

## OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

**TITLE OF REPORT:** Beckford Road, Bath

**PROPOSAL:** Active Travel Fund Scheme  
 (i) Amendments to parking restrictions  
 (ii) Mandatory cycle lane  
 (iii) Road humps (part of continuous footways)

**SCHEME REF No:** 21-016, 21-016A, 21-016B**REPORT AUTHOR:** Paul Garrod**1. DELEGATION**

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Section 4** of the Constitution under the **Delegation of Functions to Officers**, as follows:

<b>Section A</b>	The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Divisional Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility....”
<b>Section B</b>	Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to: serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within his/her area of responsibility.
<b>Section D9</b>	An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator.

For the purpose of this report, the Director of Place Management holds the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Orders.

**2. LEGAL AUTHORITY**

This proposal is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which under Section 1 provides, generally, for Orders to be made for the following reasons, and in the case of this report specifically for the reason(s) shown below:

(a)	for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or	X
(b)	for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or	
(c)	for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or	X
(d)	for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property,	

(e)	(without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or	
(f)	for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs, or	
(g)	for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality)	

This proposal, with regards to the continuous footways, is made in accordance with Section 90A of the Highways Act 1980.

### 3. **BACKGROUND**

In May 2020 the Department for Transport launched the Active Travel Fund to enable more journeys to be made on foot and by bicycle. This initially supported temporary highway schemes to aid social distancing in response to the Covid-19 pandemic but a next phase of funding (tranche 2) was then launched for permanent schemes, focusing on reallocating road space to promote active travel.

One of the schemes proposed incorporates a lightly segregated cycle lane along the northern side of the A36 Beckford Road, between its junctions with Bathwick Street and Warminster Road. Consultation was carried out between 26 February and 21 March 2021.

On 23 July, at a Cabinet meeting, Cabinet Members agreed that the Beckford Road proposals should proceed to the TRO consultation stage.

The proposed Traffic Regulation Orders for the parking restrictions and cycle lane, and the notice for the road humps at side road entrances (part of the continuous footway designs), was advertised on 2 December 2021.

### 4. **PROPOSAL**

21-016 (Road humps)

21-016A (Parking restrictions)

21-016B (Mandatory cycle lane)

The above are necessary in order to provide segregated cycle infrastructure on Beckford Road, to promote an alternative mode of transport to motor vehicles for road users, to improve safety and accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists in the area, and to enhance the local environment. The new proposals will restrict on-street parking in the area. However, these restrictions are necessary for the safety of all road users.

The following are a summary of the proposals that were subject to consultation:

### Road humps

It is proposed that 'continuous footways' (also known as 'blended crossings') which raise the level of side road carriageways to the height of adjacent footways where they meet the major road, are provided at the Beckford Road junctions with Forester Road, Beckford Gardens and Darlington Road. The purpose of these is to slow vehicles approaching when entering and exiting side roads and to give pedestrians priority when crossing.

### Parking Restrictions

In Beckford Road, the proposals are to remove the existing parking bay and the unrestricted area of parking and replace them with double yellow lines in order that a lightly segregated cycle lane can be provided.

It is also proposed that a short section of double yellow lines are removed from Forester Road to provide additional parking for permit holders. In Warminster Road it is proposed that a section of double yellow lines are removed and replaced with a time limited parking bay, to help offset the removal of the time limited parking bay in Beckford Road. In both of these locations it has been assessed that it is safe to remove the yellow line restrictions for this purpose.

### Mandatory cycle lane

This is proposed on the north-west and northern side of Beckford Road in order to provide dedicated space for cyclists which motor vehicles must not enter, other than to cross into or from a private access /driveway/car park or a side road.

## **5. SOURCE OF FINANCE**

This proposal is being funded against project code TCL0016 (Active Travel Fund). The estimated cost of this scheme is £80,000. The Department for Transport has agreed a time extension for completing the schemes beyond the original April 2022 deadline.

