treat them like knife & gun offenders not hand out £30 fines?

It's clear B&NES will use any excuse, such as an ill defined "terrorism" threat to further its anti-car agenda, while doing nothing to support the residents & businesses who have no choice but to depend on cars due to the lack of alternate provision.

Being disabled, it is already impossible to shop in Bath, my home city. Driving to the shops is limited as so many pedestrianised streets. Visitors must be put off. What has increased the terrorist alert? It sounds like a huge Council rip off. Where is the money coming from? Spend what you have in a more responsible way and stop increasing our taxes. Are you going to do the same in Keynsham, Midsomer Norton etc.

It makes no sense to make Milsom Street a No Access Road. It makes vehicles do longer journeys and increases pollution, which I thought BANES wanted to reduce.

Consideration should be given to removing the stupid bus gate by Waitrose; as again vehicles have to make longer journeys especially from Lansdown to Train/Bus stations.

The Ring of Steel is a sledgehammer to crack a nut approach, terrorist attacks would most likely be carried out by lone-wolf terrorist on foot to get inside the inner area.

Just look at Reading Park,UK attack 3 stabbed & killed,further afield 2012, Mohammed Merah killed seven people in Toulouse, France, August 2017,Paris 2015: Gunmen and suicide bombers hit a concert hall, a major stadium, restaurants and bars, almost simultaneously - and left 130 people dead & hundreds wounded,(could easily do same to Theatre Royal, restaurants & bars in Bath) & finally Abderrahman Bouanane stabbed 10 people in the city of Turku, Finland. Just a few examples.

I do not agree that we need a safe zone, or any of these ridiculous measures. Open the City and keep it open for access to all.

I am a street trader that operates from pitch # Union Street and I require access to my pitch via Cheap street. Previously I traded on a pitch on York street and required access through Stall street where the barrier existed. My vehicle registration was included on a white list which enabled the barrier to drop down and for me to access my pitch before 6pm to load. This was removed once the Covid measures were put in place and now remains as a result of the security access. Restricting access before 6pm has created the 7 pitches along Union street to jostle for space to park their vans in a space only suitable for 3 vans at a squeeze. Where before the stall holders would leave at staggered times, anywhere between 4.30-6pm, this eased the congestion on upper borough walls at the top of Union street and did not cause an issue for pedestrian access as it does now. This access issue is particularly annoying on a Sunday when all the shops are closed by 5pm and we have to wait an hour later before we can bring our vans through to start loading. It's also an issue during the quieter times of the year when the footfall drops off considerably by 4pm. It is unfair to keep traders stuck at their stalls, creating a longer working day unnecessarily. Stall holder vehicles should have their vehicle registrations included on white lists as they previously were to enable us to operate our businesses without hindrance. Access is a necessary requirement after 10.00am and before 6pm for street traders and poses no security risk to the city.

Disabled should not be denied access

this idea is just plain stupid the threat is not from vehicles causing the type of terrorism it's from gun and knife attacks and it would just happen on another of many roads elsewhere where there is high footfall it is not needed by any one and would be very detrimental to residents and business alike have a bit of common sense it is the most stupid idea I have heard from a bath council in the 40 years I have lived here

I have never had an issue with cycling in Bath. During lockdown it's been fantastic to see the uptake in cycling throughout Bath centre and people able to commute actively. The more bikes, the merrier. It's stops polluting cars taking over the city. Cycling around Bath should be encouraged and not limited.

From my perspective, the proposals regarding the exclusion of blue badge holders effect my wife and I directly. We had enjoyed the parking in the centre of the city to facilitate ease of access to local shops and businesses. Without this valuable benefit we will be forced to shop elsewhere or online. This along with other proposals will ultimately sign a death warrant to the businesses and shops of Bath.

I am a fervent supporter of pedestrianising central Bath, and thus bringing it into line with so many similar towns all over Europe. As for disability access, I am deeply sceptical. There is a scandal about the privilege many of these people have, parking where they want on yellow lines etc (apart from the rumours one hears of how people obtain these privileges). At Waitrose, for example, they park outside rather than in the car park. There are alternatives for them and to sacrifice pedestrianisation because a few selfish people are grumbling would be totally unacceptable. BANES has for far too long, been subject to the voting predilections of those with vehicles coming in from outlying areas. This sacrifices the potential to massively upgrade public spaces in the city centre and to ease car access, and cutting pollution. I have serious doubts that the Council has the will to bring Bath into the 21st century, making the city attractive to those providing jobs other than in tourism. Tourism destroys cities and communities. The point at issue is upgrading of public spaces, closing streets, allowing pavement cafes, etc. The city will then thrive if this is complemented by promotion of alternative employment, city centre housing

and good, contemporary office spaces. I cannot believe that a disabled minority that manages to be served in so many pedestrianised other cities will prevent Bath progressing.

