

Bath & North East Somerset Council

DECISION MAKER:	Cllr Sarah Warren, Cabinet Member for Climate & Sustainable Travel	
DECISION DATE:	On or after 29 October 2022	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:
		E 3408
TITLE:	Church Street Pilot Intervention	
WARD:	Widcombe	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
List of attachments to this report: Appendix A – ETRO Notice of Making Appendix B – AECOM Public Engagement Report		

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 Executive Forward Plan Reference E3394 delegated the decision to proceed with the implementation of a pilot through traffic restriction on Church Street to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Transport and Directors of Place Management and Sustainable Communities, in consultation with cabinet and ward members.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet member is asked to;

- 2.1 Note the high levels of support identified in the public engagement held during August 2022.
- 2.2 Make a decision to proceed with the implementation of a pilot through traffic restriction on Church Street, as set out in the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) Notice of Making in Appendix A.
- 2.3 Note the intention to proceed with the implementation as soon as a decision is made, and as such the potential interface with the Christmas embargo period.

3 THE REPORT

- 3.1 Residents were first consulted about the Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy in Autumn 2020. The results of this consultation were taken to Cabinet in December 2020, with applications for a first phase of Liveable Neighbourhood areas subsequently invited in Spring 2021.

- 3.2 48 communities applied, via their ward councillors, to become a Liveable Neighbourhood between February and May 2021. In June 2021, 15 areas were identified as places where a first phase of Liveable Neighbourhoods could start.
- 3.3 A further round of community engagement took place in December 2021 during which residents in these areas were asked for some initial feedback on what they thought was good about their local area, what transport-related issues they experienced, and what improvements would make the most impact.
- 3.4 Following this public engagement feedback, some potential modal filters (i.e., restrictions on vehicular through traffic) were identified as possible pilot interventions offering 'quick wins' for communities. Identifying a scheme as a pilot intervention meant that design work could be expedited, enabling some interventions to be implemented in advance of others. The pilot interventions initially selected were:
 - Queen Charlton Lane
 - Southlands, Bath
 - Church Street, Bath
 - Royal Victoria Park, Bath
 - Cork Street & Tennyson Road, Bath
- 3.5 Working with ward members, these pilot scheme locations were identified as places where residents had expressed high levels of support for vehicle restrictions to tackle anti-social driving, speeding and through traffic.
- 3.6 Engagement took place on four of the proposed pilot interventions during August 2022 (Royal Victoria Park was not taken forward at this stage). A letter was sent to all households in the local area. The webpage for the engagement can be found [here](#). A paper copy of the feedback form was available at the in-person event held on 16 August 2022 at Widcombe Baptist Church, and on request. The AECOM Public Engagement Report for Church Street can be found in Appendix B.
- 3.7 Two options were consulted on:
 - Option 1: a modal filter at St Thomas A 'Becket's Church
 - Option 2: a modal filter at the junction with Ralph Allen Drive
- 3.8 In total, there were 123 responses to the engagement, 26 responses were from residents of Church Street, 93 responses were from respondents who lived elsewhere, and four responses were from respondents who did not provide the basis of their interest in the area.
- 3.9 66% of respondents objected to the option of a filter at the junction with Ralph Allen Drive, so the following analysis just considers Option 1.
- 3.10 Overall, 62% of respondents either supported or partially supported the proposed pilot. Out of the 26 respondents that stated that they live on the affected road, 63% supported or partially supported it. Out of the 93 that live elsewhere, 59% supported or partially supported it.
- 3.11 The report notes that 31% of those objecting to the proposal cited displacement concerns. This is considered further in section 6.

- 3.12 The report also notes that whilst 29% of those objecting to the proposal felt that the proposed scheme would only benefit Church Street residents, 41% of those supporting the proposal felt that it would stop traffic using the lane as a cut through and generate a range of potential safety improvements.
- 3.13 24 respondents proposed changes to the proposal that they would like to see included or as an alternative, with the most popular suggestions being that access should be maintained for the church, National Trust, refuse collection and emergency services. These suggestions have already been incorporated in the proposed scheme.

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 In parallel with this decision to implement the proposed scheme, the necessary ETRO is being progressed to ensure implementation as soon as a decision is made.
- 4.2 The ETRO can be implemented seven days after the Notice of Making is published. The process allows consultation to be undertaken whilst the scheme is trialled, allowing further feedback and objections to be collected whilst the pilot is in place. Once an ETRO comes into force, there is a six-month period in which objections can be made. If the ETRO is subsequently modified, objections can be made in this period starting from the date of the changes. The decision to remove the ETRO or make the intervention permanent must be made within 18 months of initial implementation. If the ETRO is to be made permanent, a TRO notice will then need to be made.
- 4.3 A public inquiry could be required, depending on the nature of the objection, if it is received within the first six months of making the ETRO and not withdrawn, and the authority intends to make the order permanent without any modifications to address it. Making modifications or the withdrawal of the objection following correspondence with the objector will remove the need for an inquiry.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 5.1 Funding to implement the Liveable Neighbourhoods programme has been allocated through the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement. AECOM estimate the design and installation cost at around £7,500, which is within the current available budget envelope.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision-making risk management guidance.
- 6.2 One of the key risks is that the scheme displaces traffic and has a negative impact on other parts of the transport network. Traffic monitoring will therefore be carried out before and during the trial to understand how traffic adapts to the proposed pilot and to evaluate any impact on the network.

7 EQUALITIES

- 7.1 Equalities impacts are assessed both at a programme level and from the preliminary design stage, as part of the individual scheme design process.
- 7.2 A programme level joint equalities impact assessment has been developed for the Liveable Neighbourhoods and Resident's Parking Zone programmes. This was published in January 2022 and is under regular review.

8 CLIMATE CHANGE

- 8.1 A Climate Emergency was declared in March 2019 along with an Ecological Emergency in July 2019. In response to this B&NES has pledged to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. Liveable Neighbourhoods are part of a package of measures to mitigate the climate crisis through the adoption of more sustainable and healthy transport options.

9 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 9.1 A one-way along Church Street was considered and dismissed for the following reasons:

- The street would continue to be used as a through route
- Speeding is likely to remain a problem
- Residents would have to access the full length of Church Street via either Prior Park Road or Widcombe Hill

- 9.2 Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) enforcement was also considered and dismissed for the following reasons:

- Access would still be needed for visitors and other services
- Speeding is likely to remain a problem
- ANPR cameras would not be in keeping with the heritage of the area
- The cost would be higher than the proposed modal filter
- It would take longer to implement than the proposed modal filter

10 CONSULTATION

- 10.1 Consultation has been undertaken with the Directors of Sustainable Communities and Place Management, together with cabinet and ward members.

- 10.2 This report has been agreed by the S151 Officer and Monitoring Officer.

Contact person	Joanna Sammons , Assistant Transportation Planner
Background papers	None.
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	