## **6. INFORMAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

Informal consultation was carried out with the Chief Constable, Ward Members and the Cabinet Member for Climate & Sustainable Travel.

The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO report number 2.

## **7. OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS RECEIVED (following the public advertisement of the proposal(s))**

A detailed analysis of the consultation responses is available in Appendix 1 'Traffic Regulation Order Consultation Outcome Report'. Information on the objections and comments received have been summarised below with officer responses in italics underneath each one.

### Overall response

A total of 159 responses were received, with most people using the online consultation form to submit their views. 45 respondents (28%) objected to the proposals, 43 (27%) partially supported and 71 (45%) supported. Those who used the online form were asked to tick a box as to whether they objected, supported or partially supported. Respondents using the online form were not limited in the length of comments they could submit about the proposals.

Those respondents who selected either 'object' or 'support' using the online consultation were asked if they agreed with a series of statements. They were then able to add other comments they wished to make about the proposals. Those respondents who selected 'partially support' were asked to explain why.

Supporting statements	
"The proposals will make it safer and more convenient to cycle."	selected by 67 (94%) of supporters
"It is important to expand the cycle network to give more people the opportunity to cycle."	selected by 66 (93%) of supporters
"The proposed improvements will make Beckford Road a better place for walking."	selected by 52 (73%) of supporters

Objecting statements	
"The loss of parking bays will make it difficult for me to park near my home and/or make it difficult to receive deliveries and/or visitors."	selected by 24 (57%) of objectors
"I have concerns about changes to parking in other roads."	selected by 25 (60%) of objectors
"There is no need for the cycle lanes."	selected by 32 (76%) of objectors

A more detailed analysis of the responses from those who commented on the proposals can be found in Table 5-2 of the Traffic Regulation Order Consultation Outcome Report in Appendix 1.

People who were objecting to the proposals tended to include more detailed comments on their reasons compared to those who said they supported the proposals. This is quite normal for responses to proposals for Traffic Regulation Orders.

### OBJECTIONS

#### Loss of parking in Beckford Road (24 respondents)

These objectors were concerned about the loss of parking and that this would also result in parking being displaced to other roads. Some stated that it can already be difficult to find a space to park and that the proposed scheme would make this worse.

*Response: the proposed cycle lane requires the removal of the ability to park along Beckford Road. There is not enough road space to provide cycle lanes and retain parking. Some of the time limited near Darlington Road is being re-provided through the creation of a new time limited parking bay in Warminster Road, which will provide some parking with a regular turn-around of use and only 15 metres further away than the existing time limited parking bay. It has been noted through observations that some vehicles parked in the un-restricted section of Beckford Road do not appear to be used very often.*

Concerns about changes to parking in other roads (25 respondents)

As well as changes to parking restrictions in Beckford Road, the proposals include changes in Forester Road and in Warminster Road.

*Response: these 25 responses were to the one of the three statements respondents could select for objecting in the online survey. Further details of specific parking objections are given below.*

Forester Road – removal of double yellow lines (4 respondents)

The objectors were concerned that the removal of these lines, intended to free up space for permit holders to help offset the loss of parking in Beckford Road, could cause congestion at peak times because there is often a queue of vehicles waiting to turn out into Beckford Road during weekday mornings. The queue would be likely to extend past the gap created for parking, which would then block any vehicles turning into Forester Road. There is a nursery in Powlett Road which generates quite a few vehicle movements in the morning.

*Response: it is recommended that the existing ‘no waiting at any time’ restriction is left in place to prevent obstruction.*

Impact on house boat dwellers (6 respondents)

The unrestricted parking area on Beckford Road is currently used by boat dwellers and these objectors state that the removal of these spaces will affect boat dwellers without a home mooring to park their vehicles. Some have stated that since the Canal & River Trust required them to travel 20 miles during their licence period (when they previously were able to move their boats every 14 days they could still remain in walking or cycling distance of their work or children’s schools), they are now forced to use vehicles to get to work and take children to school.