The proposed changes to restrict vehicles in the city centre should also be considered with regards to climate change, vehicle emissions, risk of road traffic collisions between vehicles/cyclist/pedestrians. Bath council should lead and be proactive in acting in the best interests of the city and reduce vehicle journeys through and within the city.

The LibDems city centre "Ring of Steel" exclusion zone is a terrible idea and is money wasted. How dare this council discriminate against Blue Badge holders and the huge number of people with mobility issues.

No good will come of this dreadful proposal and the people of Bath are against it.

Preventing cycle access is a disproportionate response to potential concerns of disabled residents, and other factors such as reacting to climate change also need to be considered.

As a banes hackney carriage owner/driver who specialises in wheelchair transport I am very concerned about the access for elderly and disabled residents and visitors to our great city, the road closures we have had already during covid 19, Cheap St, Westgate St, Sawclose, Upper Borough Walls not to mention Milsom St have already caused great hardship in our ability to provide a vital service to these groups of people who find walking or being pushed in their wheelchairs any distance extremely difficult

If the ring of steel is introduced to Bath this will cause even more extreme difficulties to very many residents and visitors as it will restrict access even further to so much of our great city

Also it looks like the taxi rank situated in Orange Grove which has been in place for over a century and is essential to over 120 self-employed BANES licensed hackney carriage operators who are already struggling to make ends meet, will be moved or possibly just closed!!

Taxis ranks need to be in the center of any city and be accessible to all ages and abilities

I don't feel that the people of Bath will see this online consultation in time - people need time to make up their minds and shouldn't be rushed.

Please tell me how by shutting the streets it will make a difference. All you've done is denied the disabled access to shopping areas. I'm sure if a committed terrorist wanted to plant a bomb they could walk or cycle in with it stuffed in his backpack or are you going to check everyone's bag who comes into the town centre. Why now ??? This is all about the CAZ not terrorism. Just another excuse.

It is my opinion that the heavy-handed response to a tiny possibility of a terrorist attack in Bath is just nonsense. If a terrorist wants to attack, he will. No bollards or police officers are going to make a blind bit of difference to the outcome.

Our historic city does not need barricades. What the Council needs to do, is paid to do by Bath residents, is get rid of double-decker buses (except tourist buses), provide parking for the elderly or disabled and give access to those trying to work for a living and who need a van or vehicle.

We don't need costly consultations; we need common sense solutions to benefit us all. Look at bicycle lanes sensibly not in the 'do-good' manner that has been adopted and just accept that for the ageing population who use their cars, cyclists have to be accommodated despite paying nothing towards the costly lanes and the reduction in our road widths.

We have as much chance of being struck by a meteor from Mars as suffering a terrorist attack.

There is a very, very small risk of a terrorist attack. With these measures in place there will still be a very, very small risk of a terrorist attack. If I were a terrorist I would not be put off by these measures, they are easy to avoid, the backpack would be the obvious weapon. The disruption to the lives of Bath citizens and visitors is not justified by the rewards.

I am against the security measures proposed by the council as I believe they will be of very limited protection because any determined terrorist (and most are determined enough to die for their misguided cause) will simply choose the many alternative methods of attack used including indiscriminate knifing, suicide bombing etc., as we have sadly seen on many occasions. Therefore, I believe this project will be a wasted expense of ratepayer's money in terms of achieving its goal.

I also believe it will be detrimental to less able visitors to Bath city centre as it will be more difficult for Blue Badge Holders to gain access.

NOTE: I was appalled by Councillor Appleby's callous response to a disabled citizens recent concerns about this and hope this is not a reflection of the council's attitude to its ratepayers. Has any apology been provided by this council on this matter?

On almost all occasions my wife and I walk into the town, but there occasional times when need to drive into the town to drop off each other or to pick up a large items from shops in the centre but if we are stopped from doing this we will simply have to go elsewhere. I am sure we are not unique and if this is the case, I fear more shops will close and revenue from Business Rates and Shop rents will be reduced for BaNES.

Please count my wife and I as strongly opposed to this proposal.

I am strongly opposed to this proposal as I believe it will be detrimental to the residents of Bath, particularly those with disabilities. This is such a lovely city which needs B&NES to concentrate on reviving its economy post covid. I can't see how this proposal will help this in any way. It is ill conceived as the measures will not deter terrorists.