*Response: it is not possible to retain the parking on Beckford Road and provide a cycle lane. This location is very close to the city centre and there are bus stops with a regular service into the city centre. There would still be unrestricted parking available on Warminster Road approximately 600 metres away. Although this is up a hill, any disabled boater with a Blue Badge would be able to park their vehicle in the adjoining residents’ parking zone, the nearest space being Beckford Gardens and is no further than the existing parking in Beckford Road. It would not be possible to issue boaters with residents’ parking permits because under the terms and conditions of the*

*scheme permits can only be issued to residents living in a property within the zone that is registered for council tax purposes.*

Impact on residents with mobility issues or disabilities (3 respondents)

Two objections were related to residents living in properties fronting Beckford Road which do not have off-street parking. One is concern about an elderly resident with very limited accessibility who is cared for by a relative and they are worried about not being able to park close by. The other concern was from a retired resident who raised issues of how they could carry heavy items to/from a vehicle if they could no longer park on the road outside.

*Response: Beckford Road is usually continuously full of parked vehicles during the daytime and it is currently difficult to find a free space here, meaning at the present time more often than not it would not be possible to park in front of or that close to these properties. The proposals would not prevent vehicles from stopping alongside the cycle lane for the purposes of picking up/dropping off passengers or for loading/unloading. Although this would mean traffic heading uphill would have to overtake a vehicle that is stopped for such a purpose, this would be largely the same as currently happens. Disabled Blue Badge holders can park without the need for a separate permit in the Residents' Parking Zone in Forester Road and Beckford Gardens.*

Provision of cycle lanes – no need for the cycle lanes (32 respondents)

Respondents questioning the need for the cycle lane was the most common reason for objecting to the proposals. Some stated there would only be a modest increase in the number of people who may cycle and that it would not be worth the cost. Others asked whether cyclists would use a lane that takes an uphill route. One objector suggested that issuing high visibility waistcoats to cyclists would do more to improve cyclists' safety at less cost.

Several objectors commented that cyclist numbers are insufficient to justify the proposals and five stated that a better route already exists along Sydney Road. One objector, in questioning the need for the route, in part due to the gradient being steeper than recommended in the design standards, also made reference to the proposals failing to meet one of the core objectives of the standards of the need to provide schemes that are coherent and connected.

*Response: this cycle lane will provide a better link between the city centre and the National Cycle Network route along the canal. In particular, it will help cyclists from Bathwick Street to the canal route. A future route via Sydney Road would also be helpful but the Beckford Road proposal will help cyclists from a different part of the city. It will also provide access to Cleveland Pools.*

*New cycle infrastructure does not need to be based on current levels of usage. National research has identified that a significant barrier to preventing more people from cycling is concern about safety. Providing better cycle lanes is one factor in helping enable more people to cycle. As we develop a larger and better cycle network across B&NES it will make cycling more accessible.*

*With regards to comments about gradient and a cohesive scheme, see comments below.*

Proposals do not comply with new design standards (3 respondents)

The majority of respondents who made similar comments to this stated that they partially supported the proposals. However, a small number raised this as a full objection. Comments included that this proposal does not form part of a coherent cycle network, that the gradient is steeper than recommended for routes, and that the funding should be used elsewhere, such as London Road, where it could provide greater benefits to cyclists.

*Response: the council is planning to create a cohesive cycle route network, but this can only be done in stages as funding becomes available. That will mean parts of routes are put in that over time will join up. The design of the proposals is as compliant as possible with the design standards LTN 1/20 within the timeframe and funding that was available from the Active Travel Fund. There will always be an issue with gradients on some routes in Bath given its topography but that should not mean we should not provide new infrastructure for cyclists. Over time it is likely that e-bikes will become more common and more affordable, which may make cycling more accessible to people who do not currently cycle, and such bikes will be easier to use on Bath's steeper roads.*

Design of 'bus stop boarders' (9 respondents: 6 object; 3 partially support)

These objectors are concerned that passengers boarding and alighting from buses would have to step into the cycle lane as they do so and that this would pose a risk to their safety due to potential collisions with cyclists. The comments include concern that there would be particular difficulty in using this design of bus stop for disabled people.

*Response: catering for bus users and cyclists is particularly challenging. The 'bus stop boarder' design proposed is the only design available due to the limited road space at this location. If the cycle lane were to stop either side of the bus stop it would mean cyclists have to pull out into the lane of motor traffic in order to pass a stationary bus. Our assessment is that the risk of collision between a cyclist and motor vehicle is higher if the cycle lane were to stop either side of the bus stop than the risk of a collision between a cyclist and pedestrian with the proposed bus stop design. The 'boarder' design is included within the LTN 1/20 design standards where there is not space for the preferred 'bus stop bypass' design (ie cycle lane that passes behind the bus stop). The proposal includes enhanced features that do not appear in the design standards such as the use of red coloured surfacing in the cycle lane to make it distinct from the adjacent footway, road markings telling cyclists to give way to pedestrians, and tactile paving. If the scheme goes ahead we will closely monitor how these bus stops are used and undertake an early review. We will also carry out publicity to make bus users and cyclists aware of these relatively new types of road layout.*

### Design of continuous footways (2 respondents)

One respondent believes the continuous footways will be unsafe for vulnerable pedestrians and another stated that it will make emerging from Forester Road more dangerous in a vehicle because of the restricted visibility.

*Response: the proposal is aimed at improving priority and safety for pedestrians. Not having to step down and having a continuous level will be a benefit to people with mobility difficulties. Vehicles turning into or out of the side road will have to slow down due to the change in level of the carriageway. Although the design of the continuous footway puts the 'give way' marking further back, the purpose of this is for drivers to give way to pedestrians first and then proceed over the continuous footway and wait at the edge of the main road before proceeding. This means there is no change to visibility for a driver looking to enter the main road.*

### The proposals will reduce the safety of pedestrians (4 respondents: 1 support, 5 partially support)

These comments were largely relating to the proposals for continuous footways (see Partial Support section below). Comments of concern included views that the continuous footways would be dangerous for vulnerable pedestrians and that they could cause confusion between pedestrians, drivers and cyclists.

*Response: the purpose of the continuous footway is to make it visually appear that the footway continues across the carriageway of the side road, and that drivers, riders and cyclists turning in or out of the side road give way to people crossing. This supports and reinforces the recent changes to the Highway Code. Although such layouts are not currently common outside of large cities in the UK, people will become more familiar with them and they will give much greater priority to pedestrians.*

## PARTIAL SUPPORT

### Proposals don't go far enough in giving space to pedestrians and cyclists (32 respondents: 9 support, 23 partially support)

These types of comment relate to the design of the proposals and that they do not go further in terms of providing a longer route for cyclists. There was some concern the method of separating cyclists from motor traffic would not be sufficient and that the route would not continue to the University of Bath as had been originally proposed.

*Response: the North Road and The Avenue sections of the route to the University were put on hold following the initial stage of consultation earlier in 2021. Further assessment of the route options to the University is currently being undertaken and a Citizens' Panel is being set up to consider the routes further. The design of the scheme was influenced by the funding available and the timescales set down through the government's Active Travel Fund. With a greater level of funding an alternative method of separating the cycle lane from other traffic could have been considered, but the method of light*



*segregation proposed still provides a safer route for cyclists compared to the current situation.*

Cycle lane wands are spaced too far apart (22 respondents)

Bollards called 'wands' would be used to separate the cycle lane from other traffic. The objectors were concerned that this could make the cycle lane vulnerable to being encroached by motor vehicles and diminish the level of protection to cyclists. Some objectors asked for the cycle lane to be separated using kerbs or use of a raised cycle track.