This response of the ring of steel is disproportionate to the threat. There is no reasonable adjustment for the disabled. It appears yet another tool to remove cars off our streets - which is fine but it should be honest rather than hiding behind a terror threat

Somehow missed this consultation.

I am a Bath resident and not disabled.

For the rest of the consultation I would select "strongly disagree".

Complete nonsense. Bath offers no more security risk than any other popular city - also most terrorists operate on foot. This feels like another attack on the car in line with WEF policy's on Smart city's and LTNs - funded by the govt as part of their green build back better agenda 2030. If you continue to block off Bath and fill it with lumps of tarmac, ugly plastic barriers and cheap bits of street furniture people won't visit. The place will die and along with it your ability to collect rent and tax. The latest scam of luring unsuspected visitors into badly sign posted CAZ roads like Milsom St, then fining them when they don't even know they have done anything wrong, won't bode well either. If this is about the car - just fess up and say so. Also if you want proper opinion then write to every Banes council tax payer (you do when you want our money), as opposed to hide your consultation behind some online survey that only those in the know and pro the idea are made aware of. Ltn's is a very good example of this too. Ps of traffic is an issue then build a bypass instead of fining motorists

Personally I would very much welcome fewer cars in the city. I live in Fairfield Park and always walk or cycle into the city. My only reservation regarding the walk or cycle has been the pollution, noise and potential danger caused by the number of vehicles and traffic jams I encounter on my walk or ride although I am grateful for the cycle lanes. I have recently been prescribed an inhaler for asthma possibly caused by the level of pollution in the city especially around the London Road area. I think the ambiance within the city would be much improved by food and drink being served outside on pedestrianised streets such as we see in a lot of European cities which would increase the capacity of outlets and indeed profits. It would make the city more pleasant and civilised and less stressful. Although safety is important, I am not in favour of such streets being lined with bollards but would prefer to keep cars out of the city altogether. I understand that deliveries will have to be made early in the day but that could be arranged before say 9.00 in the morning when fewer pedestrians are using the streets. I also understand that there are people with disabilities who are unable to walk but this is not the majority and I am sure some innovative ideas could be used to allow this minority access using golf buggy type electric vehicles or something similar. I am no expert but there are experts who can advise. I feel really strongly about this issue and want to make sure that the views of walkers and cyclists concerned about the health of us all and the planet are set alongside those who feel it is their right to use their car for every journey.

This ring of steel is grossly unfair and discriminatory to disabled people. The terror threat has been with us a long time, why now? Is this the only way a terrorist attack can be carried out in the city? No. This ring of steel is not about protection against an act of terrorism, it is about traffic control. Stop pretending that it isn't.

As a Bath resident who lives outside the city boundaries, I wish to add my concerns to those already expressed about the further restriction of access to the city centre. As someone with restricted mobility though not registered disabled, I find it increasingly difficult to access the city centre at all. My husband and I suffer from serious mental health issues that mean we are not always able to use the bus, especially since the onset of the pandemic. The current restrictions on parking are problematic but to reduce access to the centre further without providing alternative routes means that we are effectively deprived of access to amenities in the city centre. The proposals do seem like an attempt to introduce pedestrianisation by the back door. This prioritises the needs of visitors over those of residents.

I think the proposals will be extremely damaging to already struggling city centre businesses & are entirely disproportionate to the perceived terrorist threat. It smacks of an ideological war on motor cars rather than a sensible response to terrorist danger.

I am disabled so bring back parking or will not come into town again

This poorly disguised attempt to further limit vehicular access to central Bath is flawed. Even if there were a risk of attacks in central Bath from 'hostile vehicles' any reasonable 'hostile vehicle driver' would simply carry out their evil attack in a street NOT covered by your cunning ring of steel. This ill thought out 'plan' will protect nobody and cause no end of inconvenience for residents and businesses both in the area and those in the wider area needing vehicular access from time to time.

Please do not shut Westgate street, saw close and upper Borough walls to cars 24 hours a day. Disabled people and delivery drivers need access to these roads.

It is already extremely difficult for anyone with a disability to access the city and these proposals would, in effect, deny my partner access to anywhere. He could not get to the only optician with a ground level consulting room, nor visit the book shops which are one of his sole pleasures. We already struggle to vacate the nearest parking to vision express by the 10am closure and, sadly, he is unable to use public transport. I understand that there are security concerns but they must not be allowed to outweigh the needs of blue badge holders (of which there are many) as that denies them too much.

Ridiculous

Stop punishing small businesses in Bath. All this 'build back better' ethos was never put to a vote before the last elections, yet all this council does is shut down the city centre, shut down access roads, penalise law abiding citizens who can't afford more modern cars. Why do you hate us?