*Response: the proposals would provide wands spaced 15 metres apart (with a small traffic island at the start of the cycle lane). This was a change from the original proposals where the wands were to be much closer, but this was altered following feedback from the emergency services who were concerned that motor vehicles would not be able to pull out of the way of an emergency vehicle. Whilst it is acknowledged that these larger gaps between wands would enable vehicles to enter the cycle lane, vehicles would have to slow considerably to do this and it would have to be a deliberate manoeuvre rather than through a vehicle accidentally straying in. There would be a series of lower level 'Orca' separator devices to help maintain the distinction and separation between cycle lane and other traffic in between the wands. A stepped cycle track would face similar issues.*

Cycle lanes are not wide enough (22 respondents)

Many of these respondents made reference to 2 metre wide cycle lanes as stated in the LTN 1/20 design standards, and expressed disappointment that the Beckford Road proposal do not include 2 metre wide lanes throughout.

*Response: the desirable minimum width of a cycle lane in LTN 1/20 where peak hour cycle flow is up to 200 cyclists is 2 metres, but it allows for 1.5 metre wide lanes at constraints. In Beckford Road the cycle lane would be 2 metres wide between the junctions with Beckford Gardens and Warminster Road, but on the section between Bathwick Street and Forester Road it would be 1.5 metres wide and from there to Beckford Gardens the cycle lane would be 1.7 metres wide. It is not possible to provide a wider lane in these sections without removing one of the two inbound general traffic lanes. Doing this could have a major impact on inbound queue lengths and require significant amendments to the Beckford Road/Bathwick Street signalised junction. Such a change was outside of the budget and timescale for the Active Travel Fund.*

Design of continuous footways (21 respondents)

Some respondents who commented about the continuous footways stated that the proposals were not proper continuous footways as such and believed they would just be a raised section of carriageway. Seven respondents were concerned that the design of the continuous footway means double yellow line markings are discontinued at the point of the raised section of carriageway and that it could lead to vehicles parking there, making it dangerous to cross the road. Some respondents also asked whether the proposals included use of 'Dutch kerbs' which are a specific design of kerbs that are safe for cyclists

to use and have been included in designs of continuous footways in the Netherlands and elsewhere.

*Response: there appears to have been some confusion with regards to the design of the proposed continuous footways. They would not just be ramped sections of raised carriageway and would include new footway materials stretching beyond the carriageway of the side road into the adjacent footway to make it look like the footway continuous across the carriageway. We would use best practise design used elsewhere. There is currently no national design guidance on continuous footways. The double yellow lines would not appear on the raised section of carriageway because this would then prevent it from looking like the footway continues across. However, this is no different from how signalised crossings are marked, where the double yellow lines stop either side of the crossing point, and we do not experience parking issues in such locations.*

#### Lack of dropped kerb access to Sydney Gardens (17 respondents)

Comments were made noting that no step-free access was being provided into Sydney Gardens.

*Response: access into Sydney Gardens is beyond the scope of this scheme. However, step-free access is to be provided as part of the separate Sydney Gardens improvements project.*

#### Other comments from respondents partially supporting the proposals

Some respondents cited reasons contained within the objections section above for not giving a full 'support' response, including the impact on parking, concerns that they could have a negative impact on the safety of cyclists or pedestrians.

*Response: please refer to comments above.*

### SUPPORT

#### The proposals will make it safer and more convenient to cycle (67 respondents)

There were varied comments from people in support of the proposals that have been grouped together under this heading. Several people stated they currently cycle along Beckford Road and would feel safer with the proposals in place. Two people stated they would start cycling to work if the scheme goes ahead. Other comments included reference to this being an important cycle route, that more measures of this kind are needed in Bath, and several people stated they believe the scheme would encourage more people to cycle.

#### Importance of expanding the cycle network to enable more people to cycle (66 respondents)

Many of the people who responded stating they support the proposals made reference to the need to expand the cycle network in Bath.

Proposals will provide a safer environment for pedestrians (10 respondents: 9 support, 1 partially support)

One person stated they believe people cycle along the footway in Beckford Road because the road is not safe to cycle on and therefore welcomed the proposals. Two others commented that the continuous footways will help people cross side roads and that it would make it safer to cross the Forester Road junction because traffic turning in would have to slow.

Other comments by those responding in support of the proposals

Two respondents commented that the proposals will help improve air quality through enabling more people to cycle instead of driving, and two people commented that the proposals would be a positive step towards tackling the climate emergency.

**Ward Members**

**Bathwick:**

Cllr Manda Rigby –

Thanks for this. I still have severe reservations about the floating bus stop, and encourage any paint or other signage possible to be deployed to ensure the possibility of conflict between pedestrians accessing or alighting buses and cyclists is minimised. I understand that this design is compliant with national legislation, hence it has to be used.

I am pleased that the plan has been amended so that we are not re-providing parking on Forester Road, and would like to request that in a future TIP we review parking on the road to see if a different provision could help with safety and speeding.

Cllr Dr Yuktेशwar Kumar –

As I said during our meeting, I have huge concern for the people alighting from buses and bumping into cyclists at the bus stop on Beckford Road. Disabled and senior people are particularly vulnerable. Can we do something differently to avoid any fatalities in future, please?

*Response: this particular bus stop has relatively light usage. The principle of the design layout is included within the design standards and we have enhanced it order to improve awareness between cyclists and bus users. The only alternative to the design at this location is to stop the cycle lane either side of the bus stop, which would mean cyclists then have to pull out into traffic when there is a bus at a stop.*

**Cabinet Member for Climate & Sustainable Travel**

Cllr Sarah Warren -

As Cabinet Member I would like to progress this TRO, which provides safe cycling infrastructure on an important strategic route.

Acknowledging concerns of ward members, I am pleased to see that additional measures are proposed at B&NES' first floating bus stop, and would like close monitoring and reporting to cabinet of any safety incidents that arise at this location.

**8. RECOMMENDATION**

It is acknowledged that the proposals will have an impact on the residents who live along Beckford Road and some house boat dwellers. However, the overall benefits of the scheme outweigh the disadvantages because this will provide an important and safer cycle facility as one part of Bath's planned network of cycle routes. It also brings benefits and improvements to pedestrians. It is therefore recommended that the proposed scheme is implemented and the Traffic Regulation Orders are sealed as described below.

Signature: 

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> February 2022

Gary Peacock  
Deputy Group Manager, Highways & Traffic

**9. DECISION**

As the Officer holding the above delegation, having reviewed this report and the accompanying Appendix 1, I have decided that the objections / comments be:

Road humps (continuous footways):		
a)	not acceded to and the proposal as advertised goes ahead.	X
b)	acceded to in full and the proposal(s) withdrawn.	
c)	acceded to in part and the following adjustments, being of minor significance; be included:	

Parking restrictions (21-016A):		
a)	not acceded to and the Order as advertised be sealed.	
b)	acceded to in full and the proposal(s) withdrawn.	
c)	acceded to in part and the following adjustments, being of	X

	minor significance; be included in the Order to be sealed.  The proposal to remove the no waiting at any time (double yellow line) restriction in Forester Road be withdrawn.	
--	---	--

Mandatory cycle lane (21-016B):		
a)	not acceded to and the Order as advertised be sealed.	X
b)	acceded to in full and the proposal(s) withdrawn.	
c)	acceded to in part and the following adjustments, being of minor significance; be included in the Order to be sealed.	

In taking this decision, I confirm that due regard has been given to the Council's public sector equality duty, which requires it to consider and think about how its policies or decisions may affect people who are protected under the Equality Act.



Signature: ...  
Chris Major  
Director for Place Management

Date:22/03/22